Regular Council Agenda
May 5, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers
8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

   (a) Sports Hall of Fame Inductions --
   (b) Laura Ann England, Steel Horse Motorcycle Gear
       Re: Motorcycle Parking on Horne Street Page 5

4. PROCLAMATIONS

   (a) May 10, 2014 as “Move for Health Day” Healthy Families BC Page 6
   (b) May 2014 as “Missing Children’s Month” and May 25, 2014 as “Missing Children’s Day” Child Find British Columbia Page 7
   (c) May 4 through 10, 2014 as “Communities in Bloom Week” Communities in Bloom, Canada Page 9

5. ADOPTION OF INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

   (a) Minutes of the Abbotsford Mission Water & Sewer Commission meeting held on February 13, 2014 Page 10
   (b) Minutes of the Mission Healthy Community Council meeting held on February 18, 2014 Page 14

6. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

7. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

   (a) Storm Sewer System Assessment – Surveying Contract Cost Page 19

8. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

   (a) Rezoning Application R14-004 (McPherson/Toor) – 8462 Stave Lake Street Page 30
(b) Rezoning Application R14-005 (Pavlov) – 12699 Cardinal Street

(c) Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment to allow for a Secondary Dwelling Unit use within all Rural, Rural Residential and Suburban Zones

(d) Development Variance Permit DV14-013 (Toor/McPherson) – 7380 Wren Street

(e) Follow-Up Regarding Mr. Gord Lawson’s Presentation

(f) Excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on October 7, 2013 and related Staff Report dated September 23, 2013 (R13-016 – Toor/McPherson)

Background for consideration of adoption of Zoning Amending Bylaw 5379-2013-5050(120) [see Section 12(a)]

9. CORPORATE SERVICES

(a) Proposed Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw

(b) Draft 2013 Consolidated Financial Statements

(c) 2013 Audit Results and Communications

(d) 2013 Development Cost Charges Activity

(e) Investment Holdings Quarterly Report – March 31, 2014

(f) 2014 Tax Rates Bylaw

(g) Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives Role (Verbal Item – Councillor Tilbury)

10. RESOLUTION TO RISE AND REPORT

11. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT

(a) Adoption of Recommendations from the April 14, 2014 Committee of the Whole (Corporate Services Committee) Meeting

12. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

MOTION: That the readings of all bylaws included in the Bylaws section of the May 5, 2014 regular council agenda be approved as listed.
(a) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5379-2013-5050(120)**

(R13-016 – Toor/McPherson) – a bylaw to rezone the property at 7380 Wren Street from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to Urban Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RC465s)

Adoption

(b) **Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 5362-2013**

a bylaw to regulate the discharge of firearms within the municipal boundary

Rescind First, Second and Third Readings

(c) **Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 5433-2014**

a bylaw to regulate the discharge of firearms within the municipal boundary

First, Second and Third Readings

(d) **Annual Tax Rates Bylaw 5432-2014**

a bylaw to establish the tax rates for 2014

First, Second and Third Readings

(e) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5434-2014-5050(139)**

(R14-004 – McPherson/Toor) – a bylaw to rezone property at 8462 Stave Lake Street from the Rural Residential (RR7) Zone to the Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone

First and Second Readings

(f) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5435-2014-5050(140)**

(R14-005 – Pavlov) – a bylaw to rezone property at 12699 Cardinal Street from the Rural 36 (RU36) Zone to the Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) Zone

First and Second Readings

13. **MINUTES**

(a) Regular Council Meeting – March 3, 2014

Page 175

(b) Regular Council Meeting – April 7, 2014

Page 191

(c) Special Council Meeting (for the purposes of going into a Closed Meeting) – April 9, 2014

Page 209

(d) Committee of the Whole (Corporate Services Committee – Development Corporation and Economic Development) Meeting – April 14, 2014

Page 171

(e) Special Council Meeting (for the purposes of going into a Closed Meeting) – April 17, 2014

Page 211

14. **NEW/OTHER BUSINESS**

MOTION: That Development Variance Permit DV14-003 (Toor/McPherson) for the property located at 7380 Wren Street to vary:

Section 602, D. 1. Setbacks of the District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by reducing the minimum Interior Side setback for an Accessory Building from 1.2 metres (3.9 feet) to 0 metres (0 feet) to allow for an existing garage to be retained, be approved.
15. MAYOR’S REPORT

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

17. QUESTION PERIOD

18. ADJOURNMENT
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: April 11, 2014

To: Manager 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:

   Changing parking spaces out front of 7282 Horne Street to motorcycle parking only.
   
   I would like a chance to show how this would not be a hindrance, but would add value to downtown Mission.

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:

Laura Ann England, Steel Horse Motorcycle Gear
2014 Move For Health Day

Declaration For Mayors And Local Politicians

WHEREAS the World Health Organization has selected Move for Health Day to be observed around the globe on May 10, every year; and

WHEREAS physical activity affects the lives of all people in Canada and around the world; and

WHEREAS compelling scientific evidence has demonstrated that physical activity plays a key role in promoting optimal health and development in children and youth and in preventing disease, disability and premature death in everyone; and

WHEREAS two-thirds of Canadians are not active enough to benefit their health; and

WHEREAS there is virtually no human condition that cannot be improved by increased physical activity; and

WHEREAS physical activity builds and maintains a healthy body and promotes well-being and decreases feelings of anxiety and depression; and

WHEREAS Canada’s Physical Activity Guide recommends that everyone accumulate 30 to 60 minutes of moderate physical activity most, or preferably all, days of the week; and

WHEREAS Move for Health Day provides an opportunity to focus local, national and international attention on the necessity and benefits of physical activity; and

WHEREAS federal and provincial/territorial governments have recognized that physical inactivity is a major health concern in Canada, and that individual, community, national and global collaboration is essential to educating and raising awareness of physical activity hence promoting: Move for Health Day;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED that I, ______________, _________ (Mayor, Councillor) of __________, do hereby declare that _____________(city, municipality, community) will observe Move for Health Day May 10, every year. I urge all citizens to take part in activities and observances designed to increase awareness and understanding of the importance of physical activity, and to join local, national and global efforts to improve accessibility to physical activity for all our citizens.
April 16, 2014

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

**Re: Proclamation for National Missing Children’s Month and Missing Children’s Day**

I write today on behalf of Child Find British Columbia. Child Find BC requests that your local government proclaim May as Missing Children’s Month and May 25th as missing Children’s Day.

Child Find BC provides “ALL ABOUT ME” ID Kits with child finger printing and photos, to at no cost to families and Child Find BC hosts these Child Find ID Clinics throughout BC. Child Find BC provides education, including public speakers, literature and tips for families to assist them in keeping all of our children safe.

We hope that you will raise this proclamation for consideration to your Council and your community at your next meeting.

Most recent reporting from the RCMP show that over 8,000 cases of missing children were reported in British Columbia and over 45,000 cases in Canada. Through the support of municipal governments like yours we are able to educate and bring awareness to thousands of BC families on this important issue.

Thank you so much for your consideration of this request and your continuing commitment to Community Services in BC and the children and families of BC. If you have any questions regarding this request please contact the Child Find BC office at 1-888-689-3463.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Crystal Dunahee President, Child Find BC

If you or your organization would like to host an “All About Me” ID clinic, have an idea for an event in your community or would like literature and information on becoming a member and supporter of Child Find BC, please call us at 1-888-689-3463.
WHEREAS Child Find British Columbia, a provincial member of Child Find Canada is a non-profit, registered charitable organization, incorporated in 1984; AND

WHEREAS The Mandate of Child Find British Columbia is to educate children and adults about abduction prevention; to promote awareness of the problem of missing children, and to assist in the location of missing children; AND

WHEREAS Child Find has recognized Green as the colour of Hope, which symbolizes a light in the darkness for all missing children; AND

WHEREAS Child Find’s annual Green Ribbon of Hope Campaign will be held in the month of May and May 25th is National Missing Children’s Day; AND

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT

I, (Mayors Name) of the (city, town, municipality), do hereby proclaim May as Child Find’s Green Ribbon of Hope month and May 25th as National Missing Children’s day. I urge our citizens to wear a green ribbon as a symbol of Hope for the recovery of all missing children; and to remain vigilant in our common desire to protect and nurture the youth of our Province.

___________________________________________ Mayor

Signed at _________________________________ this ________ day of May, 2014
PROCLAMATION

Communities in Bloom Week

Whereas, in Canada, we are fortunate to have a multitude of communities and volunteers committed to fostering civic pride, environmental responsibility and beautification; and

Whereas, communities are committed to ensuring sustainable development for future generations; and

Whereas, participation in Communities in Bloom builds communities, strengthens volunteer and community development, enhances social interaction, and creates community pride; and

Whereas, the benefits provided by Communities in Bloom may boost the economy, create sustainability, enhance property values, attract new business, and increase tourism; and

Whereas, our parks, open spaces, green spaces and trails ensure sustainability, provide space to enjoy nature, help maintain clean air and water, and preserve plant and animal wildlife; and

Whereas, all community levels: municipal, residential, commercial and institutional work together to ensure the voluntary sector and private enterprise throughout the Country participate in the planning, development and operation of recreation and parks programs, services and facilities.

Now, Therefore be it Resolved, that Communities in Bloom does hereby proclaim that the week of May 4 through May 10 has been designated as Communities in Bloom Week which will annually recognize and celebrate the benefits derived from Communities in Bloom and the countless volunteers and individuals that make our communities great places to live.

Therefore, __________________________________________ [name of municipality/organization], in recognition of the benefits and values that Communities in Bloom does provide, do hereby designate the week of May 4, 2014 as Communities in Bloom Week.

Signed this ____________ day of ______________, 2014 by:

__________________________________________________________________________ (printed name and title)

__________________________________________________________________________ (signature)

People, Plants and Pride... Growing Together
Minutes of the Abbotsford Mission Water & Sewer Commission meeting held February 13, 2014, at 9:03 a.m. in Room 530 of Abbotsford City Hall

WSC Members Present: Councillor Ross (Abbotsford) (Chair); Mayor Adlem (Mission); Councillor Braun (Abbotsford); Councillor Jewell (Mission); Councillor Luck (Mission); and Councillor Smith (Abbotsford)

Staff Present: City Manager - G. Murray; (Abbotsford); Acting General Manager, Engineering and Regional Utilities - R. Isaac (Abbotsford); Director of Engineering and Public Works - R. Bomhof (Mission); Director of Utility Operations - L. Stein (Abbotsford); Senior Engineer, Water Utilities and Solid Waste - K. Filiatrault (Abbotsford); Director of Finance - L. Pleadwell (Abbotsford); Financial Planning and Reporting Manager - R. Millard (Abbotsford); Financial Accountant Analyst - K. Basatia (Abbotsford); Manager of Finance - K. Boland (Mission); and Administrative Manager - Utilities - R. Brar (Abbotsford)

Public Present: 0

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m.

.1 Elect the Abbotsford Mission Water and Sewer Commission Chair and Vice-Chair

Councillor Ross was nominated and elected by acclamation as the Chair of the Abbotsford Mission Water and Sewer Commission. Councillor Jewell was nominated and elected by acclamation as the Vice-Chair of the Abbotsford Mission Water and Sewer Commission.

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

.1 Minutes of the December 10, 2013 Meeting

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Jewell, that the minutes of the Abbotsford Mission Water & Sewer Commission meeting held December 10, 2013, be adopted.

WSC 1-2014 CARRIED.

3. DELEGATIONS

None
4. BUSINESS OUT OF MINUTES

.1 JAMES Plant Bi-Monthly Report - December 2013/January 2014


WSC 2-2014 CARRIED.


WSC 3-2014 CARRIED.

.3 Financial Statements - December 2013 PRELIMINARY


WSC 4-2014 CARRIED.

5. REPORTS

.1 Summary of 2013 Water Usage

Moved by Councillor Braun, seconded by Councillor Luck, that Report No. WSC 1-2014, dated January 20, 2014, from the Water Planning Engineer, regarding Summary of the 2013 Water Usage, be received.

WSC 5-2014 CARRIED.
.2 Budget for Well Maintenance

Moved by Mayor Adlem, seconded by Councillor Luck, that Report No. WSC 11-2014, dated January 27, 2014, from the Senior Engineer, Water Utilities and Solid Waste, regarding a Budget for Well Maintenance, be received; (1) a budget of $150,000 for maintenance of wells used during the Norrish Landslide be approved; and (2) funding to a maximum of $50,000 be approved for a well condition assessment of all wells.

WSC 6-2014 CARRIED.

.3 JAMES Plant – Capital Cost Split for Growth-Related Projects

Moved by Mayor Adlem, seconded by Councillor Smith, that Report No. WSC 3-2014, dated January 16, 2014, from the Senior Drainage and Wastewater Engineer, regarding JAMES Plant - Capital Cost Split for Growth-Related Projects, be received; and the cost sharing percentage for flow and load-triggered growth-related projects shown in the 2014 Financial Plan be updated to the percentages splits as shown in Appendix A of Report No. WSC 3-2014 (updated population projections).

WSC 7-2014 CARRIED.

.4 Regional Water and Sewer Revenue/Cost Sharing

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Smith, that Report No. WSC 6-2014, dated January 17, 2014, from the Director of Utility Operations, regarding Regional Water and Sewer Revenue/Cost Sharing, be received; and the Abbotsford Mission Water and Sewer Commission (WSC) approve the following percentages for the allocation of revenues, and water and sewer operational and non-DCC related capital expenditures for 2014: Sewer: Abbotsford-78.12%; Mission-21.88%; and Water: Abbotsford-76.09% and Mission-23.91%.

WSC 8-2014 CARRIED.

6. NEW BUSINESS

None.
7. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Mayor Adlem, seconded by Councillor Luck, that the February 13, 2014, WSC meeting, be adjourned. (9:57 a.m.).

WSC 9-2014 CARRIED.

Certified Correct:

WSC Chair
Patricia Ross

UMC Chair
Jim Gordon
The Minutes of the Mission Healthy Community Council meeting held in the Conference Room at the Mission Municipal Hall (8645 Stave Lake Street), on February 18, 2014 commencing at 4:00 p.m.

Members Present:  
Councillor Jeff Jewell, Co-Chair  
Tracy Irwin, Executive Director Access & Capacity Optimization, Mission Memorial & Chilliwack General Hospitals, and Mission & Chilliwack Communities, FHA, Co-Chair  
Ted Adlem, Mayor  
Laurel Sheffler, Site Director - Mission Memorial Hospital  
Inspector Richard Konarski, RCMP Officer in charge  
Judith Ray, Community Member  
Kirsten Hargreaves, Manager of Social Development  
Brandi Matheson, Communitas Supportive Care Society  
Sanjay Gulati, Executive Director, Mission Community Services Society  
Bob LaRoy, Manager, Mental Health and Substance Use Services, Abbotsford & Mission Mental Health Centres (Mental Health Services Representative)  
Tricia Schweers, Mission Association for Seniors Housing  
Jonathan Wilkins, Division of Family Practice  
Marilyn Collins, Community Engagement Worker, Xyolhemeylh/Fraser Valley Aboriginal Children and Family Services Society  
Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation & Culture  

Members Absent:  
Dr. Carol Pomeroy, President, Mission Medical Association, Division of Family Practice  
Bob Ingram, Mission Seniors Centre Association  
Lisa Jarvos, Manager, Public Health Mission & Chilliwack, FHA  
Dawn Hein, Acting Executive Director, Mission Association for Community Living  
Michelle Lylyk, Community Health Worker, Mission Friendship Centre  
Candie Thorne, Mission Literacy in Motion  
Cynthia Coyle, Executive Director, Fraser House Society Mission  
John Fitzsimmons, Child & Youth Mental Health Program, Ministry of Children and Family Development  
Karen Flanagan, Community Member  
Dr. Marcus Lem, Medical Health Officer for Mission  
Annette Condon, Pleasant View Housing  
Melinda Dempster, Principal, Hatzic Elementary School, Mission Public School District #75 Representative  
Dr. Andrew Edelson  
Paul Horn, Community Member  
Anne Todd, Community Health Specialist for Chilliwack-Mission, FHA  
Lorraine Murdoch, Triangle Resources  
DeAnn Foreman, Positive Living Fraser Valley  
Tamara Throssell, F.O.R.C.E. Society  
Brian Muth, Community Engagement Coordinator, Aboriginal Health Fraser Health - Circle Fraser East
Others Present: Nadine Kainz, Fraser Health
Debi Decker, Administrative Assistant

1) ADOPTION OF AGENDA
Moved by Councillor Jewell, and
RECOMMENDED: That the agenda of the Mission Healthy Community Council meeting held on February 18, 2014 be approved as circulated.
CARRIED

2) MINUTES
Moved by S. Gulati, and
RECOMMENDED: That the minutes of the January 21, 2014 meeting of the Mission Healthy Community Council be approved.
CARRIED

3) NEW BUSINESS
(a) Integrated Community Health Plan
J. Ray and L. Scheffler gave a presentation on Developing an Integrated Community Health Plan.

This presentation touched on the following topics:

- Recommended strategies
- Previous commissioned reports (Community Health Plan for Mission [March 2009] and Pulling Together: A Mental Health and Substance Use Strategy [2011])
- Goal statement
- January 30, 2014 Collaborative Workshop
- Topics for exploration
- Desired outcomes
- Requirements for success
- Project organization
- Project scope

Points for future consideration:
- Need to consider funding for General Practitioners (or self-employed persons) for when they are asked to be involved
- It would be a good opportunity to work with the Connect Event participants that is being held this April

**Action Item:**
D. Decker will email to MHCC members, a copy of the Draft Project Charter document with the draft February minutes, with an expectation that comments from members be submitted to Laurel.Scheffler@fraserhealth.ca within one week
of receipt. The Draft Project Charter to be discussed further at the next MHCC meeting, with the potential of being approved.

(b) Mission Homeless Count Update

K. Hargreaves reported on the upcoming homeless count that will take place in Mission between March 11th and 12th. She advised that the Mission Friendship Centre will be the base of communications and that 42 volunteers had been recruited so far, but 50 volunteers would be optimum.

Inspector Konarski volunteered an RCMP member's assistance to attend high risk areas, and that a volunteer could ride along.

K. Hargreaves advised that volunteers attend a training session prior to the event and go out in teams of two. The homeless will be notified (when they attend shelters or agencies) when the count will be taking place and how to identify the volunteers. They are advised that if they participate and provide answers to the survey they will receive a thank you gift. All this data will be tabulated and brought forward to Council. This process takes approximately two months.

New for 2014 will be collecting data on youth homelessness. Surveys will be sent out to high schools and health agencies asking students to provide answers for either themselves or a friend.

(c) Mission Healthier Community Partnership

Information is attached to the minutes as A. Todd was unable to attend this meeting. No discussion took place.

(d) Procedures for establishing the Agenda

Councillor Jewell advised that he had a pre-meeting (with T. Takahashi and T. Irwin) to preview this agenda prior to it being emailed out.

**Action Item:**

The Admin support person will send an email out to MHCC members two weeks prior to the meeting date to see if anyone had any items they wanted included on the agenda.

A review of the Terms of Reference is to take place to look at the membership, making sure everyone wants to remain and be active. A small working group will meet and bring back ideas to this group.

(e) Roundtable Discussions

Committee members provided updates on their various organizations and activities, including the following points:

- The opening of the BC Winter Games is this week-end with 16 directors and 75 chairs, all dedicated volunteers who have worked hard for the last two years towards this week-end. Don’t know how we can ever thank them.

- Healthy People, Healthy Places, Healthy Communities Symposium is taking place in Surrey tomorrow (February 19) and will be presenting on the mental health and substance use strategy for Mission and the First Responder Training (Community Cares) Program for Mission.

- Mental Health Awareness Week is the first week in May (May 5-9). Centennial Place is having an Open House on Friday, May 9th to celebrate its first anniversary with a “walk for wellness” and a rally. Would like more
people involved so the event will be promoted more this year with posters put up downtown and brochures will be handed out.

- It was clarified that the MHCC has an annual planning process for the group to identify the purpose, Terms of Reference and goals are planned to keep the group on task. This does not mean that if an emergency situation were to arise, that this group would not address it. It would be good to mention this comment when the Terms of Reference is discussed at a later meeting.

- Leisure Centre is struggling trying to sort out the PLAY pass (a Leisure Centre yearly pass for qualifying disadvantaged families) and may come to this group for help, suggestions to streamline. The family annual pass is worth about $1,000 (the top pass). Should there be a sliding scale dependant on yearly income? Will come back to this later in the year.

- The Leisure Centre is also having challenges with the youth who keep coming back even though they have been told that they are not allowed inside. Maintenance staff have become security guards trying to deal with them. We have security guards outside, which does not help when the problem is inside the building. Different tactics have been tried with RCMP, Manager of Social Development, and Mission Secondary School. Will bring this issue back as an agenda item when ready.

- Some concern over the number of working groups/sub-committees coming from this group. Sub-groups need an expiration date.

- Funding to help new immigrants living in Mission is now flowing through Mission Community Services and not the School District. As long as the person has landed immigrant status or is a refugee they have support. Once they become Canadian citizens this funded support ends.

- MASH is offering up the Busy Bus if needed during the BC Winter Games.

(f) Next Meeting

Tuesday, April 15, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. in the Conference Room at Municipal Hall.

4) ADJOURNMENT

Moved by J. Wilkins, and

RECOMMENDED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.
Mission Healthier Community Partnership Update for MHCC Meeting Feb 18, 2014

1. **My Health My Community** – Mission remains ahead of all Fraser Health communities, with 64% of the target reached, compared with 26% for Abbotsford, although Abbotsford is gaining some momentum, while Mission is slowing down. The survey will continue until March 31, and I am looking for events or busy locations for field surveyors to attend. Field surveyors have paper surveys available in English, Punjabi and Mandarin. As a reminder, this is not a household survey. Every member of a household that is over 18 is encouraged to complete the survey at [www.myhealthmycommunity.org](http://www.myhealthmycommunity.org). Once completed, participants have 10 chances to win an iPad, or $200 in groceries.

   The researchers have provided me with the demographics of those who have completed the survey. In order to have a final sample that more closely represents the community, we specifically need to reach:

   i) the South Asian community  
   ii) the neighbourhoods of Steelhead, Silverdale and Stave Falls  
   iii) the 18 – 30 and 70+ age groups, both genders  
   iv) Men of all ages. Right now we have a 3:1 ratio of women to men completing the survey.  
   v) People who did not complete high school  
   vi) People who earn less than $20,000 per year.

   If you are aware of any community events in March that would be suitable for field surveyors, and would potentially reach these groups, please let me know.

2. **PlanH Innovation Fund Application** – the team will need to meet again to determine the final proposal (looking at a possible youth clinic modelled after Abbotsford’s). The proposal may need to be submitted from the District of Mission rather than FVRD as originally suggested, as FVRD may give preference to another project proposal.

3. **Healthy Communities Symposium** – is tomorrow, Feb 19 at the Sheraton Guildford Hotel. MHCC will be well represented with 6 members attending. Michele Lylyk and Kirsten Hargreaves have graciously agreed to participate in the Healthy Public Policy Panel discussion putting MHCC on the map with the Mental Health and Substance Use Strategy. Unfortunately, Paul Horn is not available to attend, but I know Michele and Kirsten will do the team proud.

4. **Education/Prevention Subcommittee:** The committee met on January 23 and decided on the theme of “Healthy Eating at any Income Level”, as this would have a broad impact and appeal (we hope!). We are drafting a strategy which we will present at the March meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Todd
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Design and Planning
SUBJECT: Storm Sewer System Assessment – Surveying Contract Cost
ATTACHMENT(S): Attachment #1: Storm Sewer System Status Update

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:
1. That a budget of $87,650 be approved for the storm sewer system survey project;
2. That the storm sewer system survey project be funded from the Community Works Gas Tax (CWGT) funds; and
3. That the Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
This report recommends Council’s approval to award Storm Sewer GIS Database – Survey Services to McElhanney Associates Land Surveying Ltd., with the contract value of $61,834.50.

Following the January 20, 2014 Council motion, the District issued a Request for Proposal to solicit a contractor’s services to survey the District’s missing storm sewer pipes and manholes data (i.e., invert elevations, pipe diameters and materials, etc.). McElhanney Associates Land Surveying Ltd. (the second lowest bidder in the amount of $61,834.50), was found to be the most qualified contractor to survey Mission’s storm sewer system, as they successfully proposed a solution that addressed satellite coverage issues in Mission and traffic management concerns at a low price.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to advise Council of an unbudgeted storm sewer system survey project and request funding approval to perform a field survey to fill out storm sewer system missing data. The completion of this project would pave the road for developing a calibrated storm sewer model for the District to:

1- Analyze the hydraulic capacity of Mission’s storm sewer system and identify the least cost solutions to deal with the hydraulic capacity deficiencies; and
2- Develop storm water management plans for Cedar Valley and Lane Creek Pump Station.

BACKGROUND:
In response to the staff report to Council dated January 20, 2014 (Attachment #1) Council resolved that:
Storm Sewer System Status Update

Moved by Mayor Adlem, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That staff issue a Request for Quotation (RFQ) to obtain the lowest bid for the storm sewer hydraulic capacity assessment project, which includes a detailed field survey, flow monitoring program, and developing a calibrated hydraulic model;

2. That staff prepare the cost estimate for upgrading storm sewer pipe sections which have caused recent flooding; and

3. That staff report back regarding possible funding sources.

CARRIED

Staff set the following four (4) stages to achieve the purposes mentioned earlier in this report, where each stage requires the completion of its previous step.

1. **Dye testing to verify storm sewer network configurations in Mission Downtown and the other older parts of the District:** This stage of the work started earlier this year and was completed in March 2014. As a result, a schematic drawing showing the storm pipe network configuration was developed that is being used to video the pipe network in that area to collect more detailed information on the:
   
   a. Structural conditions of the storm pipes; and
   
   b. Exact geographical locations (latitude/longitude) of the pipes and manholes.

   A contractor has been hired to video the storm pipes in Mission Downtown area and is expected to complete the job before the end of April 2014. Mission’s storm sewer GIS database will be updated accordingly, once this task is complete.

2. **Performing a detailed field survey to fill out missing data:** The surveyed data needs to be compared with their neighbouring asset data for invert elevation consistencies (i.e., the surveyed pipe invert elevations should match their neighbouring pipe elevation). Invert elevation inconsistencies between the existing data and the newly surveyed ones would trigger additional survey works to verify the neighbouring pipes invert elevations.

3. **Installing several flow monitors to collect data:** This data should first be analyzed for accuracy, and then be used toward development of a calibrated storm sewer model.

4. **Developing a District-wide storm sewer model:** The model shall be calibrated using the flow monitoring data and then it will be used to assess hydraulic capacity issues within the District. This hydraulic capacity assessment will identify a number of storm sewer upgrade projects to address system capacity deficiencies. The developed hydraulic model will also be used to develop storm water management plans at Cedar Valley and Lane Creek Pump Station catchment.

   This report deals with item #2 only (i.e., storm sewer system field survey).

**DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:**

The lack of having a complete storm sewer database is hindering a District-wide hydraulic capacity analysis to address flooding incidents proactively and develop storm water management plans for different neighbourhoods.

Staff recommends that Council approve the proposed cost of $87,650 to perform a field survey to fill
out storm sewer system missing data. This would pave the road for developing a calibrated storm sewer model later for the District.

Per Council resolution dated January 20, 2014 (Attachment #1), staff invited contractors to provide the District with their:
1- Proposed methods of surveying at areas with or without satellite coverage; and
2- Quotations for surveying Mission’s storm sewer pipes and manholes with missing data.

On April 2, 2014, the District received quotations from four (4) contractors, where their proposed prices ranged from $60,556 to $261,082.

McElhanney Associates Land Surveying Ltd. (the second lowest bidder in the amount of $61,834.50), was found to be the most qualified contractor to survey Mission’s storm sewer system, as they successfully proposed a solution that addressed satellite coverage issues in Mission and traffic management concerns at a low price.

Due to some uncertainties about the District’s storm sewer system layouts in some areas the project is best done in stages, where at the end of each stage, the collected data will be entered in the District’s GIS database, and be checked for consistencies with its neighbouring pipes. This surveyed data verification process at each stage may trigger scope changes by requiring surveying additional points to resolve invert elevation data inconsistencies. Other uncertainties that may trigger scope changes and consequently, an increase in the project cost are:

- Inaccessible manholes, clean-outs, and culverts
- Misidentified data (i.e., pipes or manholes are not exactly where Mission’s GIS database suggest)

Because of the above a contingency is recommended.

It is also anticipated that Mission’s Public Works staff assistance will be required to resolve these uncertainties. Public Works local knowledge of Mission’s infrastructure whereabouts is expected to alleviate the required contractor’s time to find misidentified manholes and pipes and/or find ways to access hard to reach points. To address these challenges, the project includes a provision whereby the District will make staff available to assist with locating manholes and pipes. The gathering and uploading of information will also involve considerable District staff time.

The following Table details the components of the requested budget to complete the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Items</th>
<th>Required Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor’s Proposed Cost</td>
<td>$61,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Contingency to cover the uncertainties</td>
<td>$12,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Public Works staff time to help the contractor to deal with hard to reach points and find misidentified manholes/pipes</td>
<td>$9,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% administration fee</td>
<td>$4,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87,650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gas Tax Fund Eligibility

The Gas Tax Fund (GTF) is an agreement on the transfer of Federal gas tax revenues from 2005 to 2014 and includes three major components:

1- Community Works Fund;
2- Strategic Priorities Fund; and
3- Innovations Fund.

All local governments outside of the Greater Vancouver Regional District receive funding under the Community Works Fund (CWF). Funding is based primarily on a per capita formula. Local governments are allowed to make local choices about which eligible projects to fund and report annually on these projects and their outcomes.

The Community Works Fund provides funding for BC local governments and other eligible recipients for a variety of capital and planning projects that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, or provide cleaner air or cleaner water. Upgrading waste water and storm water systems to improve water quality and aquatic habitat is among the project categories that are eligible for funding.

Other municipalities such as Surrey, 100 Mile House, The Town of View Royal, Lake Cowichan, Williams Lake, have already used the Gas Tax fund to improve their water quality and aquatic habitat through their storm water related projects. With climate change impacts increasing, municipalities must also invest in upgrading their storm water management systems, including improving their storm sewer system hydraulic capacity by promoting green infrastructures such as bio-swales and engineered ponds.

It is anticipated that these storm sewer system upgrade strategies will:

1- Eliminate/alleviate local flooding and hence protecting public safety and property; and
2- Improve water quality and aquatic habitat by reduction in heavy metals and sediments coming from the street storm water runoff before it is discharges into Mission’s fish bearing creeks and the Fraser River.

Upgrading the District’s storm system through hydraulic modeling will improve water quality by:

1- Preventing creek/ditch overflows and bank erosion. Proper storm water management is not only important for local residents, but also for the health of the District's creeks, ditches, and ponds.
2- Proper storm sewer system upgrades will reduce the pollution in the storm water runoff by shortening the surface runoff path. This can be done by including additional
   a. Manholes to capture street runoff faster and minimizing the surface runoff exposure to the pollutants deposited on the streets;
   b. Bio-swales and other storm water Best Management Practices (BMPs); and
   c. Detention ponds.

The upgraded storm sewer system will improve the aquatic habitat of the creeks, which is home to several fish species. The project also provides a vital step in ensuring the District’s storm sewer system is in compliance with the federal Fisheries Act.

Funding Strategy

Staff recommends the use of CWF towards the storm sewer system survey project. A complete storm sewer database would allow the District to manage its storm water runoff more effectively by ensuring
its drainage has enough capacity to convey the storm water to downstream without causing flooding, bank erosions and sediment transport to Mission's fish bearing creeks and the Fraser river.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:
This report is related to Council’s goals of financial sustainability, as well as infrastructure and facilities development. More specifically, this report presents a strategy to satisfy Council’s goal to “create a sustainable asset replacement and maintenance program for all assets within the financial plan including a fully funded road resurfacing program” by developing a District-wide storm sewer hydraulic model that will be used to:

1- Upgrade the storm sewer system by address flooding concerns during intense rainfall events; and

2- Develop storm water management plans for different neighbourhoods within the District.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
This project was not budgeted for in the annual capital works program as the scope of work was uncertain and there was insufficient cost information.

The District of Mission has approximately $300,000 of CWGT fund available that must be spent by December 31, 2018. This report recommends $87,650 of the available Community Works Fund (CWF) be used to budget the storm sewer survey project.

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SIGN-OFFS:

Hirod Gill
Manager of Engineering Design and Planning

Reviewed by: Sean McGinn
Acting Director of Engineering and Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.

Reviewed by: Kris Blond
Manager of Finance
Attachment #1
DATE: January 20, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Services
SUBJECT: Storm Sewer System Status Update

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:

1. That staff issue a Request for Quotation (RFQ) to obtain the lowest bid for the storm sewer hydraulic capacity assessment project, which includes a detailed field survey, flow monitoring program, and developing a calibrated hydraulic model;
2. That staff prepare the cost estimate for upgrading storm sewer pipe sections which have caused recent flooding; and
3. That staff report back regarding possible funding sources.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
This report provides an overview of District storm sewer issues as follows:

1- **Incomplete Stormwater Database:** The District has received flooding complaints during the last several months. These complaints are mainly related to the storm sewer system capacity deficiencies that, due to lack of drainage modelling and analysis tools, only come to light during major storm events. *The District has not been able to perform a District-wide storm pipe capacity analysis due to the incomplete storm database.*

An incomplete storm database is a concern for the following reasons:

i. Staff cannot proactively address drainage concerns;

ii. It does not allow a District-wide storm sewer capacity analysis. An example is recent flooding occurrences, which after investigations were found to be caused by undersized pipes; and

iii. It delays staff’s response to drainage complaints.

To improve Mission’s response to storm sewer hydraulic capacity issues, the District must complete a detailed field survey, establish a flow monitoring program, and develop a calibrated hydraulic computer model at a preliminary estimated cost of $200,000. The scope of this work is beyond District's in-house expertise and capacity, and will require contracting this project out. This project will take approximately 18 months to complete and is recommended to begin soon for the following reasons:
To enable staff to deal with stormwater issues, such as flooding incidents, proactively.

The information can be used alongside the structural condition assessment data (which will be prepared within next several months) to coordinate repair works efficiently. That is, any proposed storm sewer pipe replacement will take into consideration the pipe’s structural condition and its hydraulic capacity deficiency at the same time.

If Council approves this, staff will report back with funding options.

2- **Identified Projects requiring Capital Funding:** In response to the recent flooding incidents, staff has identified sections of storm sewer that must be upgraded. Cost estimates are being completed and the related Council report recommending the pertinent budget approval is forthcoming.

3- **Unavailable Structural Condition information:** Historical data on the storm pipes’ physical conditions need to be imported to the District’s Geographic Information System (GIS) database and prioritized. This would allow the District to set up a pipe replacement program with its required funding over a certain number of years. A report to Council to present the value of the asset and remaining life will be forthcoming as part of overall asset management planning.

**PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to:

1. Inform Council of:
   i. Mission’s storm sewer system structural condition data collection progress status;
   ii. Recent occurrences where residents complained about flooding issues related to pipes not shown on the GIS mapping system; and
   iii. Upcoming staff reports regarding funding requirements to address the undersized and aging infrastructure replacements.

2. Request Council approval to issue an RFP to complete a detailed field survey, establish a flow monitoring program, and develop a calibrated hydraulic computer model and to report back to Council regarding funding options.

**BACKGROUND:**

The District of Mission owns approximately 164 kilometers of gravity storm sewer pipes and culverts. The oldest pipes are 57 years old and approximately 65% of the collection system is less than 30 years old.

The District’s Engineering and Public Works Department occasionally receives flooding complaints which are dealt with routinely however recently has identified capacity issues. These complaints are mainly related to the storm sewer system capacity deficiencies that, due to lack of drainage modelling and analysis tools, only come to light during major storm events. Staff has studied the areas in question and designed the required system upgrades. The District’s Public Works division will be
implementing the low cost portions of the designed upgrades to rectify flooding problems out of operating funds; however, sections of the pipe require upgrading and cannot be funded through operating budgets. Additional reports requesting funding for upsizing storm pipes in the affected areas will be forthcoming.

A District-wide hydraulic model combined with physical storm sewer information is an effective tool to analyze storm system capacity for its deficiencies. The limited available storm sewer information in the District’s GIS database is a hindrance to developing such a model at this time. As a result staff reacts, on a per complaint basis, to local drainage catchment issues and then takes appropriate action to resolve the issue. This approach to the District’s drainage issues is unplanned and takes up a considerable amount of staff time.

An efficient storm sewer system upgrade program should look for pipe capacity deficiencies (caused by undersized pipes) and their structural condition (whether pipes are damaged/broken) at the same time. That requires staff to evaluate storm system hydraulic capacity in parallel with assessing their structural condition. The structural condition of the District’s storm sewer pipes is assessed using video inspection or Closed Captioned Television (CCTV), which reveals pipes with fractures and corrosion.

Staff is assessing structural condition data as it is available, which is then imported to the District’s GIS and used to prioritize and recommend capital upgrades. In the past 3 years (2011 to 2013) the District completed CCTV inspection of 45.9 km of storm mains (3-year total). This represents about 31% of the District’s storm mains.

The interim GIS database review shows there are pipes with structural degradation (e.g., concrete pipes with broken pieces or rusted metal pipes) that need to be replaced. Additional asset management reports on the extent of the storm pipe degradation levels and the cost of addressing storm sewer system structural conditions will be planned as part of the District’s asset management activities.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
There are currently three major concerns regarding the District’s storm sewer system:

1- **Incomplete Stormwater Database:** The lack of having a complete storm database is hindering a District-wide hydraulic capacity analysis to address flooding incidents proactively. There have been several flooding incidents in different locations within the District which have caused flooding on roadways and on private properties. These flooding incidents were found to be caused by insufficient hydraulic capacity (pipes are undersized) to convey storm runoff due to the design storm (i.e., 1 in 10 year storm). Having insufficient storm sewer system data has forced the District to be reactive, rather than proactive, in dealing with its drainage problems. To be proactive the storm system database needs to be updated and involves finding and correcting missing pipe diameters and invert elevations, incorrect survey benchmarks used to set invert elevations, and the ownership of the pipes that are not registered within the District’s Right of Ways (ROW).

2- **Identified Projects requiring Capital Funding:** Flooding incidents have been reported recently during intense storm events. Storm sewer system capacity analysis suggested that a number of storm pipes need to be upgraded, which will require capital funds. Cost estimates are being completed and the related Council report recommending the pertinent budget approval is forthcoming.

3- **Unavailable Structural Condition information:** The historical data on storm pipes physical conditions need to be imported to the District’s GIS database and prioritized. This would allow the
District to set up a pipe replacement program (similar to the existing AC Watermain Replacement Program) with its required fund over a certain number of years. The interim CCTV data assessment shows that there are pipes that are cracked, deformed, partly broken, or rusted (happens in metal pipes). In either case, it will lead to further deterioration and eventual structural failure, which in turn will cause stormwater flow backups in the upstream pipes, local flooding, washouts, and the creation of sink holes, if the failure goes undetected. A report to Council to present the value of the asset and remaining life will be forthcoming as part of the overall asset management planning.

**Required Steps to Address the Problems**

1- Develop a District-wide storm sewer hydraulic model to identify capacity deficiencies - It requires;
   a. Dye testing to verify storm sewer network configurations in the older parts of the District, including the areas defined for the Mission Downtown Revitalization Project.

Engineering and Public Works staff are working to identify the scope of work and the total cost of dye testing in older parts of the District. Staff has planned to focus on the Mission Downtown area first and start the dye testing project shortly. This is consistent with Council’s priority in that area, as its findings will directly affect the projected cost associated with Mission Downtown Revitalization project. The estimated cost of this work in downtown is estimated to be approximately $7,000. The downtown dye test is for the purpose of assessing the storm sewer system network and hence, can be paid using the 2013 “Drainage Condition Assessment & Replacement” account with the available capital budget of $89,189. Staff will be recommending carrying over this budget to 2014 to dye test storm pipes in downtown, other older parts of Mission, and CCTV them to assess their conditions, if necessary. Lessons learned in the downtown dye test work will be used to develop a plan and cost estimate for dye tests in other older areas of Mission, and requests for funding will be made as necessary;

b. Taking measures to address existing flooding problems. This is being done by developing neighbourhood storm sewer models to identify capacity deficiencies;

Staff has developed hydraulic models to analyze the capacity deficiencies in the affected areas, with more to come on an as-needed basis. The drainage system upgrade findings, as a result of this exercise, will require capital budget funding. Additional reports on the cost of upsizing storm pipes in the affected areas will be forthcoming;

c. Hiring a contractor to survey storm sewer system with missing or incorrect information to prepare the required data for hydraulic modeling, and updating GIS database accordingly;

d. Working with the District Public Works and Corporate Administration Department (for addressing related legal claims) to identify the ownership of the unregistered pipes, and if required improve their hydraulic and structural conditions; and

e. Hiring a consultant to install flow monitors, collect flow data, and calibrate a District-wide storm sewer model to identify undersized pipes.

To solve this problem the District must complete a detailed field survey, establish a flow monitoring program and develop a calibrated hydraulic computer model at a preliminary estimated cost of $200,000. The scope of this work is beyond District’s in-house expertise and capacity, and will require contracting this project out. The actual cost may vary however, depending on how much new information we find in the field that is not shown on the drawings now.

If Council approves this, staff will report back with funding options.
2- Develop a District-Wide Structural Condition Database in GIS – It requires:
   a. Digitizing the existing data and import them to the District GIS database;
   b. Developing a structural grading system to prioritize pipes with poor conditions; and
   c. Developing Capital Projects over several years to replace/rehabilitate degraded pipes.

Staff is already working on item #2, with more work to do during next several months. Additional asset management reports on the extent of the storm pipe degradation levels and the cost of addressing storm sewer system structural conditions will be planned as part of the District’s asset management activities.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

This initiative supports Council’s goal for creating a sustainable asset replacement and maintenance program for all assets within the financial plan.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

A preliminary cost estimate of $200,000 is required to complete a detailed field survey, establish a flow monitoring program, and develop a calibrated hydraulic computer model. If approved staff will issue a Request for Quotation (RFQ) to obtain the lowest bid for completing this project and will report back regarding possible funding sources. Staff will also report back on the funding required to upgrade storm sewer pipe sections which have caused recent flooding.

COMMUNICATION:

No communication action is required.

SIGN-OFFS:

Hirod Gill
Manager of Engineering Services

Reviewed by: Rick Bomhof
Director of Engineering and Public Works

Reviewed by: Alan Reggin
Manager of Assets and Infrastructure

Reviewed by: Kris Blond
Manager of Finance

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
DATE: May 5, 2013
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Gina MacKay, Planner
SUBJECT: Zoning Bylaw Amendment to permit a two lot subdivision, facilitate servicing to the adjacent property and provide a remainder parcel for future development. Proposal includes a variance to the required road width for a new public road.
ATTACHMENTS:
- Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
- Appendix 2 – Zoning Map
- Appendix 3 - Site Plan & Adjacent Development Plan
- Appendix 4 – Engineering Comments

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8462 Stave Lake Street

APPLICANT: 410374 BC Ltd. (KC McPherson & Gary Toor)

OCP: This application is in conformance with the current OCP designation: Urban Residential

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: April 24, 2014 (DVP application and fee received)

LOCATION:
LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Council consider and resolve:

a) That a bylaw be prepared to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by rezoning the property located at 8462 Stave Lake Street from the Rural Residential (RR7) Zone to the Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone;

b) That the bylaw be considered for 1st and 2nd readings at the Regular Council meeting on May 5, 2014; and

c) That following these readings, the bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on May 20, 2014.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT RECOMMENDATION:

Council consider and resolve:

That Development Variance Permit Application DV14-005 to vary the Subdivision control Bylaw 1500-1985 as it pertains to “SCHEDULE A” Required Highway Widths: for an Urban Local Residential Highway from 18 metres to 15 metres be forwarded to public input on May 20, 2014.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

Council consider and resolve:

That the Final Reading of the zone amending bylaw be held until the following have been satisfied:

a. The community amenity contribution in the amount of $5,630 ($2,815 per new lot) is received; and

b. The servicing requirements, as outlined in Appendix 4, have been addressed to the satisfaction of the District Engineer.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application has been received from 410374 BC Ltd (McPherson & Toor) proposing to rezone the property located at 8462 Stave Lake Street to accommodate two new residential lots and a remainder parcel. As part of the overall development plan for this new neighbourhood area, a servicing easement will be granted across the remainder of the subject property for the purpose of providing sanitary sewer, water and storm water management services to the adjacent property which is currently under development. A no build covenant will be secured across the remainder parcel in order to preserve this portion of the land in its vacant state until such time as the neighbouring property is developed.
The plan shown in Appendix 4 demonstrates how the proposed development will fit within the new neighbourhood and how the new neighbourhood will connect to existing and future residential uses via Cherry Avenue and Stave Lake Street.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The development site is located on the east side of Stave Lake Street. A single family home is currently located on the parent property. Located on relatively flat ground with a low point located at the northeast corner, the site is bound by Stave Lake Street to the west, by an environmentally sensitive area to the north, a single family residential property to the south and a proposed residential development the east.

SITE HISTORY

An application was previously applied for to amend the Official Community Plan (OCP) and rezone the subject property (and the adjacent property to the south) to allow for a 24 unit row house development and 4 single family residential lots (R13-013). The OCP amendment and the zone amending bylaws were both granted 3rd reading; however, the application has since been closed and will not be proceeding as initially proposed. These amending bylaws will be rescinded to allow the current proposal to proceed.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 4052-2008)

The proposed development is in compliance with the OCP designation of Urban Residential.

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009)

The proposed zoning amendment will accommodate the subdivision of this property into three (3) parcels; two residential properties and one remainder parcel as shown in Appendix 3. The development is being proposed in large part to provide services to the adjacent property which is currently under development. The overall neighbourhood character of single family residential uses will be continued with the addition of the proposed two lots.

It is anticipated that a development proposal will come forward in the future for the remainder parcel and the residential property to the south. This two lot subdivision and the road access has been designed to anticipate future development of the property to the south. Through securing a no build covenant over the remainder parcel the District can ensure that the remainder parcel is maintained in its vacant state and not developed with a single family home thus fettering future rezoning and subdivision development.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood Character

This proposed development will complement this new development area as the residential lots being proposed are of the same size as those of the adjacent property. All homes within the area are zoned for one family only; secondary suites will not be permitted.

Environmental Protection

A report was prepared by Scott Resource Services Inc. as part of the development proposal for the neighbouring properties. This report provides guidance in determining the exact location and size of area to be preserved for environmental protection for the entire area. There are no environmentally sensitive areas identified on the subject property.

Parks and Trails (Section 941 of the Local Government Act and Parks and Trails Master Plan)

This newly proposed neighbourhood will be located adjacent to a protected green space and within
walking distance of the existing Cherry Ridge Trail which connects to College Heights Trail and the Heritage Park trail systems.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

With this rezoning and subdivision, the applicant is also requesting to vary the District of Mission Subdivision Control Bylaw 1500-1985. The applicant is proposing alternative road standards for proposed Road ‘A’ as shown on Appendix 3, which will require a reduction to the minimum highway width prescribed in the Bylaw from 18.0 metres (59 feet) to 15.0 (49 feet) metres.

The Engineering Department is prepared to accept a decrease in the area required for road dedication on the basis of maintaining uniformity in the area; as a similar variance has already been approved by Council for the adjacent properties as part of rezoning application R08-031. It is noted that the reduction in dedicated area will not result in a decrease in the actual paved area (travelled portion) of the road.

STREET NAMING (Policy STR.28 Street Naming)

As part of the overall development plan for the neighbouring property and in conjunction with Council Policy STR.28 the proposed road identified as ‘Road A’ on the map provided in Appendix 3 will be named Grassick Street. A street naming bylaw was prepared in conjunction with the previous development application and will now be applied to this development proposal.

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

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $5,630 ($2,815 per new lot) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development incurs on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities. The contribution has been made related to the two lots flanking Stave Lake Street where further contributions may be considered by the developer and Council at time of further rezoning and subdivision development.

COMMUNICATION

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

Policy LAN. 50 - Pre-Public Hearing Information Package

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

Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees

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

Engineering
The Engineering Department has no objection to the proposed rezoning. Engineering requirements for the provision of services through the subject property to the adjacent development will be secured through both the rezoning and subdivision processes (see Appendix 4 for Engineering comments).

Mission Fire/Rescue Service
The Mission Fire/Rescue Service has no objection to the project subject to the area plan being achieved.

Parks, Recreation and Culture
The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department have no objection to the project.

Tree Retention
A tree survey was conducted in order to identify if there are any significant trees on the site and to explore the opportunity for replanting as appropriate. The arborist determined that there were “no large or unusual species of trees or trees considered to be significant”. Furthermore, there were “no trees on the site that would normally dictate to the design process”. Provision of street trees will be addressed through the subdivision process as will the planting of two trees per each newly created lot.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES
1. Approval of Development Variance Permit DV14-005 will be considered as part of the same Council agenda as the zone amending bylaw is considered.
2. The zoning amending bylaw will not proceed to final adoption until the statutory right-of-way or road dedication over 8478 Stave Lake Street has been secured and the sanitary sewer, storm sewer and roadwork requirements have been met.
3. Adoption of the associated street naming bylaw will proceed to final adoption in conjunction with final adoption of this zone amending bylaw.

SIGN-OFFS:

Gina MacKay, Planner

Reviewed by:
Dan Sommer, Manager of Planning

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
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Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 8462 Stave Lake Street
PID: 001-580-833
Legal: Parcel “C” (Explanatory Plan 13666) of Lot “B”, Section 27, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 9506
Appendix 2

Zoning Map
Appendix 3

Plan of Subdivision & Adjacent Development Plan

Subject Property

Servicing Easement
Appendix 4

April 17, 2014

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8462 Stave Lake Street

CURRENT ZONING: RR7

PROPOSED ZONING: R558

1. DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:

Municipal water is available on Stave Lake Street. No further upgrading required.

2. SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:

Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Araki Court. The Developer is required to secure a statutory right of way or road dedication from the owner of 8478 Stave Lake Street and extend the sanitary sewer to the site.

3. STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:

Municipal storm sewer is available on Araki Court. The Developer is required to secure a statutory right of way or road dedication from the owner of 8478 Stave Lake Street and extend the sanitary sewer to the site.

4. ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:

The site is adjacent to Stave Lake Street, however, the site is to be accessed via Araki Court. The Developer is required to secure a statutory right of way or road dedication from the owner of 8478 Stave Lake Street and extend the road south to the site. The road extension is to be constructed to the varied Urban Local Residential Standard (as detailed in the Development Variance Permit that accompanies this application) complete with road drainage, underground hydro and telephone, street lighting and boulevard tree planting in accordance with the standards of the Subdivision Control Bylaw. See District of Mission Standard Drawings No. R-3, L1 and L2. Engineered design required.

RECOMMENDATION

From an engineering point of view the rezoning application may proceed to final adoption once a statutory right of way or road dedication over 8478 Stave Lake Street has been secured and the sanitary sewer, storm sewer and roadwork requirements have been met.

Prepared by

Sterling Chan
Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by

Sean McGinn
Acting Director of Engineering
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Parissa Shafizadeh, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning application (R14-005 – Pavlov) to accommodate a 5-lot rural subdivision with a secondary dwelling unit permitted on each lot
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
                    Appendix 2 – Orthophoto (2012)
                    Appendix 3 – Watercourse and Topography Map
                    Appendix 4 – Proposed Subdivision Plan
CIVIC ADDRESS: 12699 Cardinal Street
APPLICANT: Stan Pavlov on behalf of Above and Beyond Equipment Inc. & Kitschco Development Inc.
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current OCP designation: Rural
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: March 27, 2014
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 12699 Cardinal Street from Rural 36 (RU36) Zone to Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) Zone;
2. That the bylaw be considered for 1st and 2nd readings at the Regular Council meeting on May 5, 2014; and
3. That following these readings, the bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on May 20, 2014.

COUNCIL POLICY RECOMMENDATION:

Council consider and resolve:

4. That in accordance with Section 941 of the Local Government Act and Council Policy LAN. 26, parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash-in-lieu to subdivision file S14-002.

Requirements Prior to Final Reading:

Council consider and resolve:

5. 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 $8,445 (for three new lots) is received.

SUMMARY

The Development Services Department is in receipt of an application to rezone the properties located at 12699 Cardinal Street from Rural 36 (RU36) Zone to Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) Zone to facilitate a 5-lot rural subdivision. The subdivision approval process includes consolidation of two subject lots and its subdivision into 5 smaller lots. The rezoning will also allow a secondary dwelling unit on each created lot. The rezoning is consistent with the property’s Official Community Plan (OCP) designation of Rural.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The development site is comprised of two parent lots; one larger parcel located east of Cardinal Street with an area of 15.69 hectares (38.8 acres) and the other located west of the Cardinal Street with a lot area of 0.26 hectares (0.6 acres). The larger property to the east contains a single family dwelling and three (3) accessory buildings. While the majority of subdivision development will occur on the larger parcel, the smaller parcel will be consolidated to proposed lot 1 as part of this subdivision. The above details are shown on Appendix 2.
The eastern lot, which has various grades throughout, contains number of watercourses which serve as tributary drainage for Cardinalis Creek. The watercourses drain from the southern, eastern and western upper portions of the site to the central low lying area and then generally flow to the north (Appendix 3).

The onsite watercourses are generally small, low gradient, well incised channels with small marsh fed watershed areas. The properties are situated in a relatively undisturbed mature forest with dominant Western Hemlock across the sites.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 4052-2008)

The proposed development is in compliance with the OCP Rural designation.

OCP also supports a rezoning to allow secondary dwelling units within the District of Mission as follows:

- **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.

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009)

The subject properties are currently zoned Rural 36 (RU36) with a minimum lot area of 3.6 hectares (8.9 acres). The applicant proposes to rezone the properties to Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) which would allow smaller lots with the minimum of 1.6 hectares (4.0 acres). As part of the corresponding subdivision process, the two parent lots will be subdivided to create a 5-lot rural subdivision. Each new lot will allow a single family dwelling and a secondary dwelling unit. A secondary dwelling permitted on each lot is limited to a secondary suite, garden cottage, coach house or a secondary family dwelling. However the viability of building a garden cottage, coach house or secondary family dwelling depends on the availability of buildable area on each created lot.

According to the proposed subdivision plan (Appendix 4), the existing building, structures and driveway will be contained within one of the created lots (proposed Lot 4). Each of the proposed lots will have direct access to Cardinal Street through driveways and will accommodate the future building envelopes mostly on their western portions. Given the siting restrictions related to slopes and the location of the environmentally sensitive areas, the lot layout has been designed to provide for the most practical buildable areas for the construction of residences, driveway, well and septic field on each created lot.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

**Neighbourhood Character**

The subject properties are situated within the Steelhead neighbourhood of Mission and surrounded by municipal forest lands to the east, north and west, with similar rural residential areas to the south as what is being proposed with this application. The properties on the south are zoned RU16 and RU36 with various lot size ranges from 1.3 hectares (3.2 acres) to 16 hectares (40 acres). The proposed development, containing a house and a secondary dwelling on a lot with a minimum proposed lot area of 2.0 hectares (4.9 acres), is consistent with the density of the neighbourhood and will fit well in the area.
Environmental Protection

Given that Cardinalis Creek tributaries are located within the eastern property, a riparian area assessment report has been prepared by Letts Environmental Consultants dated February 2014. According to the report, the Ministry of Environment has identified Cardinalis Creek as a fish bearing stream needing protection, however no fish were observed during the assessment. A total of 8 reaches were identified along the creek during the assessment, each of which has several tributaries with different prescribed setbacks (Appendix 4).

As part of the corresponding subdivision, the applicant is required to register a covenant against the title of all created lots to protect the identified Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area (SPEA) and fish and wildlife habitat. In addition to protection of the SPEA, the assessment report recommends:

- Identifying the large danger trees on the survey plan for removal;
- Extending a setback by 5 – 10 metres (16 – 32.8 ft.) from top of the bank where the identified setback does not reach the top of the bank;
- Maintaining riparian vegetation during development within the SPEA;
- Placing post and rail fencing along SPEA boundaries, and signage indicating a restrictive covenant for protection of fish and wildlife habitat;
- Implementing proper sediment and erosion control measures along the entire setback boundary, prior to and during construction works;
- Completing a Stormwater Management Plan; and
- Monitoring construction activities by a qualified environmental professional.

Geotechnical Hazard Assessment

A geotechnical hazard assessment was prepared by Braun Geotechnical Ltd., dated February 2014, to assess the potential for flooding, stream erosion and avulsion, debris flows and floods, landslides, snow avalanche and rock fall hazards. According to the assessment the land may be used safely for the use intended subject to mitigative measures as recommended in the assessment report. The assessment report recommends that:

- At the watercourse areas, buildings should be located on the upper slope portions of the site with minimum 15 metres (49.2 ft.) setback from top of the bank. At the small marsh areas, buildings should be located on valley bottom slopes with a minimum 7.5 metres (24.6 ft.) setback from top of the bank;
- The flood construction level (FCL) of all building/structures should be minimum 1.5 metres (4.9 ft.) above the natural boundary of the watercourses and small marsh areas;
- A minimum general geotechnical setback of 10 metres (32.8 ft.) from the toe of slope should be considered for any development on the eastern portion of the site. Any structure within the 10 metres (32.8 ft.) setback should be design under review of a qualified geotechnical engineer.

Geotechnical Hazards Lands Development Permit

According to the geotechnical hazard assessment, the prescribed mitigative measures should be applied for a safe site development. Accordingly, a Geotechnical Hazards Lands Development Permit and a covenant are required for the development of the site as part of the corresponding subdivision approval. The covenant will include save harmless provisions and geotechnical requirements, such as setbacks and building and foundation works at time of building permit application.
As per District of Mission Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, review and approval of the Geotechnical Hazards Lands Development Permit is delegated to the Director of Development Services; thus, no approval from Council is required.

Tree Retention
In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of ten (10) trees, 2 trees for each of the five (5) lots created. This condition will be met as part of the subdivision approval. In addition to this requirement, the applicant is also required to replace any significant tree (trees having a caliper of 0.2 metres or greater) that will be removed except in the areas defined as (a) building envelope to a maximum of 2,000 sq. m (21,528 sq. ft.), (b) driveways, (c) septic field and (d) wells. No tree is permitted to be removed within the identified SPEA. The applicant is required to show the location of tree clusters and those which need to be removed for development purposes on the survey plan.

Parks and Trails (Section 941 of the Local Government Act, and the Parks and Trails Master Plan)
No parkland has been identified on the subject properties. As the proposed development is within the rural area and in proximity of municipal forest and Steelhead mountain trail, it’s recommended that park dedication be accepted as cash-in-lieu of land.

Community Amenity Contribution (LAN. 40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities)
It is recognized that residential development imposes a unique financial burden on the community by creating 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 $8,445 ($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 (date, 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 will be made 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.

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

Parissa Shafizadeh, Planner

Reviewed by:
"Insert Name, Position(DH/Dir/Dep)"

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
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Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 12699 Cardinal Street

PID: 006-900-445

Legal: North West Quarter Legal Subdivision 13 Section 22 Township 18 New Westminster District Except Part on Statutory Right of Way Plan 24130

Civic Address: 12699 Cardinal Street

PID: 006-900-453

Legal: Legal Subdivision 13 Section 22 Township 18 Except: North West Quarter, New Westminster District
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Orthophoto 2012

The eastern lot

The western lot
Appendix 3
Watercourse and Topography Map
Appendix 4
Proposed Subdivision Plan

Lot 1: 2.50 ha.
(6.2 ac.)

Lot 2: 2.88 ha.
(7.1 ac.)

Lot 3: 3.83 ha.
(9.5 ac.)

Lot 4: 4.74 ha.
(11.7 ac.)

Lot 5: 2.00 ha
(4.9 ac)

The western lot which will be consolidated into the proposed Lot 1 as part of the subdivision process.

The existing buildings

The proposed building envelopes
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Parissa Shafizadeh, Planner
SUBJECT: Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment to allow for a Secondary Dwelling Unit use within all Rural, Rural Residential and Suburban Zones
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Comparison of neighbouring municipalities’ approach to regulating secondary dwelling unit uses

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

That Council’s resolution RC13/482 AUG 06/13 directing staff to prepare a zoning amendment bylaw to allow secondary dwelling units as an outright permitted use within all rural, rural residential and suburban zones as an outright permitted use be rescinded and that further consideration of the proposed bylaw change be deferred until such time a Water Sustainability Plan is prepared and the next Official Community Plan review is conducted.

SUMMARY

On August 6, 2013, Council directed staff to prepare a zone amending bylaw that would allow secondary dwelling units as an outright permitted use within all rural, rural residential and suburban zones. The primary objective of the proposed amendment to the Zoning Bylaw was to expedite construction of secondary dwellings within these zones by simply eliminating the rezoning process prior to submitting building permit applications.

While the change would remove a development application step that typically receives little to no attention at public hearings, further evaluation of this option revealed that allowing secondary dwellings as an outright permitted use in these zones could have an adverse and cumulative effect in other areas. For example, staff now recognize that the options of bypassing the rezoning process as a streamlining, as was initially recommended by staff, could inadvertently weaken the management of other important considerations including groundwater quality and quantity, and tree retention as well as any potential impacts on the character of the surrounding neighbourhood.

Currently as part of the rezoning process to allow a secondary dwelling, an assessment on the availability of a safe and adequate source of groundwater for secondary dwelling, compatibility of the proposed use with the surrounding neighbourhood and the protection of environmentally sensitive areas is conducted by planning staff. Maintaining the review of these factors is important to avoid future problems with the introduction of secondary dwellings as an outright use into the neighbourhoods. Moreover, eliminating the rezoning step and deferring review of these matters to the building division will require changes to the building permit process to ensure thorough review and analysis are maintained.
Deferring these additional reviews to the building permit process will also require additional resources and training for the Building Division staff and will likely be more difficult to manage outside the rezoning approval process.

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with additional information ahead of their consideration for the zone amending bylaw to allow an outright permitted use of secondary dwellings. Specifically, this report revisits staff’s original recommendation and informs Council about the potential impacts of the proposed amendment on future groundwater supplies as well as loss of other management opportunities as they relate to neighbourhood character and density.

The report includes a recommendation that Council rescind the previous resolution directing staff to prepare a bylaw which allows secondary dwelling units within all rural, rural residential and suburban zones and defer it until such time a Water Sustainability Plan is prepared and an OCP review is conducted. Should Council decide to maintain their initial decision, staff will prepare a bylaw for an upcoming meeting of Council.

**BACKGROUND**

Rezoning applications to allow for secondary dwellings in all areas of Mission are becoming more common. Since usually little to no public comments or concerns are received for rezoning applications to allow secondary dwellings in all rural, rural residential and suburban zones, these applications are considered less problematic given the relatively larger size of the properties. With this in mind, Council requested staff to explore a more efficient way to process these types of applications. In the report prepared by the Deputy Director of Development Services, dated August 6, 2013, three options were presented for Council’s consideration. These options included:

1. A bylaw amendment to allow secondary dwelling units on all residential lots throughout the municipality;
2. A bylaw amendment to allow secondary dwelling units on rural, rural residential and suburban zoned properties; or
3. To continue the status-quo, requiring case-by-case rezoning to allow secondary dwellings in particular zones.

Considering the August 6th report, Council resolved to follow staff’s initial recommendation on option 2 in “that a zone amending bylaw be forwarded for Council’s consideration to permit secondary suite, coach house and garden cottage as an outright permitted use in all Rural, Rural Residential and Suburban Zones within the District of Mission”.

**DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

The Official Community Plan supports rezoning of the rural and rural residential properties to allow secondary dwelling units. In general, secondary dwellings are a cost-effective source of rental housing and are becoming an important aspect of housing that provides affordable accommodation for seniors and people with disabilities and for those who wish to live close to their families.
While the outright allowance of secondary dwellings will expedite the construction of secondary dwellings by eliminating the rezoning process, in areas not serviced by municipal water it may have a cumulative impact on the future availability of ground water. This issue is specifically important in areas where existing groundwater supply is susceptible to shortages during the summer months as has been reported in the Silverdale area.

The issue of groundwater supply was the subject of a previous staff report provided to Council dated February 17, 2014. The purpose of that report was to raise awareness of rural water issues with the general public and Council. The report provided rationale for improving our knowledge of rural water issues by completing a Water Sustainability Plan as part of the next Official Community Plan review. Staff’s recommendation to defer consideration of this Bylaw change is based on the concerns raised in this report.

As stated, allowing secondary dwellings as an outright permitted use in rural, rural residential and suburban zones will likely increase water demand and well interference between water users in areas which have access to groundwater supplies. It may also compromise assurance for access to the safe water which is currently required as part of the rezoning process. While the primary concern is water management, the change to the Bylaw may also have other potential impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood which will be outlined in detail in the following discussion.

**Process Comparisons: Rezoning vs. Outright Permitted Use of Secondary Dwellings**

Currently, applications to allow secondary dwellings proceed through a rezoning process which in turn allows for closer scrutiny of a proposal. Allowing the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings in the rural, rural residential and suburban zones will eliminate the need for rezoning and defer the decision on these proposals to the building division as part of their review and issuance of building permits. Where considerations such as, water supply quality and quantity, environmental protection and compatibility with neighbourhood character were evaluated as part of the rezoning process, these matters will then need to be taken into account during the building permit process. It is likely that measures to address these issues outside the rezoning approval process may not be as easily employed.

For example, properties which are zoned rural, rural residential and in some areas suburban do not have access to municipal water service. Therefore, the rezoning application is an opportunity for staff to require a hydrogeology report to ensure well water quality and quantity are met and that the potential impacts of the additional water extraction on the neighbouring wells and the source aquifer are considered. Typically, a Section 219 restrictive covenant is required to advise prospective purchasers of any issues with water quality and quantity and whether any necessary treatments are required if the well water doesn’t meet the federal government’s water quality and quantity standards. Requiring and review of the reports and covenant as part of the building permit process will require change to our current process.

Another aspect of the rezoning is assessing the compatibility of the development with the surrounding neighbourhood character, ensuring implementation of the District’s Tree Retention/Replanting Policy and protection of the environmentally sensitive areas as part of the rezoning process. These reviews are not triggered as part of the current building permit process and therefore preparation of supporting policy may be required.

Should Council consider approval of the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings, additional provisions that would require a hydrogeology and/or environmental assessment report and Section 219 covenant should be introduced to the building permit process so as to
allow a complete review of an application. With these additional requirements, additional staff resources and training will be needed for the building division staff.

**Table 1** below provides a comparison of the level of review that is conducted under both rezoning and building permit process. The table indicates that the level of review through a rezoning is more comprehensive than what would be conducted at the building permit process and addresses water quality and quantity, environmental and tree protection and neighbourhood compatibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item considered</th>
<th>Current rezoning process to allow secondary dwellings in rural, rural residential and suburban zones</th>
<th>Current building permit process to allow secondary dwellings following the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Meeting the requirements of the Zoning Bylaw** (including separate entrance, parking, setback, independent vehicular access & floor space) | • Is reviewed by planning division as part of the rezoning process and subsequently checked by as part of the building permit process. Any variance requests will be considered as part of rezoning application. | • Is reviewed by building division as part of the building permit process  
• Any variance requests will be considered under separate application. |
| **Water system in Rural, Rural Residential and Suburban areas without access to municipal water** | • A hydrogeology report is required by planning to address: water quality and quantity, impact of additional water extraction on neighbouring wells and the source aquifer  
• A covenant may be required for a treatment system to ensure the water is safe for consumption, indemnify the District and inform the future owners | • A copy of Water System Operating Permit issued by Fraser Health should be received for construction of a new well or for additional extraction of an existing well  
• Owners and operators of water supply systems are responsible to ensure the water is safe for domestic use |
| **Sewer system** | • Proof that the new septic system has been filed at Fraser Health or confirmation from a qualified professional engineer that the existing septic system can serve both the existing house and the new secondary dwelling,  
• A covenant is required for a new septic field | • Proof that the new septic system has been filed at Fraser Health or confirmation from qualified professional engineer that the existing septic system can serve both the existing house and the new secondary dwelling |
Table 1 – Comparison of review conducted through a rezoning process and building permit process to allow a secondary dwelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item considered</th>
<th>Current rezoning process to allow secondary dwellings in rural, rural residential and suburban zones</th>
<th>Current building permit process to allow secondary dwellings following the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical hazardous areas</td>
<td>• A geotechnical assessment report is required as part of the rezoning process if the secondary dwelling will be located in proximity to a slope greater than 33% or an unsafe area for construction; a Geotechnical Development Permit &amp; a covenant may be required</td>
<td>• A geotechnical assessment report is required as part of the building permit process if the secondary dwelling will be located in proximity to a slope greater than 33% or unsafe areas for construction; a Geotechnical Development Permit &amp; a covenant may be required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Environmental protection                             | • A riparian area assessment report is required for construction of a secondary dwelling within 30 m of the natural boundary of a watercourse and to identify the Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) and a covenant needs to be registered to protect the ESA  
• A 15 m setback from the natural boundary of any stream, other than Fraser River, Silverdale Creek and Stave River should be applied in accordance with the District’s Floodplain Management Bylaw | • A 15 m setback from the natural boundary of any stream, other than Fraser River, Silverdale Creek and Stave River should be applied as part of the building permit process in accordance with the District’s Floodplain Management Bylaw |
| Compatibility with the surrounding neighbourhood character and density | • Is reviewed as part of the rezoning process to ensure that construction of a secondary dwelling is compatible with the neighbourhood character and density. Alternative design considerations are negotiated at this time | • Neighbourhood character will not be reviewed as part of the building permit process |
| Policy LAN. 32 - Tree retention policy                | • Council policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention/Replanting is applied as part of the rezoning process | • There is no policy to protect significant trees as part of the building permit process |
Table 2 outlines the advantages and disadvantages of the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings in all rural, rural residential and suburban zones with regards to the level of review and the financial impacts on the District’s finance.

**Table 2 – Pros and Cons of the outright permitted use of secondary dwelling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitates construction of secondary dwellings through a shorter overall process (building permit application only)</td>
<td>• Likely to increases the building inspector’s workload by delegating the full review of the application to the building inspectors including requiring a section 219 covenant to protect the new septic system infrastructure servicing a secondary dwelling, and to protect the adjoining environmentally sensitive areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Likely to result in an increase in the number of secondary dwelling units and possibly increase the revenue from building permit applications</td>
<td>• Potential to exacerbate groundwater supply issues including well interference between water users, and to decrease the groundwater availability, by increasing un-controlled demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces the application costs for construction of secondary dwellings by eliminating the rezoning application fees. Building permit fees still apply.</td>
<td>• Increase removal of significant trees since the Tree Retention Policy would not be required as part of the building permit process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase water related health hazard by not requiring a Section 219 covenant to advise the owners and prospective purchasers of the water quality issues and treatment system requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the issues associated with outright permitted use of secondary dwellings in the rural, rural residential and suburban zones can be mitigated by requiring additional requirements as part of the building permit process. The one concern that cannot be addressed at the building permit stage is the concern from existing residents who do not wish to see a change to the character and density of their neighbourhood that could come with the introduction of secondary dwellings into an area. However, should Council consider amending the Zoning Bylaw to allow
secondary dwellings as an outright permitted use, a public hearing for this amendment will be required to give residents one last opportunity to voice their concerns about this change.

Eliminating the rezoning stage may also lessen environmental review and protection during construction of secondary dwelling units. According to provincial regulations, unlike the rezoning process, a riparian assessment report to identify watercourse setbacks is not required for the building permit applications to allow secondary dwellings. However the District’s Floodplain Management Bylaw would require a setback from the watercourses which can exceed the identified setback in the assessment report. While meeting the required setback in accordance with the Floodplain Management Bylaw will prevent construction within the riparian area, it will not trigger the requirement for a covenant on title to discourage land disturbance in the environmentally sensitive area.

There is also the issue of existing secondary dwellings which were built without a building permit and therefore don’t meet the requirements of BC Building Code. The outright permitted use of secondary dwellings may increase the number of occupied secondary dwellings which were built without a building permit as the assumption would be that they are now permitted in the Zoning Bylaw.

**Comparison of neighbouring municipalities’ approach to regulating secondary dwelling unit uses**

Review of other municipalities’ approaches to allow secondary dwellings in the zones which are comparable to the District’s rural, rural residential and suburban zones (Appendix 1) indicate practices that:

- Limit secondary dwellings to specific zones considering the neighbourhood character and density;
- Restrict the type of the permitted secondary dwellings (e.g. secondary suite, mobile home, garden suite, etc.) with respect to character of the principal uses and to accommodate the related needs of the property owners;
- Permit secondary dwelling uses solely for accommodation of the owners’ relatives and farm employees, which is permitted in the senior government legislation (Agricultural Land Commission Act);
- Allow (as is the case of some municipalities, i.e., Township of Langley) secondary dwellings in the suburban zones (which has smaller lot size and higher density in comparison to rural areas) only after receipt of the surrounding community’s support;
- Require applicable health authority approval at the building permit stage if a property is not serviced by a municipal sewage system; and
- Require verification from an engineer or a certified professional confirming adequate water quantity and potability is required at the building permit stage if a property is not serviced by a municipal water system.

With this cursory jurisdictional scan regarding secondary dwellings as a permitted use, staff have found that that secondary dwellings are not readily permitted as an outright use in other municipalities’ rural, rural residential and suburban zones. Instead, secondary dwellings are extensively permitted in the urban residential zones where there are more housing demands due to the access to municipal amenities/ facilities and public transit. While the secondary dwelling is permitted broadly in some of the higher density urban residential zones, different solutions such as requiring a business licence are often applied to manage the related issues.
such as adequate off-street parking, private outdoor space as well as applicable Building Code requirements.

**Official Community Plan Amendment**

According to Policy 2.3.3, the Official Community Plan supports rezoning to allow secondary dwelling units on properties that are designated rural or rural residential on a case by case basis. The purpose of this policy was to introduce secondary dwelling units as an affordable type of housing accessory to the principal use, in the rural or rural residential areas with larger size properties. Despite the fact that amending the Zoning Bylaw to allow the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings in rural, rural residential and suburban areas would not contravene this policy, an amendment to the OCP is required to clarify the scope of allowing secondary dwelling and eliminating a need for site specific rezoning in the rural, rural residential and suburban areas. This issue would be discussed as part of a report introducing an amending bylaw for Council’s consideration.

**Options**

Following staff review of the cumulative impacts of the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings on the groundwater supplies, neighbourhood character and environmental protection, Council are presented with two options:

**Option 1: support staffs recommendation to maintain the rezoning application status-quo**

Due to the potential cumulative impact to allowing secondary dwellings as an outright permitted use and that the District on receives approximately 5 rezoning applications per year to allow secondary dwelling, Council may decide on continuing the rezoning process on a case-by-case basis. This recommendation is to hold off on the Bylaw change until such time a Water Sustainability Plan is completed and as part of the next Official Community Plan review. At the time, other issues such as water quality, compatibility with the neighbourhood character and environmental protection would be addressed through amendments to the Zoning Bylaw and or OCP policies.

**Option 2: continue with the initial decision to allow secondary dwelling units as an outright permitted use in rural, rural residential and suburban zones along with any needed changes to the building permit process**

Many of the adverse impacts of the outright permitted use of secondary dwellings will be mitigated by requiring additional information as part of the building permit process. The proposed changes will likely necessitate additional resources and trainings for the building division. A thorough review of the financial implications of this zoning amendment by law to allow an outright permitted use of secondary dwelling units in all rural, rural residential and suburban zones is also required.

Should Council wish to proceed with the Bylaw amendment, staff will present supporting recommendations to:

1. Include a water sustainability planning component to the next OCP review for areas not supplied by municipal water to provide some understanding (benchmarking) of the potential for water supply issues that may arise as development proceeds over the years (see related report on February 17, 2014 Council meeting agenda);

2. Require a hydrology report as part of the building permit process to ensure that drinking water standards are met and that the proposed new water sources will not have an impact on downstream wells as part of the building permit process;
3. Require a Section 219 covenant as part of the building permit process to inform the property owners of any water treatment requirements; and

4. Require a Section 219 covenant as part of the building permit process to protect the new effluent discharge area (i.e. septic system infrastructure).

The District of Mission Building Bylaw 3590-2003, Section 4.1 b), states that the building official may refuse to issue a permit where, in his or her opinion, following a limited review, the proposed construction will not substantially comply in all material respects with the requirements of the Building Code, Building Bylaw, or any other relevant bylaw. This section of Bylaw authorizes the building official to require a hydrology report and other covenants to ensure access to a safe water supply and protection of septic system infrastructure in the properties which are not serviced by municipal water and sewage system. The scope and details of these requirements will be defined within a new policy and procedure related to the building permit process.

COMMUNICATION

Should Council consider the status quo rezoning process, no communication would be required. However, should Council decide to proceed with the zoning amendment bylaw to allow an outright permitted use of secondary dwelling units, an established communication process will be used.

The proposed changes will affect approximately 4137 properties, 62 of which are the result of rezoning and 4075 properties due to amending the rural, rural residential and suburban zones to allow secondary dwellings. In accordance with District’s Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, notification to the owners and occupiers is not required if 10 or more parcels owned by 10 or more persons, are the subject of the bylaw amendment. However due to the extent of the affected areas and various previously received feedback (positive or negative) from the residents, staff may consider surveying the affected property owners and neighbouring properties prior to conducting a public hearing. The purpose of the survey is to gauge the residents’ sentiments and to identify their concerns prior to presenting the zoning amendment bylaw at the public hearing.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no additional financial implications should Council maintain the current rezoning process, however, proceeding with the zoning amendment bylaw to allow an outright permitted use of secondary dwelling units will likely have some financial implications.

For example, over the course of a year, the Development Services Department receives an average of five standalone rezoning applications for secondary dwellings in the rural, rural residential and suburban zones. The revenue from these applications would be eliminated as a result of the outright permitted use of the secondary dwelling units. This could result in lost revenue from planning fees in the amount of $5,000, although it is expected that some of this would be offset through an increase in building permit applications and related fees.

In addition, if a survey is warranted, approximately 4137 letters will need to be sent at a cost of approximately $5200.

The changes will impact over 4,100 properties within the District of Mission and might increase the service needs of these properties. In order to fully address the financial impacts of the
zoning amendment bylaw and upon a preliminary support from Council, a referral will be sent to the Finance Department to determine any potential financial implications related to service prior to the public hearing.

SIGN-OFFS:

Parissa Shafizadeh

Reviewed by:
Mike Younie, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
## Appendix 1
Other Municipalities’ Approach In Regard to Allowing Secondary Swellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township of Langley</th>
<th>Type(s) of permitted secondary dwellings</th>
<th>Zones which permit secondary dwellings</th>
<th>Requirement(s) of secondary dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile home as a temporary accessory dwelling (for accommodation of farm employees or the owner’s relatives)</td>
<td>• Some of the Rural Zones</td>
<td>• Mobile home as a temporary accessory dwelling is permitted for a period of one year but may be renewed on a yearly basis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the Suburban Zones (City has petitioned the immediate surrounding properties for approval of this use in these zones)</td>
<td>• Removal of the mobile home is required when it ceases to meet the conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile home as a temporary accessory dwelling is permitted for a period of one year but may be renewed on a yearly basis;</td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal sewerage system, a copy of the authorization for construction and proof of filing in Fraser Health is required at the building permit stage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of the mobile home is required when it ceases to meet the conditions;</td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal sewerage system, a copy of notification to the applicable health authority is required at the building permit stage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal water system, an acceptable private well must be located on the property and certification of compliance with the Canadian Drinking Water Standards must be provided, at the building permit stage;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Maple Ridge</th>
<th>Type(s) of permitted secondary dwellings</th>
<th>Zones which permit secondary dwellings</th>
<th>Requirement(s) of secondary dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Detached garden suite residential (self-contained dwelling, accessory to the owner-occupied residence located on the rear yard of the property)</td>
<td>• Some of the Agricultural zones</td>
<td>• A parking covenant is required for detached garden suite;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal water system, verification from an engineer or a certified professional confirming adequate water quantity and potability is required at the building permit stage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal sewage system, a copy of notification to the applicable health authority is required at the building permit stage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Secondary suite</td>
<td>• Some of the Agricultural zones</td>
<td>The secondary suite is permitted only in the owner occupied residence;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One of the Suburban Residential Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One of the Rural Residential Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township of Langley</th>
<th>Type(s) of permitted secondary dwellings</th>
<th>Zones which permit secondary dwellings</th>
<th>Requirement(s) of secondary dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile home as a temporary accessory dwelling (for accommodation of farm employees or the owner’s relatives)</td>
<td>• Some of the Rural Zones</td>
<td>• Mobile home as a temporary accessory dwelling is permitted for a period of one year but may be renewed on a yearly basis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of the Suburban Zones (City has petitioned the immediate surrounding properties for approval of this use in these zones)</td>
<td>• Removal of the mobile home is required when it ceases to meet the conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mobile home as a temporary accessory dwelling is permitted for a period of one year but may be renewed on a yearly basis;</td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal sewerage system, a copy of the authorization for construction and proof of filing in Fraser Health is required at the building permit stage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of the mobile home is required when it ceases to meet the conditions;</td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal sewerage system, a copy of notification to the applicable health authority is required at the building permit stage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If a property is not serviced by a municipal water system, an acceptable private well must be located on the property and certification of compliance with the Canadian Drinking Water Standards must be provided, at the building permit stage;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Abbotsford</td>
<td>Type(s) of permitted secondary dwellings</td>
<td>Zones which permit secondary dwellings</td>
<td>Requirement(s) of secondary dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessory family residential use (a residence accessory to the agricultural use for accommodation of the immediate family member or the farm employees)</td>
<td>Some of the Agricultural Zones</td>
<td>Secondary suites should be registered with the City to confirm compliance with the BC Building Code and Zoning Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessory secondary suite residential use (self-contained unit within the principal building)</td>
<td>Some of the Agricultural Zones</td>
<td>Fraser Health Authority approval for the new septic field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single family detached accessory dwelling</td>
<td>Some of the Agricultural Zones</td>
<td>Fraser Health Authority approval for a new septic field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coach house, Garden cottage</td>
<td>One of the agricultural zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufactured home, Secondary suite, Residential conversion structure</td>
<td>Some of the Agricultural Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary accessory dwelling (a residence accessory to the residential or agricultural uses for accommodation of the immediate family member or the farm employees)</td>
<td>Some of the Agricultural Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Gina MacKay, Planner
SUBJECT: Development Variance Proposal to accommodate an existing garage with a zero lot line setback.
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Subdivision Layout
Appendix 3 – Variance Site Plan
CIVIC ADDRESS: 7380 Wren Street
APPLICANT: 410374 BC Ltd. (McPherson and Toor)
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current OCP designation: Urban Compact – Multiple Family
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: March 27, 2014
LOCATION:
DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

Staff requests that Council review the following Development Variance Permit Application DV14-003 and consideration be given to approval under Section 14 New/Other Business on this agenda. The following report is provided to Council in order to provide details and background information on this variance request. Staff advise Council that this variance be approved.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This property is currently the subject of a rezoning proposal to accommodate four (4) new compact residential lots and one remainder parcel set aside for future subdivision development. The purpose of this report is for Council to consider an associated Development Variance Permit (DVP) application DV14-003 to allow for an existing garage to be retained on a remainder lot which will be created by a new subdivision. Approval of the permit would allow a zero side yard setback for an accessory building until such time the lands are further subdivided.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is level, contains: very few trees, one single family home, a garage and a workshop. The intent is to retain the single family home and the garage on the remainder portion of the property, which is set aside for future subdivision.

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009)

This property is currently the subject of a rezoning proposal which has been granted 3rd reading by Council. The development proposal is to rezone the subject site from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to the Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) Zone to facilitate a maximum lot yield of seven (7) lots (Appendix 2). The first phase of the subdivision will create four (4) residential lots and one larger remainder parcel upon which the existing home and garage are to be retained. The remainder lot will have future subdivision potential to create an additional three (3) lots when the dwelling and garage (accessory building) are removed. Note that a portion of the garage has been removed to a zero lot line setback.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood Character

The neighbourhood is comprised largely of single family dwellings on oversized R558 lots. The proposed variance will have little or no impact on the existing neighbourhood character. Any potential impact of the reduced setback on the homes that will be constructed on the abutting Lots 3 and 4 will be pre-existing.

DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

Applicant’s rationale for DVP

The applicant would like to maintain the existing garage as it is currently being used by the occupant of the home on the remainder parcel. The applicant further states that the only affected parties by this proposed variance would be the purchasers of the newly created adjacent lots.

Planning rationale for DVP

As the adjacent residential properties are currently being developed, the proposed variance would have little or no impact on these properties. The subject properties are also subject to Development Permit DP13-012 which will guide the form and character for this intensive residential development area. Individual home plans for the single family lots may be approved in-house by the Director of
Development Services or their designate, thus ensuring that the individual homes complement the existing residential uses.

The applicants have indicated that they intend to plant a hedge along the rear lot line of proposed Lot 4 to reduce the visual impact of the garage for the purchaser of Lot 4. In order to ensure that the proposed variance will apply to the existing building only, Development Services staff will be adding a sunset clause to the permit. The clause will state that upon further subdivision of the remainder lot, the variance will expire thus ensuring that future accessory buildings adhere to setback requirements as prescribed in the Zoning Bylaw.

COMMUNICATION

A notice of Development Variance Permit has been mailed or otherwise delivered in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act. No written submissions had been received from the public at the time of writing this report.

SIGN-OFFS:

Gina MacKay, Planner

Reviewed by:
Dan Sommer, Manager of Planning

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

Civic Address: 7380 Wren Street

PID: 007-562-284

Legal: Lot 5, Section 20, Township 17, New Westminster District Plan 8996
Appendix 2

Proposed Subdivision Layout

Portion of structure removed
Appendix 3

Variance Site Plan

Variance needed to accommodate zero lot line set back along proposed lots 3 & 4.
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Mike Younie, Director of Development Services
SUBJECT: Follow-Up Regarding Mr. Gord Lawson’s Presentation

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

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with follow-up information regarding Mr. Gord Lawson’s property issues that were raised as part of rezoning 12468 Cardinal Street (R13-029 John Schell).

BACKGROUND:
A public hearing was held on April 7, 2014 regarding the proposed rezoning and subdivision of property at 12468 Cardinal Street (R13-029 John Schell). Mr. Gord Lawson presented concerns that he had regarding trespass onto his property by previous owners of the subject property. The trespass has allegedly resulted in theft of soil and the digging of an unauthorized ditch. Council requested that staff provide Council with a follow-up report. The information provided in this report is not directly related to the April 7, 2014 public hearing and is not considered to be new information that would put the validity of the public hearing in question.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The property at 12468 Cardinal Street, adjacent to Mr. Lawson’s property at 12492 Ogden Avenue, has had several owners over the last decade. Mr. Lawson has been communicating with District staff since at least 2005 and alleges problems regarding the digging of a ditch on his property, the construction of an illegal foundation on the neighbour’s property and theft of soil from Mr. Lawson’s property first started in 1996.

Mr. Lawson is asking that the District become actively involved to help solve Mr. Lawson’s allegations by developing a legal agreement with the owners of 12468 Cardinal Street and Mr. Lawson. Mr. Lawson believes that the District and the RCMP should have done more to stop the trespass activities. When notified about the construction of the bunker without a permit, the District issued a stop work order to the previous owner. No further construction has occurred since the order was issued. The current owner, Mr. John Schell assumed ownership of the property in 2013 and is therefore not responsible for activities that occurred on the property prior to the time of purchase.

Notwithstanding Mr. Lawson’s concerns are not directly related to any bylaw infractions and the issues are of a civil nature, as part of Mr. Schell’s rezoning, staff have been discussing Mr. Lawson’s concerns with Mr. Schell. Mr. Lawson agrees that he has had positive communication with Mr. Schell and staff are hopeful that Mr. Schell can complete remedial work to the satisfaction of Mr. Lawson.
Recent conversations with Mr. Schell indicate that he is planning on replacing the lost soil on Mr. Lawson’s side of the property line. At this point in time, staff are not prepared to take any additional action other than to try and facilitate a mutually agreeable outcome to the situation.

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

COMMUNICATION:
Staff will communicate with Mr. Lawson and offer their assistance in communicating with Mr. Schell to see a suitable resolution to Mr. Lawson’s concerns.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Mr. Gord Lawson, the owner of the property adjacent to 12468 Cardinal Street which was the subject of a recent public hearing as part of a rezoning application, spoke about trespass concerns from previous owners of the subject property at the public hearing. Council requested a follow-up report. While no enforcement action is required on the part of the District, staff are in contact with the owner of the property at 12468 Cardinal Street who has indicated that he intends to make efforts to address Mr. Lawson’s concerns. Should this not come to fruition, Mr. Lawson will need to consider taking civil action against those he believes have caused him damages.

SIGN-OFFS:

Mike Younie, Director of Development Services

Reviewed by:
Gina MacKay, Planner

Chief Administrative Officer’s Comment
Reviewed.
Excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on October 7, 2013

**Zoning Amending Bylaw 5379-2013-5050(120)**
(R13-016 – Toor/McPherson) – a bylaw to rezone the property at 7380 Wren Street from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to Urban Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RC465s)

The purpose of the proposed zoning bylaw amendment is rezone the property located at 7380 Wren Street and legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 007-562-284
Lot 5 Section 20 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8996

from Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to Urban Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (RC465s) to accommodate a five (5) lot subdivision with a secondary dwelling permitted on each lot, with the potential to increase the lot yield to seven (7) through a subsequent subdivision application.

Gina MacKay, 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 Deputy Director 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 5379-2013-5050(120) (R13-016 – Toor/McPherson), closed.
DATE: September 23, 2013
TO: MAYOR AND COUNCIL
FROM: Gina MacKay, Planner
SUBJECT: Proposed rezoning to allow for the subdivision of existing residential property into 7 urban infill lots

CIVIC ADDRESS: 7380 Wren Street
APPLICANT: Gary Toor & KC McPherson
OCP: This application is conformance with the current OCP designation: Urban Compact – Multi Family

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: September 13, 2013
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Proposed Subdivision Layout
Appendix 3 – Engineering Comments
Appendix 4 – Zoning Map
Appendix 5 – OCP Map

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 the property located at 7380 Wren Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) zone to Urban Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) zone.

2. That the bylaw be considered for 1st and 2nd readings at the Regular Council meeting on September 23, 2013.

3. That following these readings, the bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on October 7th, 2013

COUNCIL POLICY RECOMMENDATION(S):

Council consider and resolve:

4. 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 S13-010.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:

Council consider and resolve:

5. That the Final Reading of the amending bylaw be held until the following have been satisfied:
   a. The community amenity contribution in the amount of $16,890 ($2,815 per new lot) is received.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The land use proposal is consistent with the Urban Residential designation in the Official Community Plan and proposes to subdivide the subject property into seven urban infill lots.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The subject property is level, contains very few trees, one single family home, a garage and a workshop. These buildings will be removed as part of the subdivision process.

ZONING BYLAW COMPLIANCE (Bylaw 5050-2009)

The proposal is to rezone the subject site to Residential Compact 465 Secondary Dwelling (RC465s) zone to facilitate a 7 lot subdivision; a draft plan of subdivision is attached (Appendix 2). Each proposed lot meets the minimum size requirements, including lot depth and width, for the proposed Residential Compact 465 (RC465) zone. Proposed Lot E is oversized and has further subdivision potential into three lots once the existing dwelling is removed.
PLANNING ANALYSIS

General – OCP

The property and the surrounding area is designated Urban Compact – Multi Family. The proposed Urban Residential density is in keeping with the future densities envisioned for this area. The proposed secondary dwelling zone also respects the following OCP policy:

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 new residential units with secondary suites will be required to demonstrate that off-street parking can be provided for each residence at time of building permit.

Neighbourhood Character

The general neighbourhood character comprises of single family dwellings on oversize R558 lots. In order to maintain the overall character of the Terepocki Crescent, the proposed layout limits the number of new lots accessed via Terepocki to one; proposed Lot 1 will be accessed via Wren Street and managed by way of registration of a restrictive covenant at subdivision stage.

Tree Retention/Replanting (LAN. 32 – Tree Retention/Replanting)

There are two significant trees located on the development site; adjacent to Wren Street road right-of-way. The initial site investigation has determined that the trees may be able to be saved. In the event that the trees may not be retained the applicant will be required to plant trees to replace any removed on a one to one basis in addition to planting two trees per lot in accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32. This requirement will be met through the subdivision approval process.

Parks and Trails (Section 941 of the Local Government Act, Parks and Trails Master Plan)

As the development proposal is within close proximity to the Silverdale Creek Trail System and West Heights Elementary School, it is recommended that park dedication be accepted as cash-in-lieu of land. The amount paid will be in accordance with Section 941 of the Local Government Act and will not exceed 5% of the value of the land being proposed for subdivision.

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT – Intensive Residential

Development Permit DP13-012 will guide the form and character for this intensive residential development area. Individual home plans for the single family lots may be approved in-house by the Director of Development Services or their designate, thus ensuring that the individual homes complement the existing residential uses. Development Permit Application DP13-012 will be forwarded to public input on October 21, 2013.

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

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $16,890 ($2,815 per new lot or unit) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development incurs on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities. The contribution is based on the full development potential of the site; six (6) new compact residential lots.
COMMUNICATION

The developer has posted a development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development. Provided a public hearing date is determined by Council, 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 152 metres (500 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

Policy LAN. 50 - Pre-Public hearing Information Packages

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

Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees

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

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

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project; engineering department comments area provided in Appendix 3.

Mission Fire/Rescue Service

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

Parks, Recreation and Culture

The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has no objection to the project.

SIGN-OFFS:

Gina MacKay, Planner

Reviewed by:
Barclay Pitkethly, Deputy Director of Development Services

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

Civic Address: 7380 Wren Street

PID: 007-562-284

Legal: Lot 5, Section 20, Township 17, New Westminster, District Plan 8996
Appendix 2

PROPOSED LOT LAY OUT
Appendix 3
Engineering Comments

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT REZONING COMMENTS

August 28, 2013
REZ. FILE: R13-016

CIVIC ADDRESS: 7380 Wren Street

CURRENT ZONING: R558
PROPOSED ZONING: RC465s

1. DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:

Municipal water is available on Wren Street, Hillcrest Avenue and Terepocki Crescent. No further upgrading is required.

2. SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:

Municipal sanitary is available on Wren Street, Hillcrest Avenue and Terepocki Crescent. No further upgrading is required.

3. STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:

Municipal storm sewer is available on Wren Street, Hillcrest Avenue and Terepocki Crescent. No further upgrading is required.

4. ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:

Wren Street, Hillcrest Avenue and Terepocki Crescent provide 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

Sterling Chan
Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by

Rick Bomhof
Director of Engineering
Appendix 4

ZONING MAP
Appendix 5

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN MAP
DATE: May 5, 2014

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jennifer Russell, Legislative Assistant, and Kelly Cameron, Forestry Technologist

SUBJECT: Proposed Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw

ATTACHMENT(S):
- Appendix 1: Table of Task Force Revisions
- Appendix 2: Current Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993
- Appendix 3: Map 1 – Current areas where shooting is permitted
- Appendix 4: Proposed Bylaw 5433-2014
- Appendix 5: Map 2 – Proposed bylaw map with task force revisions

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Council consider and resolve:

1. That first, second and third readings of District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 5362-2013 be rescinded;

2. That Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 5433-2014, with one of the following map options, be considered for first, second and third readings at the regular Council meeting of May 5, 2014:

   Option 1
   - Maintain the current boundaries and areas of discharge/no discharge as set out in Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993, as shown on Appendix 3: Map 1.

   Option 2
   - Incorporation of the area revisions recommended by the Discharge of Firearms Bylaw Task Force, as shown on Appendix 5: Map 2.

   Option 3
   - Further modification of bylaw map areas of discharge/no discharge, using Option 2 as the base reference and each area considered and voted on individually.

   Option 4
   - Any other combination of discharge/no discharge areas within the municipal boundary that Council deems appropriate (which must be specified in the motion).

   Option 5
   - A total ban on the discharge of a firearm anywhere within the municipal boundary.
PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the recommendations of the Discharge of Firearms Bylaw Task Force regarding a new Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Discharge of Firearms Bylaw Task Force was formed to provide recommendations to Council regarding a new Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw that would not only update some of the antiquated wording, but also to advise on any proposals with regard to areas that may be considered as open or closed to the discharge of firearms, with primary consideration being given to public and worker safety, and to proximity to popular recreation and camping areas.

The task force reached agreement (by majority, not unanimously) on new bylaw wording. The proposed new bylaw wording presented in Appendix 4 represents the outcome of task force discussions and the final revisions suggested by the District’s legal counsel.

There was no consensus among the task force members on recommendations for some of the current bylaw areas where the discharge of a firearm is permitted. The options stated below are presented for the map areas only. Final determination of the areas where the discharge of firearms will or will not be permitted will need to be considered by Council. The map areas can be voted on as the options presented in this report, or can be voted on individually.

Once a new bylaw is adopted, a smaller advisory committee will be formed to provide ongoing advice and information to Council on implementation and monitoring. The formation of this advisory committee was approved by Council on July 2, 2013.

BACKGROUND:

Progression of the Bylaw Review

The current Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993 was last amended in 1996 when a review noted that the bylaw needed to be updated with a number of changes to bring it into compliance with the Community Charter. It allows the use of particular firearms in specific areas (see Appendix 3: Map 1) subject to all the applicable federal and provincial licensing and regulations, and does not allow target practice anywhere except on a legal shooting range.

There has been a long history of unauthorized firearm use in certain areas around the Municipal Forest. Not only are there substantial public safety concerns with this unauthorized use, but also costly vandalism to equipment and gates, and significant environmental impact with the shooting of live trees and with the amount of garbage, spent shells and shot left behind.

In 2010, an informal staff committee was established to review the Discharge of Firearms Bylaw in light of the work that is being done to enhance recreational use in the Mission Interpretive Forest around Stave Lake and the Florence Lake Forest Service Road (FLFSR). The RCMP, Forestry, Bylaw Enforcement and Planning departments were all in agreement that the use of firearms should be prohibited considering the future plan for this area as a family-oriented recreation and tourism area. Staff determined that the anticipated increase of (non-hunting) recreational users, the Zajac Ranch, the new Sayres Lake Campground and the proposed Tim Horton Children’s Foundation (THCF) camp facility were not compatible with nearby firearms use.

In October 2012 Council stated that they would like the firearms bylaw to be amended to reflect banning the discharge of firearms in the area around the FLFSR.

In May of 2013 the staff committee presented a report to Council that recommended a total ban on the discharge of a firearm within the municipality, except at the Mission & District Rod & Gun Club.
On May 21, 2013 Council gave the first three readings to the new Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 5362-2013. Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 5362-2013 is still sitting at third reading, pending further directions from Council.

Formation of Task Force

In addition to giving the new bylaw its first three readings, Council also directed that it be forwarded to a public input session before Council considered it for adoption.

The resulting public notice of the proposed changes generated a significant response in the District, and a very well-attended public input session was held on June 19, 2013. A stakeholder task force was formed in response to the public input session. The Discharge of Firearms Bylaw Task Force was mandated to provide advice to Council on a new discharge of firearms regulation bylaw, ideally before the start of the 2014 summer recreation season.

The task force membership consisted of Mayor Adlem (chair), Councillor Tilbury (vice-chair) and representatives from Zajac Ranch, Tim Horton’s Children’s Foundation, Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce, Mission & District Rod & Gun Club, Fraser Valley Mountain Bike Association, Mission Horse Club, BC Wildlife Federation, BC Ministry of Agriculture, Trails BC, Right Nuts ATV Club, Mission RCMP, Mission Forestry Department, and two members from the general public. Representatives from the Four Wheel Drive Association of BC and from the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations attended the final task force meeting on April 3, 2014.

Kwantlen and Matsqui First Nations are also task force members, however due to unresolvable scheduling conflicts, were not able to attend any of the meetings. Copies of all agenda materials and correspondence have been forwarded to them throughout the process. Kwantlen First Nation has indicated that they would like to provide additional comments, and are aware that the proposal is being presented to Council this evening. All task force members were forwarded a copy of this report once it was made publicly available through the regular Council meeting agenda package.

The task force held three meetings in total, and has now completed its mandate. The findings of the task force are presented in this report. Once a new bylaw is adopted, a smaller advisory committee will be formed to provide ongoing advice and information to Council on implementation, monitoring and enforcement options.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The three task force meetings were very productive and full of lively, respectful debate, despite the difficulty of the task at hand and the diversity of stakeholder interests. Members actively listened to all ideas, thoughts and opinions expressed. All of the task force members expressed an interest in participating on the future advisory committee.

The general areas of concern included:

- public and worker safety
- compatibility of various recreational uses
- challenges with enforcement
- District liability if people are hurt or property destroyed
- preservation of hunting areas
- unrecognizable geographic boundaries within Areas B, C and D
- wording in the bylaw that was inconsistent with other federal and provincial legislation
Areas of Consensus and Non-Consensus

The proposed bylaw has received a full legal review. The body of the bylaw attached as Appendix 4 represents the outcome of task force discussions and the final revisions suggested by the District’s legal counsel.

Appendix 1: Table of Task Force Revisions summarizes the outcome of most of the discussions held over the course of the three meetings. It is important to note that there was no consensus among the task force members on recommendations for certain current bylaw map areas. Final determination of the areas where the discharge of firearms will or will not be permitted will need to be considered by Council.

Each area of proposed revisions to address the concerns of the task force were discussed at length. Bylaw mapping changes were incorporated into Appendix 5: Map 2 based on the rationale listed in the table.

Bylaw Mapping Options for Consideration

Option 1

Maintain the current boundaries and areas of discharge/no discharge as set out in Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993, as shown on Appendix 3: Map 1.

Option 2

Incorporation of the area revisions recommended by the Discharge of Firearms Bylaw Task Force, as shown on Appendix 5: Map 2.

Option 3

Further modification of bylaw map areas of discharge/no discharge, using Option 2 as the base reference and each area considered and voted on individually.

Option 4

Any other combination of discharge/no discharge areas within the municipal boundary that Council deems appropriate (which must be specified in the motion).

Option 5

A total ban on the discharge of a firearm anywhere within the municipal boundary.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

It is difficult to quantify all of the financial implications before an Option is selected. At a minimum, there will be financial implications to the District in terms of a communication strategy (including a public education component) and new signs posted in prominent locations along the FLFSR.

In the future there may need to be a determination of RCMP enforcement requirements regarding the ongoing issues with illegal discharge of firearms.

COMMUNICATION:

Should Council decide to proceed with adoption of a new discharge of firearm regulation bylaw within the municipality, staff will take a proactive role in educating the public through a comprehensive communications plan. This plan would include a press release, District Update articles, the District’s website, and in person, whenever possible, through a community watch program, distribution to gun
and ammunition shops in the general vicinity, and large signage throughout the FLFSR area.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**

A new Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw with five options for areas that either allow or prohibit the discharge of a firearm is presented for review and consideration by Council.

RCMP and District staff acknowledge that adoption of a new bylaw will not solve all of the recurring issues, because a significant amount of current firearms use around the FLFSR is already prohibited under the existing bylaw. Adoption of a new bylaw would be the first step toward a change in how land within the municipal boundary is used.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Jennifer Russell, Legislative Assistant

Kelly Cameron, Forestry Technologist

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed.
**APPENDIX 1: Table of Task Force Revisions**
(see Map 2 for illustration of described areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Bylaw Area</th>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>Fraser River/ Silvercreek Industrial area</td>
<td>Maintain AREA B - Remove area east of Nelson St. Matsqui Island I.R.3</td>
<td>Industrial park/worksites does not allow firearms use in this area currently as a prohibition clause in already states no use on or across any highway, or within 150 metres of any worksite. Municipality has no jurisdiction on the discharge of firearms on Indian Reserves. For Canada Goose population control.</td>
<td>Group consensus reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C₁</td>
<td>North of Sayres Lake</td>
<td>Change to AREA A – No shooting</td>
<td>Campground on Sayres Lake, future re-routing of Florence Lake Forest Service Road, and future campground opportunity at Morgan Lake.</td>
<td>Group consensus reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C₂</td>
<td>Hoover Lake</td>
<td>Maintain AREA C – Remove the portion of Area D₂ that is only accessible via Hoover Road system and change to C₂. Remove area within Cannell Lake Community Watershed within Area C₂. Ensure southern boundary of C₂ follows distinguishable boundary such as logging roads, creeks or contours</td>
<td>Shotgun or rifles currently permitted in small undistinguishable area D (no landmarks). Map area C₂ based on logical contour between Hoover and Hunter Road systems. See D₂ Watershed security. Current southern boundary was not definable. * Some task force members not in favour due to popular recreation fishing lake area</td>
<td>*No consensus reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C₃</td>
<td>Red Mt.</td>
<td>Maintain AREA C 1000m buffer Hayward Reservoir Trail – redefine on contour to logging road in the north west corner. * Further discussion between dropping as a hunting area due to 25+ km of recreation trail network and marketed destination mt. bike area</td>
<td>Extensive managed trail network promoted with Bear Mt. * Most on task force not in favour of hunting in this area.</td>
<td>*No consensus reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C₁</td>
<td>Bear Mt.</td>
<td>Change to AREA A - No hunting</td>
<td>Extensive managed trail network, FV tourism promotion of destination mountain biking, two communication cell tower worksites, adjacency to rural residential properties.</td>
<td>Group consensus reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D₁</td>
<td>West Stave-West Florence Lake FSR</td>
<td>Change portion to AREA A: North of Kearsley road system north to Municipal boundary</td>
<td>Extensive managed trail network, FV tourism promotion of destination mountain biking, two communication cell tower worksites, adjacency to rural residential properties.</td>
<td>Group consensus reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D₂</td>
<td>North Cannell Lake (Hunter Rd access via Steelhead Sabo Rd)</td>
<td>As per C₂ - Remove portion of AREA D₂ that is only accessible via Hoover Road system and change to C₂.</td>
<td>Extensive managed trail network, FV tourism promotion of destination mountain biking, two communication cell tower worksites, adjacency to rural residential properties.</td>
<td>Group consensus reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw wording</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Remove conflict with protection of livestock clause</td>
<td>Federally and Provincially regulated.</td>
<td>Group consensus reached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED FOR CONVENIENCE ONLY and is a consolidation of "District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw" with the following amending bylaws:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bylaw Number</th>
<th>Date Adopted</th>
<th>Section Amended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2745-1994</td>
<td>April 5, 1994</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2979-1996-2568(2)</td>
<td>July 15, 1996</td>
<td>Section 2, 3, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual copies of any of the above bylaws are available from the Administration Department of the District of Mission. For legal purposes, copies of the original bylaws should be obtained.
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 2568-1993

A bylaw to Provide for the Regulation of Firearms

The Council of the District of Mission in open meeting assembled ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993".

2. Interpretation:

"Firearm" means a gun, including a rifle, pistol or shotgun and includes an airgun, air rifle, air pistol and spring gun, but does not include a weapon used for the discharge of blank ammunition in connection with athletic or sporting events.

"Highway" means a street, road, lane, bridge, viaduct, forestry road and any other way open to the use of the public, but does not include a private right-of-way on private property.

"Livestock" means the same as defined in the Livestock Protection Act (RSBC 1979) as may be amended from time to time, and for the purposes of this bylaw also includes aquaculture and fish as defined in the Fisheries Act (RSBC 1979), as may be amended from time to time.

"District" means the District of Mission.

3. No person shall discharge a firearm within the limits of the District in those areas shown as "closed to the discharge of firearms" and designated as Area "A" on Schedule "A", hereto attached and forming part of this bylaw, except as otherwise provided under Sections 5, 8 and 12.

4. No person shall discharge a firearm utilizing a single projectile anywhere in the District except as otherwise provided under Sections 5, 11(b), 11(c) and 12.

5. A permit to discharge a firearm within the limits of the District shall be required:

a) by a person who operates a pistol range, rifle range, trap range or skeet shooting range. Any permit issued to such person shall be valid for not more than one calendar year from date of issue;

b) by an organizer of a trap or skeet shooting event located on property elsewhere than on a shooting range. Any permit issued to such organizer shall be valid for not more than seven days from date of issue;

c) by a property owner for the protection of crops, poultry or livestock on their own property if said property is located in an area shown as "closed to the discharge of firearms" designated as Area "A" on Schedule "A". Any permit issued under this section shall be subject to the provisions of the Wildlife Act (SBC 1982), Livestock Protection Act (RSBC 1979), and the Migratory Birds Convention Act (SC). Any permit issued to such person shall be valid for not more than the time specified, if any, in the federal or provincial permits and in no case for longer than one calendar year from the date of issue.
6. Application for a permit as required under Section 5 shall be made in writing to the Municipal Clerk of the District on forms provided for that purpose. The Municipal Clerk shall be authorized to issue permits, based on the application being in compliance with the provisions of this bylaw, provided that the applicant is in possession of a current Firearms Acquisition Certificate which is not in any manner jeopardized by criminal activity or other cause.

7. a) An applicant for a permit to discharge a firearm under Section 5 must be covered by an existing third party public liability and property damage insurance policy covering an incident which may occur from the discharge of a firearm in the amount of at least $2,000,000 per occurrence.

   b) Failure to maintain such coverage during the life of the permit automatically cancels the permit.

   c) An applicant must provide a copy of his existing insurance policy or a valid British Columbia Wildlife Federation membership card to the Municipal Clerk and must sign a waiver of liability form prepared by the District of Mission, saving it harmless of any and all claims made against the District of Mission that may arise from the applicant's discharge of a firearm.

   d) The District shall be a named insured on any applicant's policy unless the applicant has coverage by virtue of his membership with the British Columbia Wildlife Federation.

8. Subject to the provisions of the Wildlife Act, Migratory Birds Convention Act, and the Livestock Protection Act and all amendments and regulations thereto, the provisions of Section 5 of this bylaw shall not apply:

   a) to a person engaged in a farm operation who discharges a firearm for the purpose of protecting his crops, poultry or livestock from injury or destruction by birds or animals provided that the area in which the firearm is to be discharged is not located in an area shown as "closed to the discharge of firearms" designated on Schedule "A";

   b) to a person engaged in the humane destruction of an injured or sick animal;

   c) to a person engaged in the slaughter of domestic livestock, where such livestock is legally kept according to the provisions of other applicable District bylaws;

   d) to a person who discharges an airgun, air pistol, air rifle or spring gun on property owned or leased by him or by his parent or guardians;

   e) when the discharge of firearms is conducted by a person who is the holder of a valid resident trapping licence issued by the Province of British Columbia in conjunction with the person's trapping operation.

9. The provisions of this bylaw do not apply to a Peace Officer, employee of the Government of British Columbia or the Government of Canada or the District or a Special Constable of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, any of whom may be required to use a firearm in the performance of his duties, and discharges the firearm while performing his duties.
10. No person shall discharge a firearm:

a) on or across any highway;

b) within 150 metres of any school building, school yard, public park, playground or church unless discharging same within the provisions of Sections 8(b) and 8(c);

c) within 150 metres of any workshop, place of business, dwelling house, farm building, highway or place where people are assembled or engaged in work of any kind unless discharging same within the provisions of Sections 5(a) and Section 8.

11. A person may, without permit, subject to the applicable laws and regulations of the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada, discharge:

a) a shotgun utilizing ammunition with shot only while hunting in the area shown as Area B on Schedule "A";

b) a shotgun utilizing ammunition with a single projectile or shot while hunting in the area shown as Area C on Schedule "A";

c) a rifle or shotgun utilizing ammunition with shot or a single projectile while hunting in the area shown as Area D on Schedule "A".

12. No person shall discharge a firearm except for an air gun or spring gun for the purpose of target practice of any kind in the District, except:

a) on a legal shooting range which has been issued a permit under Section 5(a); or

b) on property of which they are the owner or legal occupier, or have the written permission of the owner or legal occupier, provided that such property is within an area designated on Schedule "A" appropriate to the kind of firearm and ammunition used and such discharge is not in violation of other applicable sections of this bylaw; or

c) on property for which a permit has been issued under section 5(b) of this bylaw.

13. No person shall discharge a firearm in such a way that the projectile or projectiles go into, over or through an area which is closed to the discharge of firearms, including any area prohibited by application of Section 10 of this bylaw.

14. Any person who offends any provision of this bylaw commits an offence and shall be liable, upon summary conviction, to a fine of not less than $100 or to imprisonment, or both.

15. "Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw No. 2184-1990 and amendments thereto, are hereby repealed."
READ A FIRST TIME this 1st day of February, 1993

READ A SECOND TIME this 1st day of February, 1993

READ A THIRD TIME this 1st day of February, 1993

RECONSIDERED AND FINALLY ADOPTED this 15th day of March, 1993

______________________  _______________________
MAYOR      CLERK
DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS
PERMIT APPLICATION

1. Applicant's name:

Address:

Telephone: Contact person:

2. Address where firearm will be discharged (attach plan showing where firearms will be discharged and proximity to roads and buildings):

3. Type(s) of firearm intended to be discharged:

4. Purpose of discharging firearm(s) (e.g. rifle range, skeet shooting, target practice, protection of crops, poultry, livestock):

5. Name of applicant's insurer:

Address:

Telephone: Contact person:

Amount of liability insurance coverage: $ __________ (per occurrence)

6. Proof of insurance indicating amount of liability coverage OR Proof of B.C. Wildlife Federation Membership

z attached z to be provided z attached z to be provided

APPLICATION WILL NOT BE PROCESSED UNTIL PROOF OF INSURANCE SATISFACTORY TO THE DISTRICT OF MISSION, OR PROOF OF B.C. WILDLIFE FEDERATION MEMBERSHIP IS ATTACHED TOGETHER WITH A CURRENT AND VALID FIREARMS ACQUISITION CERTIFICATE IN THE NAME OF THE APPLICANT AND ANY PROVINCIAL OR FEDERAL PERMITS RELATED TO THE INTENDED PURPOSE INCLUDED IN THIS APPLICATION.

I acknowledge I have reviewed and agree to comply with District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993.

Applicant signature Date
The District of Mission hereby grants a **DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS PERMIT**

to ____________________________ (the "Permit Holder") for the period commencing ____________________________ up to and including ____________________________, subject to ____________________________, subject to the provisions of District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993, as amended, for the discharge of firearms at the following location ____________________________

(address or legal description)

for the purpose of ____________________________.

_________________________ (date issued)                                        MUNICIPAL CLERK

**WAIVER AND INDEMNITY:** In consideration of being issued a Firearms Discharge Permit by the District of Mission, the Permit Holder for himself, his agents and employees, hereby indemnifies and saves harmless the District of Mission, its employees and agents from and against all claims, losses, demands, costs, damages, actions, suits and proceedings that may arise out of the discharge of a firearm at the location described above or the issuance of a permit to him to discharge a firearm.

_________________________ Signature of Permit Holder

**WARNING:** Failure by the Permit Holder to maintain third party public liability insurance in the manner and amount required by District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993 and all amendments thereto, automatically invalidates this permit.
WHEREAS a municipal council may, by bylaw, regulate or prohibit the discharge of Firearms pursuant to Section 8(5) of the Community Charter;

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

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 5433-2014".

2. "District of Mission Discharge of Firearms Regulation Bylaw 2568-1993", and all amendments thereto, are hereby repealed.

Interpretation

3. In this Bylaw, unless the context otherwise requires,

   (a) “District” means the District of Mission.

   (b) “Firearm” means a rifle, pistol or shotgun, and includes an air gun, air rifle, air pistol and spring gun, but does not include a starting pistol that is incapable of firing a projectile and is used for the discharge of blank ammunition in connection with an athletic or sporting event.

   (c) “Highway” means a street, road, lane, bridge, viaduct, forestry road and any other way open to the use of the public, but does not include a private right-of-way on private property.

   (d) “Legal Shooting Range” means a place that is designated or intended for the safe discharge, on a regular and structured basis, of firearms for the purpose of target practice or target shooting competitions, and that is licensed and operates in accordance with all applicable Federal, Provincial and local government statutes, regulations and bylaws.

   (e) “Livestock” means the same as defined in the Livestock Act (RSBC 1996) as may be amended from time to time and, for the purposes of this Bylaw, also includes aquaculture and fish as defined in the Fisheries Act (RSBC 1996), as may be amended from time to time.

   (f) “Permit” means a permit issued by the Corporate Officer in accordance with the provisions of this Bylaw.

Prohibition

4. No person shall discharge a Firearm anywhere within the District except as permitted under this Bylaw.
5. No person shall discharge a Firearm within those areas of the District shown as Area A on Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw, except as otherwise provided under Sections 12 and 19.

6. No person shall discharge a Firearm for the purpose of target practice of any kind in the District, except on a Legal Shooting Range.

7. No person shall discharge a Firearm:
   (a) on or across any Highway;
   (b) within 150 metres of any school building, school yard, public park, playground or church; or
   (c) within 150 metres of any workshop, place of business, dwelling house, farm building, Highway or place where people are assembled or engaged in work of any kind unless discharging same within the provisions of Section 12 or Section 19.

8. No person shall discharge a firearm utilizing a single projectile anywhere in the District except as specifically provided under Section 10, Section 11 and Section 12.

9. No person shall discharge a firearm in such a way that the projectile goes into, over or through an area of the District where the discharge of firearms is prohibited under this Bylaw.

Regulations

10. Notwithstanding Sections 4 and 8 of this Bylaw, but subject to the Migratory Birds Convention Act, the Wildlife Act and the Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act, and all regulations thereto, a person may discharge a Firearm within the District when:
    (a) he/she is engaged in a farm operation [as defined in the Farm Practices Protection (Right to Farm) Act] and the Firearm is discharged for the purpose of protecting crops or Livestock from birds or animals; or
    (b) he/she is engaged in the humane destruction or slaughter of domestic Livestock, where such Livestock is legally kept according to the provisions of other applicable District bylaws; or
    (c) he/she is engaged in a commercial slaughterhouse operation; or
    (d) he/she is engaged in shooting on a Legal Shooting Range duly authorized by a Permit issued under Section 12 of this Bylaw.

11. A person may, without a Permit, subject to the applicable laws and regulations of the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada, discharge:
    (a) a shotgun utilizing ammunition with shot only while hunting in the area shown as Area B on Schedule "A";
    (b) a shotgun utilizing ammunition with a single projectile or shot while hunting in the area shown as Area C on Schedule "A";
    (c) a rifle or shotgun utilizing ammunition with shot or a single projectile while hunting in the area shown as Area D on Schedule "A";
during that period of the year when the hunting of wildlife or waterfowl may be carried out in accordance with the laws of the Province of British Columbia, AND

provided that person is a holder of a valid and subsisting hunting license issued by the Province of British Columbia under the *Wildlife Act*, and any other documentation that is required by the laws of British Columbia and of Canada for the hunting and killing of such wildlife.

**Permit**

12. A Permit to discharge a Firearm within the limits of the District shall be required for the operation of a Legal Shooting Range.

13. Application for a Permit as required under Section 12 shall be made in writing to the Corporate Officer of the District on the form approved by the Corporate Officer. The Corporate Officer is authorized to issue a Permit when the application is in compliance with the provisions of this Bylaw.

14. A Permit under Section 12 may be issued for a term of no more than:

   (a) two (2) years; or

   (b) where the applicant applies to renew a Permit, and provided the applicant has complied with the terms and conditions of the Permit and the requirements of this Bylaw throughout the previous term, five (5) years.

15. A Permit under Section 12 for the discharge of Firearms at a Legal Shooting Range may be issued providing the applicant is covered by an existing third party public liability and property damage insurance policy that remains in force for the duration of the Permit:

   (a) in the minimum amount of $2,000,000.00 per occurrence; and

   (b) that has the District of Mission as an additional insured.

16. An applicant for a Permit must provide a copy of his or her existing insurance policy to the Corporate Officer and must sign a waiver of liability form prepared by the District of Mission, saving it harmless of any and all claims made against the District of Mission that may arise from the applicant's discharge of a Firearm.

17. The holder of a Permit must provide the Corporate Officer with evidence that the policy of insurance required under Section 15 remains in force, upon request.

18. If the insurance policy required pursuant to Section 15 is cancelled, revoked or is not maintained in force throughout the term of the Permit, the Corporate Officer shall cancel the Permit.

**Exceptions**

19. The provisions of this Bylaw do not apply to a Peace Officer, an employee of the Province of British Columbia, Government of Canada or the District, or a Special Constable of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, who discharges a Firearm in the performance of duty.

20. The provisions of this Bylaw do not apply when the discharge of Firearms is conducted by a person who is the holder of a valid resident trapping license and a resident hunting or firearms license issued by the Province of British Columbia who has produced written permission from the owner or the lessee of the lands upon which he proposes to operate his trap line.
Penalty

21. Any person guilty of an infraction of this Bylaw shall be liable, upon summary conviction, to a fine of not less than $500.00 and not more than the maximum penalty provided by the Offence Act, and, where the offence is a continuing one, each day that the offence is continued shall constitute a separate offence.

Severability

22. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this Bylaw is for any reason held to be invalid by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this

READ A SECOND TIME this

READ A THIRD TIME this

ADOPTED this

WALTER (TED) ADLEM, MAYOR

KEN BJORGGAARD, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER (Interim Corporate Officer)
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Kris Boland, Manager of Finance
SUBJECT: Draft 2013 Consolidated Financial Statements
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A – Draft 2013 Consolidated Financial Statements
Appendix B – Budget Variance

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
That the District of Mission’s 2013 draft consolidated financial statements be approved, as attached as Appendix A to the Manager of Finance’s report dated May 5, 2014 entitled Draft 2013 Consolidated Financial Statements.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The District of Mission’s draft 2013 consolidated financial statements, including the draft audit opinion, are attached as Appendix A. In accordance with audit standards, Council is required to approve the financial statements before the auditors issue their final audit report. A summary of the District’s 2013 financial results and financial position is included in this report.

The District’s annual surplus on an accrual-basis was $10,040,564, and the general operating fund cash-basis surplus was $1,185,002 for the year. A reconciliation of the accrual-basis surplus and the cash-basis surplus is included in this report. It is important to note that the cash-basis surplus was as a result of several budget savings that occurred in 2013, namely increase in grants in-lieu of tax revenue, increase in traffic fine revenue due to a change in accounting standards, an increase in building permit revenue, plus cost savings in the RCMP contract, cost savings in transit expenditures, and several vacant positions that were not filled in 2013. The budget variances from grants in-lieu of tax, transit and building permits that occurred in 2013 were known at the time of preparing the 2014 final budget, and have been incorporated into the budget moving forward. Salary savings and traffic fine revenue are both one-time occurrences so no budget adjustments were made in 2014. Given that the budget variances have either been incorporated into the 2014 final budget or are one-time in nature, it is not expected that a cash-basis surplus of this magnitude will occur in 2014 and beyond.

In order to ensure financial sustainability over the longer term, the District must continue to be disciplined and focused in terms of reaching specific financial goals and targets. For example, funding for regional water and sewer infrastructure, DCC programs, community amenities, and infrastructure renewal will continue to present challenges, in addition to any investments required as a result of the downtown revitalization process.

Staff looks forward to continuing to work with Council and the community to ensure Mission maintains its fiscal health and reaches its financial goals, thereby ensuring a bright future for all Mission residents.
PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present the District’s draft 2013 consolidated financial statements, including the draft audit opinion.

BACKGROUND:
The District of Mission’s draft 2013 consolidated financial statements, including the draft audit opinion, are attached as Appendix A. The term “consolidated” refers to the fact that the District of Mission Development Corporation’s 2013 financial results are included in the District of Mission’s 2013 financial statements, in accordance with accounting standards. In accordance with audit standards, Council is required to approve the financial statements before the auditors issue their final audit report. A summary of the District’s 2013 financial results and financial position follows in this report.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The District’s annual surplus on an accrual-basis was $10,040,564, and the general operating fund cash-basis surplus was $1,185,002. A reconciliation of the accrual-basis surplus and the cash-basis surplus is included in this report. It is important to note that the cash-basis surplus was as a result of several budget savings that occurred in 2013, namely increase in grants in-lieu of tax revenue, increase in traffic fine revenue due to a change in accounting standards, an increase in building permit revenue, plus cost savings in the RCMP contract, cost savings in transit expenditures, and several vacant positions that were not filled in 2013. The budget variances from grants in-lieu of tax, transit and building permits that occurred in 2013 were known at the time of preparing the 2014 final budget, and have been incorporated into the budget moving forward. Salary savings and traffic fine revenue are both one-time occurrences so no budget adjustments were made in 2014. Given that the budget variances have either been incorporated into the 2014 final budget or are one-time in nature, it is not expected that a cash-basis surplus of this magnitude will occur in 2014 and beyond.

A summary of the financial statements follows.

Audit Opinion
In terms of the audit results and draft audit opinion, the District’s external auditors have concluded that in their opinion, the District’s 2013 consolidated financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects.

Consolidated Statement of Financial Position
The consolidated statement of financial position, which is similar to a balance sheet, summarizes the District’s assets and liabilities, the net of which results in accumulated surplus. The components of accumulated surplus are detailed in note 13 to the financial statements. Assets are broken down into two categories:

- Financial assets: includes assets which are available to discharge existing liabilities, and excludes assets that are held for use in the provision of services. Examples include cash, accounts receivable, and investments.
- Non-financial assets: includes assets that are held for use in the provision of services and have useful lives extending beyond one year. Examples include tangible capital assets primarily, such as roads, water and sewer infrastructure that are used to provide municipal services.
At the end of 2013, the District had net financial assets of approximately $29.5 million, which means financial assets were greater than liabilities. This represents an $8.6 million increase in net financial assets over the prior year. A portion of this increase can be attributed to the District paying down long-term debt from $16.2 million to $13.8 million, in addition to increasing financial assets by approximately $9 million.

The District had non-financial assets of about $426.8 million at the end of 2013, the majority of which is the historical cost of tangible capital assets, less amortization. The District's net financial assets together with its non-financial assets contributed to its overall accumulated surplus position of approximately $456.3 million at the end of 2013.

**Consolidated Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus**

This statement, which is similar to an income statement, summarizes the District's revenues and expenses for the year, the net of which results in the accrual-basis annual surplus. The annual surplus is added to the prior year’s accumulated surplus, to arrive at the ending accumulated surplus for the year. Based on total revenues of approximately $65 million and expenses of approximately $55 million during the year, the annual surplus per the accrual-basis of accounting of $10 million is shown in this statement. The ending accumulated surplus position reflected in this statement of approximately $456.3 million corresponds with the accumulated surplus shown on the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position.

**Consolidated Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets**

This statement adjusts the annual surplus for transactions involving non-financial assets, to arrive at the increase in net financial assets for the year. The net increase in financial assets is then added to the net financial assets at the beginning of the year to arrive at the year-end balance for net financial assets. The District’s net financial assets at the end of 2013 were approximately $29.5 million, which corresponds with the net financial assets figure in the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position.

**Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows**

This statement summarizes the sources and usage of cash over the year, in the categories of operating, investing, financing, and capital transactions. The change in cash and cash equivalents is reflected in the final cash position shown, which reconciles with the cash and cash equivalents balance shown on the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position. The District's cash and cash equivalents balance at the end of 2013 was approximately $34.7 million. Cash and cash equivalents includes cash held at the bank as well as cashable term deposits; see Note 4 to the financial statements for more details.

**Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements**

The Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements reflect significant accounting policies, the details of certain amounts shown in the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position and Consolidated Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, as well as other pertinent information that helps to explain the financial statements. For example, a detailed breakdown of the investments balance shown in the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position is reflected in note 6.

Note 13 shows the detailed composition of the District’s $456.3 million accumulated surplus, which consists primarily of amounts invested in tangible capital assets, as well as operating surplus balances and reserve fund balances.

Note 18 shows the status of the District's Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Fund. This trust fund has been established pursuant to the *Cremation, Interment and Funeral Services Act* (the Act), which stipulates that the trust fund balance is to be used to maintain the cemetery into perpetuity once the cemetery is closed. Trust fund contributions and interest earnings throughout the year are added to
the trust fund balance. Interest earnings are then transferred to the general operating fund to assist with operational expenses of the cemetery, as permitted by the Act. The fund balance increased by $22,641 in 2013. Unlike the District’s reserve funds, the Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Fund is not included as part of the District’s accumulated surplus in the consolidated financial statements, in accordance with accounting standards.

**Schedule 1 – Consolidated Schedule of Tangible Capital Assets**

Schedule 1 reflects the historical cost of tangible capital assets and the changes in the balance of these assets as a result of additions, disposals and amortization expense. The District had approximately $547.5 million (historical cost) of tangible capital assets at the end of 2013 with accumulated amortization of about $121.4 million, for a net book value of about $426 million. Total additions to tangible capital assets were $10.5 million in 2013, of which $3.2 million were infrastructure assets received from developers through their property development activities.

**Schedule 2 – Statement of Operations by Segment**

Schedule 2 shows revenues and expenses for the year broken down into 14 departmental/functional areas (i.e. segments). The total revenues and expenses for all of the departmental/functional areas balance to the Consolidated Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, as does the total annual surplus. Details of the services/functions included in each segment can be found in Note 17.

**Schedule 3 – Long-Term Debt**

Schedule 3 reflects the principal amount of debt owing, separated into the categories of general, sewer utility, and water utility debt. The annual debt servicing requirements for the next five years are also reflected in this schedule. The District had approximately $13.8 million of external debt principal outstanding at the end of 2013, consisting of approximately $12.5 million of general debt, $879,000 of sewer utility debt, and $379,000 of water utility debt. In accordance with the District’s 2013 financial plan, a debt retirement strategy is in place to take advantage of early debt payout opportunities in 2013 and 2014. This strategy has resulted in a significant reduction in water utility debt during 2013, and provides for significant reductions in all three categories of debt during 2014.

**Schedule 4 – Internal Debt/Transfers Outstanding**

Schedule 4 lists all of the District’s outstanding internal debt (i.e. borrowing from reserves) including advances, adjustments and payments. The outstanding internal debt of $5.2 million as at December 31, 2013, is entirely related to borrowing for Development Cost Charge (DCC) projects. In other words, other reserves have had to prepay for certain DCC projects, because insufficient DCC funds were collected prior to acquisition or construction of those DCC projects. The intent is that as DCC funds are collected from future development, these collections are used to pay back to the lending reserve funds.

Paying for growth related DCC projects prior to actual growth occurring is an ongoing challenge. It is important to adhere to a solid pay back plan if and when funds are advanced for DCC projects. Difficulties with payback arise when DCC collections are slow and when the funding of current DCC projects takes precedence over the payback of existing internal loans.

During 2013, the District repaid almost $1.4 million of internal loans, reducing the outstanding balance from $6.6 million to $5.2 million. One new internal loan for $13,446 was required during the year, to provide funding towards major upgrades at the regional sewage treatment plant. Overall, the net effect was a 20% decrease in the total amount of internal loans outstanding from the prior year.
2013 Cash-Basis Surplus and Variance Explanations

The attached Appendix B provides an explanation of the various departmental revenue and expense variances, which in turn explains the District's $1,185,002 general operating fund cash-basis annual surplus. Also included in Appendix B are the year-end results for refuse, water, sewer, equipment and forestry.

The cash-basis annual surplus is different than the surplus shown on the Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, which is prepared on an accrual-basis in accordance with accounting standards. For example, current year tax revenue is used to pay principal payments on debt, and no cash-basis surplus arises from this transaction. However, under the accrual-basis, tax revenue is recorded as revenue, while principle payments on debt result in a reduction in liabilities; therefore, tax revenue is included on the Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, while principle payments on debt are not. This differing treatment of principle payments on debt is an example of how the cash-basis and accrual basis annual surplus figures differ.

A reconciliation of the two surplus amounts follows:

### 2013 Annual Surplus Reconciliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash-basis annual operating surplus (general fund)</td>
<td>1,185,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cash items required per accounting standards:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization expense</td>
<td>(7,936,834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net-book-value of disposed fixed assets</td>
<td>(1,059,313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue (i.e. DCC funds spent)</td>
<td>2,237,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributed capital assets</td>
<td>3,184,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior period adjustment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>(3,574,798)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash items excluded per accounting standards:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to reserves</td>
<td>11,118,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from reserves - operating only</td>
<td>(1,884,273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal payments on debt</td>
<td>2,440,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend received from Development Corporation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>11,675,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items that are excluded under the cash-basis:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Corporation annual deficit</td>
<td>(24,995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small capital expenses</td>
<td>(1,704,042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant revenue for capital projects</td>
<td>2,273,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery revenue for capital projects</td>
<td>210,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>755,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrual-basis annual surplus per financial statements (consolidated)</strong></td>
<td>10,040,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

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

The District's 2013 consolidated financial statements will be forwarded to the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development, prior to the legislated deadline of May 15, 2014. The financial statements will also form part of the District’s 2013 Annual Report, which will be included on a public Council meeting agenda prior to the June 30, 2014 legislated deadline. The Annual Report will also be available to the public on the District’s website.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kris Boland, Manager of Finance

Reviewed by:
Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.

g:\finance\yearend\yend2013\memo - 2013 financial statements.docx
DRAFT

2013 CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013)

District of Mission, British Columbia
### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### District of Mission Consolidated Financial Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditors’ Report</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Statement of Financial Position</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements</td>
<td>6 – 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Supplementary Financial Information

**Schedules:**

1) Tangible Capital Assets                                                  | 21 - 22   |
2) Statement of Operations by Segment                                       | 23 - 24   |
3) Long-Term Debt                                                           | 25 – 26   |
4) Internal Debt/Transfers Outstanding                                       | 27 - 28   |
Independent Auditor’s Report

To the Mayor and Council of the District of Mission

We have audited the accompanying consolidated financial statements of the District of Mission, which comprise the Consolidated Statement of Financial Position as at December 31, 2013, and the Consolidated Statements of Operations and Accumulated Surplus, Changes in Net Financial Assets and Cash Flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management’s Responsibility for the Financial Statements

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

Auditor’s Responsibility

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

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

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

Opinion

In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements present fairly in all material respects, the financial position of the District of Mission as at December 31, 2013, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Chartered Accountants

Vancouver, British Columbia
May 5, 2014
## District of Mission

### Consolidated Statement of Financial Position

#### as at December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents (Note 4)</td>
<td>$34,701,227</td>
<td>$23,107,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables (Note 5)</td>
<td>7,955,396</td>
<td>6,907,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories held for resale</td>
<td>234,754</td>
<td>186,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (Note 6)</td>
<td>29,789,875</td>
<td>33,464,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>72,681,252</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,664,542</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Liabilities**            |               |               |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities (Note 8) | 11,538,929    | 10,091,515    |
| Deposits                   | 1,888,145     | 1,942,545     |
| Long-term debt (Note 9, Schedule 3) | 13,772,222    | 16,213,167    |
| Deferred revenue           | 4,073,949     | 3,930,979     |
| Restricted revenue (Note 10)| 10,656,061    | 9,215,172     |
| Employee future benefits (Note 11) | 1,286,952     | 1,372,054     |
|                            | **43,216,258**| **42,765,432**|

| **Net Financial Assets** |               |               |
|                          | **29,464,994**| **20,899,110**|

| **Non-Financial Assets** |               |               |
| Tangible capital assets (Schedule 1) | 426,044,541   | 424,537,301   |
| Inventories of supplies and land | 630,054       | 645,254       |
| Prepaid expenses           | 148,868       | 166,228       |
|                            | **426,823,463**| **425,348,783**|

**Accumulated Surplus (Note 13)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$456,288,457</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Kris Boland CPA, CGA  
Manager of Finance

Walter (Ted) Adlem  
Mayor

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

### Consolidated Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus

for the year ended December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation (Note 14)</td>
<td>$30,041,960</td>
<td>$30,300,200</td>
<td>$29,147,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of services and regulatory fees</td>
<td>23,735,696</td>
<td>24,084,099</td>
<td>25,321,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers (Note 15)</td>
<td>2,979,069</td>
<td>3,891,981</td>
<td>1,883,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>1,107,033</td>
<td>2,237,002</td>
<td>1,892,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>731,355</td>
<td>868,675</td>
<td>922,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>464,569</td>
<td>472,355</td>
<td>408,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions in-kind related to capital</td>
<td>6,071,117</td>
<td>3,184,347</td>
<td>3,398,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$65,130,799</td>
<td>$65,038,659</td>
<td>$62,973,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenses**        |        |          |          |
| Administration and finance | 3,691,267 | 4,203,501 | 4,412,245 |
| General government and fiscal services | 1,290,474 | 1,117,682 | 1,996,378 |
| Protective services  | 13,615,246 | 13,188,918 | 13,137,926 |
| Engineering and public works | 7,454,365 | 7,861,288 | 7,692,267 |
| Transit services     | 2,555,743 | 2,465,741 | 2,282,039 |
| Refuse collection and landfill | 4,537,001 | 4,507,088 | 4,572,226 |
| Planning and economic development | 2,191,438 | 2,082,628 | 1,356,210 |
| Parks, recreation and cultural services | 6,424,296 | 6,549,962 | 6,359,668 |
| Library              | 1,333,770 | 1,351,476 | 1,270,747 |
| Cemetery             | 274,517  | 250,312  | 237,132  |
| Water utility        | 3,966,646 | 4,458,543 | 4,640,389 |
| Sewer utility        | 4,105,485 | 3,599,694 | 3,257,345 |
| Forestry enterprise  | 3,694,113 | 3,326,097 | 4,395,939 |
| Development Corporation | 59,266  | 35,165   | 37,550   |
| **Total Expenses**   | $55,193,627 | $54,998,095 | $55,648,061 |

| **Annual Surplus**   | $9,937,172 | $10,040,564 | $7,325,863 |

| **Accumulated Surplus, Beginning of Year** | 446,247,893 | 446,247,893 | 438,922,030 |

| **Accumulated Surplus, End of Year** | $456,185,065 | $456,288,457 | $446,247,893 |

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

**Consolidated Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets**

**For the Year Ended December 31, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Surplus</strong></td>
<td>$ 9,937,172</td>
<td>$ 10,040,564</td>
<td>$ 7,325,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition of tangible capital assets, including developer contributions in-kind</strong></td>
<td>(9,912,823)</td>
<td>(10,503,387)</td>
<td>(9,388,402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amortization of tangible capital assets</strong></td>
<td>7,985,084</td>
<td>7,936,834</td>
<td>8,001,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</strong></td>
<td>22,731</td>
<td>995,632</td>
<td>398,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net sale proceeds from tangible capital assets</strong></td>
<td>105,719</td>
<td>63,681</td>
<td>62,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,137,883</td>
<td>8,533,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in inventories of supplies and land</strong></td>
<td>522,108</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>(10,535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in prepaid expenses</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,360</td>
<td>12,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>522,108</td>
<td>32,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in Net Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td>8,659,991</td>
<td>8,565,884</td>
<td>6,402,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Financial Assets, Beginning of Year</strong></td>
<td>20,899,110</td>
<td>20,899,110</td>
<td>14,496,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Financial Assets, End of Year</strong></td>
<td>$ 29,559,101</td>
<td>$ 29,464,994</td>
<td>$ 20,899,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

## Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows

For the Year Ended December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Flows from Operating Transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual surplus</td>
<td>$ 10,040,564</td>
<td>$ 7,325,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items Not Involving Cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>7,936,834</td>
<td>8,001,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>(2,237,002)</td>
<td>(1,892,107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>995,632</td>
<td>398,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions in-kind related to capital</td>
<td>(3,184,347)</td>
<td>(3,398,186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in employee future benefits</td>
<td>(85,102)</td>
<td>65,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Non-Cash Operating Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>(1,048,276)</td>
<td>2,720,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>1,447,414</td>
<td>(1,823,429)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>(54,400)</td>
<td>(79,584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>142,970</td>
<td>260,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories held for resale</td>
<td>(48,583)</td>
<td>70,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories of supplies and land</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>(10,535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>17,361</td>
<td>12,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in Cash from Operating Transactions</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,938,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,652,703</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Cash Flows from Investing Transactions** |          |          |
| Change in investments              | 3,674,200 | 10,077,297 |

| **Cash Flows from Financing Transactions** |          |          |
| Long-term debt principal repaid     | (2,440,946) | (1,103,763) |
| Restricted revenue collections and interest earnings | 3,677,891 | 4,184,635 |
| **Net Change in Cash from Financing Transactions** | **1,236,945** | **3,080,872** |

| **Cash Flows from Capital Transactions** |          |          |
| Proceeds from sale of tangible capital assets | 63,681 | 62,723 |
| Cash used to acquire tangible capital assets | (7,319,040) | (5,990,216) |
| **Net Change in Cash from Capital Transactions** | **(7,255,359)** | **(5,927,493)** |

| **Net Change in Cash and Cash Equivalents** |          |          |
| Cash and Cash Equivalents, Beginning of Year | 11,594,051 | 18,883,379 |
| Cash and Cash Equivalents, End of Year | **34,701,227** | **23,107,176** |

The accompanying notes and schedules are an integral part of these financial statements.
District of Mission
Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements
For the Year Ended December 31, 2013

The notes and schedules to the consolidated financial statements are an integral part of the statements. They provide detailed information and explain the significant accounting and reporting principles that form the basis for the statements. The notes and schedules also provide important supplementary information and explanations, which cannot be conveniently integrated into the consolidated financial statements.

The principal activities of the District of Mission (the District) include the provision of local government services to residents and businesses. The Community Charter of British Columbia requires local governments to adopt a five year financial plan, wherein total budgeted expenditures and transfers to other funds for each year must not exceed the total of the budgeted funding sources and transfers from other funds for each year. Budget information presented in the consolidated financial statements reflects the budget for the year 2013 of the District of Mission’s 2013-2017 five year financial plan adopted by Council Bylaw #5329-2012.

1. Significant Accounting Policies

(a) Basis of Consolidation

The consolidated financial statements of the District are prepared in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards established by the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) of the Chartered Professional Accountants Canada. The consolidated financial statements reflect the combined results and activities of the District and its wholly owned subsidiary, the District of Mission Development Corporation. All inter-fund and inter-company balances and transactions have been eliminated. The Development Corporation is intended to be wound up in 2014. All assets and liabilities of the Development Corporation will be transferred to the District at the time of wind-up.

The District has a Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Fund (Trust Fund) that has been established pursuant to the Cremation, Interment and Funeral Services Act (the Act). This Trust Fund provides earnings that will be used for the eventual closure and upkeep of the cemetery. Interest earnings on the Trust Fund balance are transferred to general operations and are used for ongoing cemetery maintenance in accordance with the Act. The Trust Fund is excluded from the District’s consolidated financial statements, in accordance with PSAB guidelines (Note 18).

(b) Basis of Accounting

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

(c) Use of Estimates

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

(d) Inventories Held for Resale

Inventories held for resale are valued at the lower of cost and net realizable value.
1. Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

(e) Investments

Investments are recorded at cost. Investments are written down to net realizable value when there has been, in the opinion of management, a decline in market value that is not temporary. Investments in the Municipal Finance Authority (MFA) of British Columbia bond, intermediate and money market funds are recorded at market value, which approximates cost.

(f) Non-Financial Assets

Non-financial assets are not available to discharge existing liabilities and are held for use in the provision of services. They have useful lives extending beyond the current year, and are not intended for sale in the ordinary course of operations.

(g) Tangible Capital Assets

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Useful Life Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and improvements</td>
<td>5 to 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>20 to 100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology infrastructure</td>
<td>3 to 80 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>not amortized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>35 to 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill infrastructure</td>
<td>10 to 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks infrastructure</td>
<td>10 to 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer infrastructure</td>
<td>25 to 100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>10 to 80 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and equipment</td>
<td>5 to 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water infrastructure</td>
<td>20 to 100 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(h) Inventories of Supplies and Land

Inventories of supplies and land are valued at the lower of cost and net realizable value.
1. Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

(i) Deferred Revenue

Certain contributions and other amounts are received from third parties pursuant to legislation, regulation, or agreement. These amounts may only be used to conduct certain programs, complete specific work, or to purchase tangible capital assets, as specified by the transferring party. In addition, certain user fees and charges are collected, for which the related services have yet to be performed. These revenues are recognized in the period when the related expenses are incurred, services performed, or the tangible capital assets are acquired.

(j) Restricted Revenue

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

(k) Employee Future Benefits

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

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

(l) Revenue Recognition - Taxation

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

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

(m) Government Transfers

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

During 2013, it was recognized that the portion of costs attributed to the District of Mission in relation to regional water operations in the years 2007 through 2011 was not accurate. The prior year comparative figures in these financial statements have been restated to reflect these adjustments. The effects of these changes are as follows:

### 2012 Consolidated Statement of Financial Position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receivables (previously reported)</td>
<td>$ 6,548,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: regional water operations cost adjustment</td>
<td>359,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receivables (restated)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 6,907,120</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Surplus (previously reported)</td>
<td><strong>$445,888,893</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: regional water operations cost adjustment</td>
<td>359,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated Surplus (restated)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$446,247,893</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 Consolidated Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Surplus, Beginning of Year (previously reported)</td>
<td>$438,563,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: regional water operations cost adjustment</td>
<td>359,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated Surplus, Beginning of Year (restated)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$438,922,030</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 Consolidated Statement of Change in Net Financial Assets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Financial Assets, Beginning of Year (previously reported)</td>
<td>$ 14,137,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: regional water operations cost adjustment</td>
<td>359,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Financial Assets, Beginning of Year (restated)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 14,496,934</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Change in Accounting Policies

In 2013, the District adopted the provisions of the public sector accounting standard "PS3410 Government Transfers". This new standard can be applied either retroactively or prospectively, however the requirements of this standard did not differ from the treatment the District had previously been following and therefore, no change was required.

Government transfers are recognized as revenue when authorized and eligibility criteria have been met, unless the transfer contains stipulations that create a liability. If the transfer contains stipulations that create a liability, the related revenue is recognized over the period that the liability is extinguished.

In 2013, the District also adopted the provisions of public sector accounting standard "PS3510 Tax Revenue". The requirements of this standard did not differ from the treatment the District had previously been following and therefore, no change was required.

4. Cash and Cash Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$ 5,701,222</td>
<td>$ 6,107,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashable term deposits</td>
<td>29,000,005</td>
<td>17,000,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$34,701,227</td>
<td>$23,107,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Receivables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>$ 3,630,841</td>
<td>$ 2,995,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Mission Development Corporation receivables</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes receivable (including residential utilities)</td>
<td>4,324,026</td>
<td>3,911,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7,955,396</td>
<td>$ 6,907,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed term deposits</td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Intermediate Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>580,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Short-Term Bond Fund</td>
<td>15,173,252</td>
<td>32,761,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage receivable from Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce (secured by promissory note and general security agreement against debtor's property); interest rate: 5.5%; maturity: July 1, 2026</td>
<td>116,623</td>
<td>122,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 29,789,875</td>
<td>$33,464,075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Municipal Finance Authority Debt Reserve Cash Deposits and Demand Notes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Deposits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General fund</td>
<td>$265,403</td>
<td>$253,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility</td>
<td>40,164</td>
<td>38,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utility</td>
<td>20,449</td>
<td>49,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$326,016</td>
<td>$340,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand Notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General fund</td>
<td>$543,964</td>
<td>$543,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility</td>
<td>78,125</td>
<td>78,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utility</td>
<td>42,153</td>
<td>102,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$664,242</td>
<td>$724,581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Accounts Payable and Accrued Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$ 8,458,801</td>
<td>$ 7,058,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and benefits payable</td>
<td>1,541,718</td>
<td>1,709,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill closure and post-closure care costs</td>
<td>1,538,410</td>
<td>1,323,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,538,929</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,091,515</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The costs associated with landfill closure and post-closure care are recognized over the operating life of the landfill site in accordance with PSAB standards. The District has estimated and recognized a liability of $1,538,410 as at December 31, 2013 ($1,323,514 in 2012), for future estimated closure and post-closure costs at the landfill site. The estimated total expenses for closure and post-closure care are approximately $16.5 million, with approximately $15.0 million remaining to be recognized. There are currently no assets designated for settling the landfill closure and post-closure care liability.

The landfill closure and post-closure care liability is based on the discounted costs associated with the phased closure of various landfill cells and environmental monitoring for 25 years after the landfill is closed. Approximately 65% of the landfill’s capacity remains, and the landfill is predicted to reach capacity around 2048.

9. Long-Term Debt

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt interest - forestry enterprise</td>
<td>$ 4,847</td>
<td>$ 5,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt interest - general operations</td>
<td>854,540</td>
<td>854,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt interest - sewer utility</td>
<td>71,243</td>
<td>71,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt interest - water utility</td>
<td>105,785</td>
<td>137,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total long-term debt interest</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,036,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,068,602</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on prepayments</td>
<td>33,028</td>
<td>33,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total interest expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,069,443</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,101,819</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Restricted Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$ 43,870</td>
<td>$ 5,533,295</td>
<td>$ 1,636,143</td>
<td>$ 2,001,864</td>
<td>$ 9,215,172</td>
<td>$ 6,922,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>101,165</td>
<td>26,915</td>
<td>36,710</td>
<td>165,527</td>
<td>155,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees collected</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>976,872</td>
<td>2,168,930</td>
<td>366,562</td>
<td>3,512,364</td>
<td>4,028,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - collections</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1,078,037</td>
<td>2,195,845</td>
<td>403,272</td>
<td>3,677,891</td>
<td>4,184,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal loan payments made</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,371,042)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,371,042)</td>
<td>(1,093,370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal loan payments received</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal loan proceeds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,446</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,446</td>
<td>491,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(879,406)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(879,406)</td>
<td>(1,333,265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,237,002)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,237,002)</td>
<td>(1,892,107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending balance</td>
<td>$ 44,607</td>
<td>$ 6,611,332</td>
<td>$ 1,594,986</td>
<td>$ 2,405,136</td>
<td>$10,656,061</td>
<td>$ 9,215,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11. Employee Future Benefit Obligations

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued benefit obligation, beginning of year</td>
<td>$1,372,054</td>
<td>$1,306,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service cost</td>
<td>106,700</td>
<td>103,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest cost</td>
<td>60,300</td>
<td>58,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit payments</td>
<td>(243,681)</td>
<td>(93,541)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuarial (gain) / loss</td>
<td>(8,421)</td>
<td>(2,955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrued benefit obligation, end of year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,286,952</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,372,054</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District estimated the accrued benefit obligations by actuarial valuation as at December 31, 2010. The next actuarial valuation is planned to occur for the year ended December 31, 2013, with results available in 2014.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount rate</td>
<td>4.50 %</td>
<td>4.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected future wage and salary increase</td>
<td>3.00 %</td>
<td>2.50 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipal Pension Plan

The District and its employees contribute to the Municipal Pension Plan (Plan), a jointly trustee pension plan. The board of trustees, representing the Plan members and employers, is responsible for overseeing the management of the Plan, including investment of the assets and administration of benefits. The Plan is a multi-employer contributory pension plan. Basic pension benefits provided are based on a formula. The Plan has about 179,000 active members and approximately 71,000 retired members. Active members include approximately 208 contributors from the District.

The most recent actuarial valuation as at December 31, 2012, indicated a $1,370 million funding deficit for basic pension benefits. The next valuation will be as at December 31, 2015, with results available in 2016. Employers participating in the Plan record their pension expense as the amount of employer contributions made during the fiscal year (defined contribution plan accounting). This is because the Plan records accrued liabilities and accrued assets for the Plan in aggregate with the result that there is no consistent and reliable basis for allocating the obligation, assets and cost to individual employers participating in the Plan.

The District paid $1,141,821 ($1,152,555 in 2012) for employer contributions while employees contributed $1,005,882 ($1,025,236 in 2012) to the Plan in fiscal 2013.
12. Contingencies

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

13. Accumulated Surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Increase / (decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General operating surplus</td>
<td>$5,386,204</td>
<td>$4,222,848</td>
<td>$1,163,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer operating surplus</td>
<td>770,062</td>
<td>757,339</td>
<td>12,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water operating surplus</td>
<td>916,135</td>
<td>900,999</td>
<td>15,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Corporation surplus</td>
<td>820,838</td>
<td>845,832</td>
<td>(24,994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated surplus:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon tax</td>
<td>135,036</td>
<td>107,147</td>
<td>27,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General operating carry forwards</td>
<td>59,797</td>
<td>74,871</td>
<td>(15,074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling operations</td>
<td>(8,544)</td>
<td>14,973</td>
<td>(23,517)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted Surplus</strong></td>
<td>8,079,528</td>
<td>6,924,009</td>
<td>1,155,519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reserve Funds:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Increase / (decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>83,146</td>
<td>104,133</td>
<td>(20,987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community amenity</td>
<td>1,274,001</td>
<td>987,943</td>
<td>286,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt retirement</td>
<td>1,629,978</td>
<td>1,085,537</td>
<td>544,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial stabilization</td>
<td>540,731</td>
<td>408,763</td>
<td>131,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>1,466,812</td>
<td>789,208</td>
<td>677,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>298,143</td>
<td>289,694</td>
<td>8,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General capital</td>
<td>1,960,751</td>
<td>1,550,061</td>
<td>410,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information systems</td>
<td>367,133</td>
<td>464,792</td>
<td>(97,659)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>365,138</td>
<td>244,253</td>
<td>120,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land sale</td>
<td>54,970</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>54,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>206,544</td>
<td>176,040</td>
<td>30,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major capital</td>
<td>1,231,256</td>
<td>938,497</td>
<td>292,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>418,718</td>
<td>411,800</td>
<td>6,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>1,526,795</td>
<td>1,567,320</td>
<td>(40,525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads capital</td>
<td>475,237</td>
<td>412,142</td>
<td>63,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer capital</td>
<td>10,961,183</td>
<td>10,358,229</td>
<td>602,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and equipment</td>
<td>4,664,302</td>
<td>3,713,038</td>
<td>951,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water capital</td>
<td>8,411,772</td>
<td>7,498,145</td>
<td>913,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserve Funds</strong></td>
<td>35,936,610</td>
<td>30,999,751</td>
<td>4,936,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment in Tangible Capital Assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Increase / (decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>412,272,319</td>
<td>408,324,133</td>
<td>3,948,186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Accumulated Surplus**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$456,286,457</td>
<td>$446,247,893</td>
<td>$10,040,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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14. Taxation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Taxation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General municipal property taxes</td>
<td>$27,324,746</td>
<td>$27,390,650</td>
<td>$26,491,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Regional Library taxes</td>
<td>1,251,116</td>
<td>1,252,875</td>
<td>1,202,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assessments and area charges</td>
<td>183,295</td>
<td>188,287</td>
<td>192,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants in lieu of taxes</td>
<td>869,196</td>
<td>1,052,291</td>
<td>860,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% utility taxes</td>
<td>413,607</td>
<td>416,097</td>
<td>401,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total municipal taxation</strong></td>
<td>$30,041,960</td>
<td>$30,300,200</td>
<td>$29,147,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Collections for Other Taxing Authorities:** | | | |
| Province of BC - school taxes | 14,686,707 | 14,846,953 | 14,500,215 |
| Fraser Valley Regional District | 651,521 | 640,842 | 647,911 |
| Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District | 1,361,587 | 1,374,270 | 1,354,309 |
| BC Assessment Authority | 373,725 | 377,873 | 366,960 |
| Municipal Finance Authority of BC | 1,145 | 1,181 | 1,160 |
| Downtown Business Association | 77,852 | 77,852 | 74,146 |
| **Total collections for other taxing authorities** | 17,152,537 | 17,318,971 | 16,944,701 |

| Payments to other taxing authorities | (17,152,537) | (17,318,971) | (16,944,701) |

| **Net taxation for municipal purposes** | $30,041,960 | $30,300,200 | $29,147,989 |

15. Government Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$3,196</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1,610,794</td>
<td>1,424,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,377</td>
<td>29,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating transfers</strong></td>
<td>1,618,367</td>
<td>1,454,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Capital Transfers**          |      |      |
| Federal                        | 1,936,019 | 354,095 |
| Provincial                     | 215,246 | 66,055 |
| Other                          | 122,349 | 8,937 |
| **Total capital transfers**    | 2,273,614 | 429,087 |

| **Net government transfers**   | $3,891,981 | $1,883,802 |
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16. Letters of Credit and Performance Bonds

In addition to the deposits reflected in the financial statements, the District is holding irrevocable letters of credit and performance bonds in the amount of approximately $2.5 million as at December 31, 2013 ($2.9 million as at December 31, 2012), which were received from various parties to ensure completion of various works within the District. These amounts are not reflected in the financial statements but are available to satisfy any liability arising from non-performance by the parties.

17. Segment Reporting

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

Administration and Finance

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

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

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

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

• Grants to Organizations: provides grants to Mission non-profit organizations including arts and culture, recreation and social services, and community events grants.

General Government and Fiscal Services

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

Protective Services

• Police Services: utilizes contracted RCMP members and municipal employees to provide proactive general and community policing services (including victim services, speed watch programs and school/youth programs) within the District. Regional integrated police units also provide services to the community related to homicide investigations, emergency response, traffic re-construction, dog unit assistance, and forensic identification.

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

• Bylaw and Inspection Services: administering and enforcing the District’s regulatory bylaws including the building, business licensing, and dog licensing bylaws.
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17. Segment Reporting (continued)

• Restorative Resolutions: assists citizens in overcoming and resolving conflicts, by engaging willing participants in a process that addresses the root causes of conflict including repairing any harm that has resulted from conflict.

Engineering and Public Works

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

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

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

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

Transit Services

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

Refuse Collection and Landfill

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

Planning and Economic Development

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

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

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services

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

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

Library

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

Cemetery

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

Water Utility

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

Sewer Utility

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

Forestry Enterprise

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

Development Corporation

• The District of Mission Development Corporation has provided loans and mortgages to various organizations in the past in order to generate economic development activity within the District, and holds a variety of real estate properties.
18. Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Fund

The Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Fund is administered in accordance with the *Cremation, Interment and Funeral Services Act*. In accordance with PSAB guidelines, the Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Fund is excluded from the District’s consolidated financial statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery Perpetual Care Trust Fund</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery trust fund investments</td>
<td>$787,510</td>
<td>$764,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance, beginning of year</td>
<td>764,869</td>
<td>740,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care fund contributions</td>
<td>22,641</td>
<td>24,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earnings</td>
<td>13,040</td>
<td>14,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to cemetery operations</td>
<td>(13,040)</td>
<td>(14,676)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$787,510</td>
<td>$764,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Comparative Figures

Certain comparative figures for 2012 have been reclassified to conform to the 2013 financial statement presentation.

20. Subsequent events

Subsequent to the year end, the District entered into two significant property transactions. A property located at 7530 Hurd Street was sold for $1,750,000, with proceeds directed to the Land Sale Reserve Fund. A property located at 7337 Welton Street was purchased for $1,925,000, funded from the Land Sale Reserve Fund.
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Included in total additions are capital assets received from developers through property development activities, which totalled $3,184,347 in 2013 ($3,398,186 in 2012).

The amount of interest capitalized was $Nil in 2013 ($Nil in 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost, December 31, 2012</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Cost of Disposals</th>
<th>Cost, December 31, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets under construction</td>
<td>$ 4,646,018</td>
<td>$ 516,229</td>
<td>$(27,113)</td>
<td>$ 5,135,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and improvements</td>
<td>43,320,178</td>
<td>247,270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,567,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>90,220,693</td>
<td>558,393</td>
<td>(5,013)</td>
<td>90,774,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology infrastructure</td>
<td>2,076,133</td>
<td>183,104</td>
<td>(31,770)</td>
<td>2,227,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>93,595,539</td>
<td>1,574,773</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95,170,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>2,172,699</td>
<td>136,475</td>
<td>(195,249)</td>
<td>2,113,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill infrastructure</td>
<td>7,153,969</td>
<td>9,658</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,163,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks infrastructure</td>
<td>4,215,826</td>
<td>95,253</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,311,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling depot (regional)</td>
<td>523,163</td>
<td>15,111</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>538,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage conveyance infrastructure (local)</td>
<td>48,788,075</td>
<td>452,796</td>
<td>(30,414)</td>
<td>49,210,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage treatment plant (regional)</td>
<td>16,566,873</td>
<td>560,851</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,127,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>153,946,116</td>
<td>1,586,314</td>
<td>(809,468)</td>
<td>154,722,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and equipment</td>
<td>11,060,475</td>
<td>644,541</td>
<td>(1,590,318)</td>
<td>10,114,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water distribution infrastructure (local)</td>
<td>40,390,378</td>
<td>330,810</td>
<td>(84,933)</td>
<td>40,636,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply infrastructure (regional)</td>
<td>21,238,426</td>
<td>3,591,809</td>
<td>(176,583)</td>
<td>24,653,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 539,914,561 $ 10,503,387 $ (2,950,861) $ 547,467,087
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ - $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$ - $</td>
<td>$ 5,135,134</td>
<td>$ 4,646,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9,998,273)</td>
<td>(870,554)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(10,868,827)</td>
<td>32,698,621</td>
<td>33,321,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19,267,691)</td>
<td>(954,940)</td>
<td>5,012</td>
<td>(20,217,619)</td>
<td>70,556,454</td>
<td>70,953,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,278,040)</td>
<td>(190,593)</td>
<td>31,770</td>
<td>(1,436,863)</td>
<td>790,604</td>
<td>798,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,170,312</td>
<td>93,595,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(897,636)</td>
<td>(52,228)</td>
<td>195,249</td>
<td>(754,615)</td>
<td>1,359,310</td>
<td>1,275,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,342,827)</td>
<td>(362,633)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,705,460)</td>
<td>4,458,167</td>
<td>4,811,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,849,690)</td>
<td>(191,769)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,041,459)</td>
<td>2,269,620</td>
<td>2,366,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(476,118)</td>
<td>(14,926)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(491,044)</td>
<td>47,230</td>
<td>47,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10,833,668)</td>
<td>(509,437)</td>
<td>9,023</td>
<td>(11,334,082)</td>
<td>37,876,375</td>
<td>37,954,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,539,650)</td>
<td>(449,941)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6,989,591)</td>
<td>10,138,133</td>
<td>10,027,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39,473,714)</td>
<td>(2,471,711)</td>
<td>236,765</td>
<td>(41,708,660)</td>
<td>113,014,302</td>
<td>114,472,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,468,024)</td>
<td>(643,993)</td>
<td>1,342,628</td>
<td>(4,769,389)</td>
<td>5,345,309</td>
<td>5,592,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11,229,914)</td>
<td>(514,047)</td>
<td>30,769</td>
<td>(11,713,192)</td>
<td>28,923,063</td>
<td>29,160,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,722,015)</td>
<td>(710,062)</td>
<td>40,332</td>
<td>(6,391,745)</td>
<td>18,261,907</td>
<td>15,516,411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $ (115,377,260) | $ (7,936,834) | $ 1,891,548 | $ (121,422,546) | $ 426,044,541 | $ 424,537,301 |
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### Schedule 2 - Statement of Operations by Segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration and finance</th>
<th>General government and fiscal services</th>
<th>Protective services</th>
<th>Engineering and public works</th>
<th>Transit services</th>
<th>Refuse collection and landfill</th>
<th>Planning and economic development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 28,980,948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of services and regulatory fees</td>
<td>133,623</td>
<td>1,026,152</td>
<td>1,078,049</td>
<td>479,492</td>
<td>705,861</td>
<td>4,224,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government transfers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500,828</td>
<td>714,286</td>
<td>12,587</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of restricted revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,002,436</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,291</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>510,474</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>327,972</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions in-kind related to capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td>143,442</td>
<td>33,348,810</td>
<td>1,795,335</td>
<td>3,273,308</td>
<td>705,861</td>
<td>4,224,278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenses**              |                                       |                     |                               |                 |                               |                                  |
| Amortization              | -                                     | 280,969             | 323,472                       | 3,697,579       | -                             | 378,335                          |
| Good and services         | 879,200                               | (331,184)           | 8,906,671                     | 340,750         | 2,462,671                     | 3,966,830                        |
| Grants                    | 374,630                               | -                   | -                             | -               | (35)                          | -                                |
| Interest                  | -                                     | 887,568             | -                             | -               | -                             | -                                |
| Salaries and benefits     | 2,949,671                             | 280,329             | 3,958,775                     | 3,132,719       | 3,105                         | 161,923                          |
| Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets | -                                     | -                   | -                             | 690,240         | -                             | -                                |
| **Total expenses**        | 4,203,501                             | 1,117,682           | 13,188,918                    | 7,861,288       | 2,465,741                     | 4,507,088                        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Annual Surplus / (Deficit)</strong></th>
<th>$ - (4,060,059)</th>
<th>$ 32,231,128</th>
<th>$(11,393,583)</th>
<th>$ (4,587,980)</th>
<th>$ (1,759,880)</th>
<th>$ (282,810)</th>
<th>$(1,670,388)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks, recreation and cultural services</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Water utility</th>
<th>Sewer utility</th>
<th>Forestry enterprise</th>
<th>Development Corporation</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,144,726</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>192,877</td>
<td>5,824,712</td>
<td>4,030,525</td>
<td>3,980,319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357,804</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,845</td>
<td>1,126,631</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>487,342</td>
<td>721,933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,040</td>
<td>144,676</td>
<td>190,315</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td></td>
<td>868,675</td>
<td>922,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,717</td>
<td>48,328</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>472,355</td>
<td>408,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>157,478</td>
<td>270,931</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,184,347</td>
<td>3,398,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,510,049</td>
<td>1,254,120</td>
<td>205,917</td>
<td>6,734,763</td>
<td>3,980,319</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>65,038,659</td>
<td>62,973,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,016,570</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>1,224,109</td>
<td>959,378</td>
<td>53,076</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,936,834</td>
<td>8,001,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,664,690</td>
<td>1,323,922</td>
<td>102,467</td>
<td>2,265,384</td>
<td>2,070,785</td>
<td>2,698,708</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>26,725,652</td>
<td>27,916,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>374,595</td>
<td>464,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105,785</td>
<td>71,243</td>
<td>4,847</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,069,443</td>
<td>1,101,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,802,229</td>
<td>27,554</td>
<td>144,499</td>
<td>645,737</td>
<td>476,897</td>
<td>569,466</td>
<td>28,869</td>
<td>17,895,939</td>
<td>17,764,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217,528</td>
<td>21,391</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>995,632</td>
<td>398,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,549,962</td>
<td>1,351,476</td>
<td>250,312</td>
<td>4,458,543</td>
<td>3,599,694</td>
<td>3,326,097</td>
<td>35,165</td>
<td>54,998,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ (4,039,913)</td>
<td>$ (97,356)</td>
<td>$ (44,395)</td>
<td>$ 2,276,220</td>
<td>$ 2,840,353</td>
<td>$ 654,222</td>
<td>$ (24,995)</td>
<td>$ 10,040,564</td>
<td>$ 7,325,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Schedule 3 - Long-Term Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Issue #</th>
<th>Year Issued</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year of Maturity</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Firehall/EOC building</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.650%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Leisure centre/sports park/water park</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>4.860%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Leisure centre/sports park/water park</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>5.200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Leisure centre/sports park/water park</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4.170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Leisure centre/sports park/water park</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>4.430%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Forestry excavator</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.000%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal - General**

### Sewer Utility Debt

**Regional Sewer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Issue #</th>
<th>Year Issued</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year of Maturity</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Regional sewer infrastructure</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Regional sewer infrastructure</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3.150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Regional sewer infrastructure</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>4.983%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal - Sewer Utility**

### Water Utility Debt

**Regional Water**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Issue #</th>
<th>Year Issued</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year of Maturity</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Regional water infrastructure</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>4.775%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Regional water infrastructure</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.345%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Regional water infrastructure</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>4.975%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal - Water Utility**

### Total Long-Term Debt
## District of Mission

For the Year Ended December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 590,594</td>
<td>$ 692,387</td>
<td>$ 130,462</td>
<td>$ 130,462</td>
<td>$ 130,462</td>
<td>$ 130,462</td>
<td>$ 90,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,665,905</td>
<td>3,911,656</td>
<td>433,634</td>
<td>433,634</td>
<td>433,634</td>
<td>433,634</td>
<td>433,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,333,056</td>
<td>1,422,421</td>
<td>164,485</td>
<td>159,985</td>
<td>159,985</td>
<td>159,985</td>
<td>159,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,071,711</td>
<td>2,204,284</td>
<td>225,845</td>
<td>225,845</td>
<td>225,845</td>
<td>225,845</td>
<td>225,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,628,997</td>
<td>4,896,694</td>
<td>490,655</td>
<td>490,655</td>
<td>490,655</td>
<td>490,655</td>
<td>490,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224,187</td>
<td>257,661</td>
<td>38,321</td>
<td>190,678</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,514,450</td>
<td>13,385,103</td>
<td>1,483,402</td>
<td>1,631,259</td>
<td>1,440,581</td>
<td>1,440,581</td>
<td>1,401,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61,710</td>
<td>80,353</td>
<td>19,837</td>
<td>19,837</td>
<td>14,189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531,031</td>
<td>606,618</td>
<td>84,963</td>
<td>84,963</td>
<td>84,963</td>
<td>84,963</td>
<td>84,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286,341</td>
<td>305,537</td>
<td>34,365</td>
<td>34,365</td>
<td>34,365</td>
<td>34,365</td>
<td>34,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879,082</td>
<td>992,508</td>
<td>139,165</td>
<td>139,165</td>
<td>133,517</td>
<td>119,328</td>
<td>119,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,387,001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378,690</td>
<td>404,077</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378,690</td>
<td>1,835,556</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
<td>45,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 13,772,222</td>
<td>$ 16,213,167</td>
<td>$ 1,668,015</td>
<td>$ 1,815,872</td>
<td>$ 1,619,546</td>
<td>$ 1,605,357</td>
<td>$ 1,565,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## District of Mission

For the Year Ended December 31, 2013

### Schedule 4 - Internal Debt/Transfers Outstanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrowing Fund</th>
<th>Lending Fund</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCC</td>
<td>Land Sale Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Purchase of property for detention ponds (Dewdney Trunk Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCC</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Detention pond D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Drainage DCC</td>
<td>Major Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Gaudin Creek re-alignment, property purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Roads DCC</td>
<td>General Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Cedar Street construction, Cherry Avenue to Egglestone Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Sewer DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Cedar Valley gravity trunk sewer, forcemain, and pump station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Local Improvement Area DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Cedar Valley local improvement area sewer extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Sale Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Major Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Animal control facility acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Roads DCC</td>
<td>Vehicle and Equipment Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Cedar Connector road project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Roads DCC</td>
<td>Major Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Highway 7/Nelson Street intersection improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewage Treatment DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Septage receiving station, biosolids dewatering, #3 trickling filter, biosolids storage area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewage Treatment DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Stage 7 upgrades and digester gas upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewage Treatment DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Headworks upgrade, transformer installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Supply DCC</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Control structure, upper Maclure reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Supply DCC</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Norrish Creek intake works, Gladwin transmission main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Supply DCC</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Gladwin transmission main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Bridge DCC</td>
<td>Parkland Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Silverdale industrial subdivision bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Industrial Water DCC</td>
<td>Water Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Silverdale industrial subdivision water infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale Industrial Sewer DCC</td>
<td>Sewer Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>Silverdale industrial subdivision sewer infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

Note: **DCC** = Development Cost Charge
## District of Mission

For the Year Ended December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Funds Advanced</th>
<th>Opening Balance, December 31, 2012</th>
<th>Advances &amp; Adjustments</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Balance Before Interest</th>
<th>Interest @ 1.68%</th>
<th>Interest Adjustment</th>
<th>Ending Balance, December 31, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 $61,616 $</td>
<td>- $ (61,616) $ - $ (61,616) $</td>
<td>- $ (518) $ - $ (518) $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $ (518) $ - $ (518) $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 596,745</td>
<td>- (396,536) 200,209 6,694</td>
<td>(6,694) 200,209</td>
<td>200,209</td>
<td>200,209</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 403,490</td>
<td>- - 403,490 6,779</td>
<td>(6,779) 403,490</td>
<td>403,490</td>
<td>403,490</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>403,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 197,244</td>
<td>- (197,244) - 1,657</td>
<td>(1,657) - 1,657</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 325,924</td>
<td>- (10,700) 315,224 5,386</td>
<td>(5,386) 315,224</td>
<td>315,224</td>
<td>315,224</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>315,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 7,263</td>
<td>- (7,263) - 61</td>
<td>(61) - 61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 335,963</td>
<td>- (335,963) - 2,822</td>
<td>(2,822) - 2,822</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 295,954</td>
<td>- - 295,954 4,972</td>
<td>(4,972) 295,954</td>
<td>295,954</td>
<td>295,954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>295,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 97,000</td>
<td>13,446 - 110,446 1,743</td>
<td>(1,743) 110,446</td>
<td>110,446</td>
<td>110,446</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 198,255</td>
<td>- - 198,255 3,331</td>
<td>(3,331) 198,255</td>
<td>198,255</td>
<td>198,255</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>198,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 102,000</td>
<td>- (102,000) - 857</td>
<td>(857) - 857</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 502,000</td>
<td>- (211,303) 290,697 6,659</td>
<td>(6,659) 290,697</td>
<td>290,697</td>
<td>290,697</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>290,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 491,555</td>
<td>- - 491,555 8,258</td>
<td>(8,258) 491,555</td>
<td>491,555</td>
<td>491,555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>491,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 784,417</td>
<td>- - 784,417 13,178</td>
<td>(13,178) 784,417</td>
<td>784,417</td>
<td>784,417</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>784,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 331,048</td>
<td>- - 331,048 5,562</td>
<td>(5,562) 331,048</td>
<td>331,048</td>
<td>331,048</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>331,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 6,602,067</td>
<td>$ 13,446 $(1,378,305) $ 5,237,208</td>
<td>$ 99,452 $(99,452)</td>
<td>$ 5,237,208</td>
<td>$ 5,237,208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 5,237,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B - Budget Variance

## December 2013 Year-End Reporting

### General Operating Fund Budget Variance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2013 BUDGET</th>
<th>2013 YEAR-END RESULTS</th>
<th>VARIANCE $</th>
<th>VARIANCE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>9,138,348</td>
<td>8,439,256</td>
<td>-699,091</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services - Planning</td>
<td>1,120,010</td>
<td>894,602</td>
<td>-225,408</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services - Inspections</td>
<td>204,231</td>
<td>26,780</td>
<td>-177,451</td>
<td>-87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>1,883,024</td>
<td>1,759,879</td>
<td>-123,145</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>-30,678,264</td>
<td>-30,798,257</td>
<td>119,994</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Purchasing</td>
<td>1,277,422</td>
<td>1,188,494</td>
<td>-88,928</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>3,493,114</td>
<td>3,418,137</td>
<td>-74,977</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services</td>
<td>1,643,679</td>
<td>1,612,703</td>
<td>-30,976</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>322,482</td>
<td>307,425</td>
<td>-15,057</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>532,014</td>
<td>519,664</td>
<td>-12,351</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>732,576</td>
<td>723,902</td>
<td>-8,674</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>1,981,699</td>
<td>1,973,300</td>
<td>-8,399</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration</td>
<td>549,520</td>
<td>546,641</td>
<td>-2,880</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Recovery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>816,483</td>
<td>830,680</td>
<td>14,196</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>-32,142</td>
<td>-15,762</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>-51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,503</td>
<td>18,503</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>4,502,655</td>
<td>4,633,110</td>
<td>130,455</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations</td>
<td>2,513,149</td>
<td>2,735,942</td>
<td>222,793</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2013 Budget Variance**

|                                | 0 | -1,185,002 | -1,185,002 |                  |

*Negative variances = Under budget*

*Positive variances = Over budget*

### Forestry, Water Utility, Sewer Utility, Equipment, and Waste Management Utility Budget Variance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGETED TRANSFER TO RESERVE</th>
<th>2013 YEAR-END RESULTS</th>
<th>VARIANCE $</th>
<th>VARIANCE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Enterprise</td>
<td>145,897</td>
<td>658,811</td>
<td>-512,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>2,634,782</td>
<td>2,985,368</td>
<td>-350,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>1,502,028</td>
<td>1,620,112</td>
<td>-118,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Pool Operations</td>
<td>765,011</td>
<td>911,117</td>
<td>-146,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Utility Operating Fund</td>
<td>191,646</td>
<td>156,670</td>
<td>34,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negative variances = Additional Transfer to Reserves*

*Positive variances = Reduced Transfer to Reserves*
## General Operating Fund Budget Variance Summary
### December 2013 Year-End Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2013 BUDGET</th>
<th>2013 YEAR-END RESULTS</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ (a)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Revenue</td>
<td>-295,818</td>
<td>-205,917</td>
<td>89,901</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>Less demand for plots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Expenditures</td>
<td>295,818</td>
<td>224,419</td>
<td>-71,399</td>
<td>-24%</td>
<td>Lower expenses reflect decreased demand for plots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,503</td>
<td>18,503</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Grants Revenue</td>
<td>-206,950</td>
<td>-192,257</td>
<td>14,693</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>Funding for the Community Resource Bureau web site not required, resulting in less funds transferred from reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Grants Expenditures</td>
<td>738,964</td>
<td>711,921</td>
<td>-27,043</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>Grant for the Community Resource Bureau not required, plus Council expenses were under budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>532,014</td>
<td>519,664</td>
<td>-12,351</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration Revenue</td>
<td>-154,810</td>
<td>-104,026</td>
<td>50,784</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>Lower costs for Downtown security and Restorative Resolution programs resulted in reduced transfer from the gaming reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration Expenditures</td>
<td>2,136,509</td>
<td>2,077,326</td>
<td>-59,184</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>Partially offset by additional costs in Human Resources, as well as labour relations costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325,823</td>
<td>312,953</td>
<td>-12,870</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Revenue</td>
<td>-3,500</td>
<td>-5,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>Successful grant application from Destination BC Community Tourism Opportunities Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Expenditures</td>
<td>1,981,699</td>
<td>1,973,300</td>
<td>-8,399</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Savings in Economic Development Office expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322,482</td>
<td>307,425</td>
<td>-15,057</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Revenue</td>
<td>-1,255,272</td>
<td>-1,189,557</td>
<td>65,715</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>Less subdivision inspection and environmental charter (carbon tax rebate) revenue than anticipated. Engineering Admin Fee lower due to some capital projects being under budget plus other capital projects being postponed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Expenditures</td>
<td>1,223,130</td>
<td>1,173,795</td>
<td>-49,335</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Reduced salary costs due to staff vacancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-32,142</td>
<td>-15,762</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>-51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Purchasing Revenue</td>
<td>-130,370</td>
<td>-144,404</td>
<td>14,034</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Salary savings from staff illnesses and vacancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Purchasing Expenditures</td>
<td>1,407,792</td>
<td>1,322,898</td>
<td>-84,904</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>Higher discounts from purchasing cards and early payments, and increase in administration fee revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,277,422</td>
<td>1,188,484</td>
<td>-88,928</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>Salary savings from staff illnesses and vacancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Revenue</td>
<td>-17,650</td>
<td>-15,656</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>No longer providing equipment maintenance plus no revenue from search and rescue vehicle for 2013 partially off-set by increase in permit revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Expenditures</td>
<td>2,530,799</td>
<td>2,271,598</td>
<td>220,799</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>In increase PPA attendance, unanticipated PPA wage increase, one hour increase per shift for career coverage (11 hrs to 12), plus costs related to the retirement of the Fire Chief, and the Chief’s vehicle being added to the fleet. Changes made to the 2014 response protocols should have costs closer to budget, excluding any major incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,513,149</td>
<td>2,735,942</td>
<td>222,793</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government Revenue</td>
<td>-2,926,070</td>
<td>-3,005,888</td>
<td>79,817</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Increase in Community Amenity Fees collected and interest revenue partially off-set by a reduction in cost recovery from capital projects, no dividend from Development Corp and reduced transfer from Insurance reserve due to appraisal postponed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government Expenditures</td>
<td>7,428,726</td>
<td>7,638,998</td>
<td>210,272</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Increase in transfer of Community Amenity Fees, excess development revenue, and interest to reserves, off-set by lower insurance claims and insurance premiums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,502,655</td>
<td>4,633,110</td>
<td>130,455</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Services Revenue</td>
<td>-871,610</td>
<td>-948,195</td>
<td>76,585</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Building permit revenue higher than budgeted, partially off-set by secondary suite recoveries no longer being performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Services Expenditures</td>
<td>1,075,841</td>
<td>974,974</td>
<td>100,866</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Majority of budget savings are salaries due to staff illness and vacant positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>204,231</td>
<td>26,780</td>
<td>-177,451</td>
<td>-87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings Revenue</td>
<td>-41,836</td>
<td>-48,013</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Additional revenue from rental property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings Expenditures</td>
<td>774,412</td>
<td>771,916</td>
<td>-2,497</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>732,576</td>
<td>729,402</td>
<td>-3,174</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Revenue</td>
<td>-22,000</td>
<td>-27,374</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Additional revenues from Municipal Insurance Association grant and Chamber of Commerce funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Expenditures</td>
<td>836,483</td>
<td>858,054</td>
<td>19,570</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Additional utility costs related to Sports Park operations, also, a portion of tree planting expenses were budgeted in the Cemetery area, with the actual expenses split between Cemetery and Parks operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>816,483</td>
<td>830,680</td>
<td>14,196</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Recovery</td>
<td>5,727,058</td>
<td>5,671,400</td>
<td>55,658</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>Staff vacancies reduce the amount collected from departments ($816,000 of budgeted positions vacant due to delayed posting or illnesses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Expenditures</td>
<td>5,727,058</td>
<td>5,671,400</td>
<td>55,658</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>Vacant positions have reduced several cost lines off-set by increase in sick time, bereavement/compassion leave and WorkSafe BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historically, department salary savings resulting from vacant positions, sick time and WorkSafe BC claims have been able to off-set this deficit. Staff will be analyzing the overhead in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Revenue</td>
<td>-534,951</td>
<td>-490,924</td>
<td>44,027</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>Transfer of funding from Gaming Reserve not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Expenditures</td>
<td>1,654,961</td>
<td>1,385,526</td>
<td>-269,435</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>Vacant positions and reduced overall general program admin costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,120,010</td>
<td>894,002</td>
<td>-226,008</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Operating Fund Budget Variance Summary
### December 2013 Year-End Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2013 BUDGET</th>
<th>2013 YEAR-END RESULTS</th>
<th>VARIANCE ($)</th>
<th>VARIANCE %</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Services Revenue</td>
<td>-695,948</td>
<td>-826,984</td>
<td>-131,036</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Increase in traffic fine revenue recognized due to new accounting standard. This overage will be needed to balance the 2014 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services Expenditures</td>
<td>9,834,296</td>
<td>9,266,241</td>
<td>-568,055</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>The majority of this savings is from the RCMP contract due to vacancy patterns, off-set by additional resources from criminal investigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,138,348</td>
<td>8,439,256</td>
<td>-699,091</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transi Revenue</td>
<td>-672,719</td>
<td>-714,887</td>
<td>-42,168</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Bus service revenue higher than anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transi Expenditures</td>
<td>2,555,743</td>
<td>2,474,767</td>
<td>-80,977</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>Transit costs about 4% below budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,883,024</td>
<td>1,759,879</td>
<td>-123,145</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Revenue</td>
<td>-100,926</td>
<td>-134,252</td>
<td>-33,326</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Higher than expected number of requests for services plus $13,000 re-imbursement from ICBC for road improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Expenditures</td>
<td>3,594,041</td>
<td>3,552,389</td>
<td>-41,651</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>Budget savings from cleaning ditches, street lighting and snow removal off-set by increase in asphalt repairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,493,114</td>
<td>3,418,137</td>
<td>-74,977</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration Revenue</td>
<td>-196,476</td>
<td>-193,556</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>Budget savings from cleaning ditches, street lighting and snow removal off-set by increase in asphalt repairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration Expenditures</td>
<td>745,996</td>
<td>740,197</td>
<td>-5,799</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>549,520</td>
<td>546,481</td>
<td>-3,039</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services Revenue</td>
<td>-2,148,225</td>
<td>-2,202,477</td>
<td>-54,252</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Increased demand in advanced aquatic courses, Club KIDS and Swimming lessons resulting in increased revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services Expenditures</td>
<td>3,791,904</td>
<td>3,815,180</td>
<td>23,276</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Increased costs due to increased attendance to Club KIDS and Aquatics partially off-set by budget savings as a result of staff vacancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,643,679</td>
<td>1,612,703</td>
<td>-30,976</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation/Grants In-Lieu Expenditures</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>33,028</td>
<td>5,028</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Increased use of the preauthorized program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-30,678,264</td>
<td>-30,798,257</td>
<td>-119,994</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Operating Fund (Surplus)/Deficit: 0, -1,185,002

(a) Negative variances represent higher revenue in the revenue section and lower expenses in the expense section.
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Kris Boland, Manager of Finance
SUBJECT: 2013 Audit Results and Communications
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A – Audit Results and Communications Report

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

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present to Council the results of the audit of the District’s 2013 financial statements.

BACKGROUND:
The District’s auditors, BDO Canada LLP, have provided the attached “Audit Results and Communications” report as a summary of their audit of the District’s financial statements for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013. Following is a brief summary of the report contents:

- **Audit Approach:** outlines the auditors’ approach to conducting the audit, and the scope of the audit;
- **Audit Findings:** summarizes the auditors’ findings during the audit. According to the report, there were no significant issues in the 2013 audit findings;
- **Audit Reporting:** discusses materiality, and the reports provided as a result of the audit;
- **Auditor Independence:** confirms the auditors’ independence from the District;
- **Possible Misstatements:** summarizes any differences discovered during the audit. Per the report, one possible misstatement was noted related to the prior period adjustment; however, the auditors note that there is no impact on any of the closing balances resulting from the treatment of the prior period adjustment;
- **Management Representations:** discusses the various representations that management made to the auditors during the course of the audit;
- **Appendix A – Management letter:** highlights areas observed by the auditors where they feel they can provide practical and constructive comments on various District policies and practices. The District’s responses to these comments are included in the report; and,
- **Appendix B – Management Representation Letter:** discusses the various representations that management made to the auditors during the course of the audit.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications associated with this report.

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required. The District’s auditor, BDO Canada LLP, will be in attendance at the meeting to present their audit findings, and answer any related questions.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The District’s auditors, BDO Canada LLP, have provided the attached “Audit Results and Communications” report as a summary of their audit of the District’s financial statements for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kris Boland, Manager of Finance

Reviewed by:
Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
The District of Mission

Audit Results and Communications

Report to Council

December 31, 2013
April 29, 2014

Members of Council
District of Mission
8645 Stave Lake Street
Box 20 Mission, BC
V2V 4L9

Dear Members of Council:

We have completed our audit of consolidated financial statements of the District of Mission [the “District”] for its fiscal year ended December 31, 2013. We take this opportunity to present our findings to you.

The responsibility for producing financial statements and ensuring adequate internal controls and sound business practices is the responsibility of Council through management and is a part of management’s overall responsibility for the ongoing activities of the District. Policies and procedures developed by the District to safeguard its assets and to provide reasonable assurance that errors and irregularities or illegal acts are promptly identified, must be properly monitored to ensure that all staff are complying with the guidelines provided.

The objective of an audit is to obtain reasonable assurance whether the financial statements are free of any material misstatement. Auditors must be completely independent and objective in the application of their testing.

We received full support from management and staff throughout our work and the scope of our audit was not restricted in any way. Our audit opinion is without reservation indicating that our audit tests and procedures yielded reliable results.

Should you have any questions or concerns in regard to any of the items mentioned in this report, please do not hesitate to contact us at any time.

Yours truly,

Bill Cox, CPA, CA
Partner through a corporation
BDO Canada LLP
Chartered Accountants

BC/mkn
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Audit Approach

We were engaged to perform the audit of the consolidated financial statements of the District of Mission (the “District”) for the year ended December 31, 2013. We adopted an audit approach that allowed us to issue an audit opinion on the consolidated financial statements of the District of Mission in the most cost effective manner, while still obtaining the assurance necessary to support our audit opinion.

The audit followed a “risk-based” approach. This approach focuses on obtaining sufficient appropriate audit evidence to reduce the risk of material misstatement in the financial statements to an appropriately low level. This means that we focused our audit effort in areas that we believed had a higher risk of being materially misstated and performed less audit work in areas that are only low risk. The audit risk model in generally accepted auditing standards has changed over recent years and generally results in an increase in the level of audit work.

To assess risk accurately, we must have a clear understanding of the District’s operations and the environment it operates in. Much of our understanding is obtained through discussions with management and staff. We would also appreciate any new information that you could provide to us about your operations, industry, competitive marketplace, internal controls or anything else that you feel is important to the audit as it may corroborate what we have already learned from management and other sources, and may be useful for next year’s planning. We would also appreciate any insights that you could provide to us on what you perceive to be high risk to the District as that will make our audit more effective and efficient in the future, which will benefit all concerned.

The following sections provide more detail on our audit approach for the District for the current year.

Audit Scope

The scope of our audit of the consolidated financial statements of the District of Mission for the year ended December 31, 2013 included the following:

- An audit opinion on the consolidated financial statements of the District of Mission
- An audit opinion on the financial statements of the District of Mission Development Corporation
- Management letter report in regard to audit recommendations of significance (an appendix to this package)
Audit Findings

There are a number of matters that arose during the audit that we would like to bring to your attention, although nothing that was detrimental to the audit. Each of these matters is summarized briefly below. We would be pleased to discuss any of these items in more detail at our upcoming meeting.

**Prior Period Adjustment**

An adjustment was made to prior period figures to account for new information in regard to the portion of costs attributed to the District of Mission in relation to regional water operations in the years 2007 through 2011. These adjustments have been stated on the consolidated financial statements and are explained in Note 2.

**Potential Wind-up of the District of Mission Development Corporation**

Subsequent to the fiscal year end Council agreed to wind-up the District of Mission Development Corporation, and for its assets and operations to be transferred to the District. This transaction will be recorded in 2014, however it is reported as a significant subsequent event in both the financial statements of the District and of the Development Corporation.

**No Fraudulent or Illegal Activities Noted**

Our audit procedures were performed for the purpose of forming an opinion on the consolidated financial statements and although they might bring possible fraudulent or illegal activities to our attention, our audit procedures were not designed to detect fraudulent or illegal activities.

In any event, we did not detect any fraudulent or illegal activities, or material misstatements resulting from fraudulent or illegal activities during our audit.

**Disagreements with Management**

There were no significant disagreements with management.

**Litigation Proceedings**

We have communicated directly with the District's various legal counsel. We have received final confirmation on legal matters and there are no material claims noted.
**Significant Accounting Policies, Estimates and Judgments**

Management is responsible for determining the significant accounting policies. The choice of different accounting policy alternatives can have a significant effect on the financial position and results of operations of the District. The application of those policies often involves significant estimates and judgments by management.

Management has implemented new accounting policies in the current year as required by the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB). Management has applied accounting policies this year related to Section PS 3410 - Government Transfers and Section PS 3510 - Tax Revenue. Neither of these changes had a significant impact to the financial statements and has been disclosed in Note 3 of the consolidated financial statements.

We are of the opinion that the significant accounting policies, estimates and judgments made by management are reasonable in the context of the financial statements taken as a whole.
Audit Reporting

Materiality

Materiality in an audit is used as a guide for planning the nature and extent of audit procedures and for assessing the sufficiency of audit evidence gathered. It is also used in evaluating the misstatements found and determining the appropriate audit opinion to express.

Since the determination of materiality is a matter of professional judgment, it is primarily dependent on our evaluation of the relative importance of accuracy in the financial statements to the various users of those statements. We have identified taxpayers, council, the Ministry and (indirectly) the Municipal Finance Authority as having an “indirect” interest because while they do not generally review the financial statements of each municipality in detail, the combined financial state of British Columbia municipalities is of importance to them and they would be particularly concerned with any qualified or denied audit opinions should they occur.

Canadian generally accepted auditing standards require the use of both quantitative and qualitative factors in determining materiality. For the audit of the District for the year ended December 31, 2013, we used a materiality level of $1,300,000 based on approximately 2% of total revenues as adjusted for qualitative factors.

For this year’s audit we have used performance materiality (used for sampling) of $975,000 based on 75% of financial statement materiality and trivial error level of $13,000 based on 1% of materiality.

Independent Auditor’s Report

Our audit testing has shown that any differences from our audit work are not material. Accordingly we plan to issue an unqualified opinion. Our audit report uses standard wording as required by our professional regulations and a draft is bound in with the draft financial statements.

Management Letter

Our audit provides insight into many of the District’s financial operations and control systems. Points that come to our attention along with recommendations for improvement are reported to you in this format. This letter is included as Appendix A of this report.
Auditor Independence

Although no longer required by Canadian generally accepted auditing standards (GAAS) for non-public companies, we believe it is useful to communicate to Council, at least annually, all relationships between BDO Canada LLP and the District of Mission (and its related entities), that, in our professional judgment, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence for the audit of the District.

In determining which relationships to report, we have considered the applicable legislation and relevant rules of professional conduct and related interpretations prescribed by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of British Columbia covering such matters as the following:

- holding of a financial interest, either directly or indirectly in a client;
- holding a position, either directly or indirectly, that gives the right or responsibility to exert significant influence over the financial or accounting policies of a client;
- personal or business relationships of immediate family, close relatives, partners or retired partners, either directly or indirectly, with a client;
- economic dependence on a client; and
- provision of services in addition to the external audit engagement.

We have prepared the following comments to facilitate our discussion with you regarding independence matters.

We are not aware of any relationships between the District (and its related entities) and us that, in our professional judgment, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence to date.

Accordingly, we hereby confirm that we are independent with respect to the District (and its related entities) within the meaning of the Rules of Professional Conduct of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of BC as of the date of this letter.
Possible Misstatements

During the audit we keep a list of differences between the financial statements and our audit findings from third parties or other sources. This list, known as “Possible Misstatements”, is totaled to ensure that the differences are not material. Should the list total become close to materiality, it is necessary to do further audit work on the differences to determine if there really is an error in the financial statements. The existence of items on our Possible Misstatements listing is normal and does not necessarily mean that the financial statements contain errors.

One misstatement was noted relating to the prior period adjustment of $359,000 as the adjustment likely should have been treated as a fiscal 2013 transaction as discussed in the Audit Findings section.

While technically a misstatement, we note that there is no impact on any of the closing balances. Management’s rationale for treating this as a prior period adjustment was to not distort the current year’s operating results, given that the adjustment was related entirely to prior years’ operations.
Management Representations

During the course of an audit, management made many representations to us. These representations were verbal or written and therefore explicit, or they were implied through the financial statements. Management provided representations in response to specific queries from us, as well as unsolicited representations. Such representations were part of the evidence gathered by us to be able to draw reasonable conclusions on which to base the audit opinion. These representations were documented by including in the audit working papers memoranda of discussions with management and written representations received from management.

Management's representations included, but were not limited to:

a) matters communicated in discussions with us, whether solicited or unsolicited;

b) matters communicated electronically to us;

c) schedules, analyses and reports prepared by the entity, and management's notations and comments thereon, whether or not in response to a request by us;

d) internal and external memoranda or correspondence;

e) minutes of meetings of the mayor and councillors;

f) a signed copy of the financial statements; and

g) a representation letter from management.

We obtained management's written confirmation of significant representations provided to us during the engagement (Sample in Appendix B). Such a confirmation included matters that are:

a) directly related to items that are material, either individually or in the aggregate, to the financial statements;

b) not directly related to items that are material to the financial statements but are significant, either individually or in the aggregate, to the engagement; or

c) relevant to management's judgments or estimates that are material, either individually or in the aggregate, to the financial statements.
Appendix A - Management Letter

April 29, 2014

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

Dear Mr. Boland:

RE: Auditor’s Management Letter

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

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

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

It is always worth noting that we almost always come up with points for all clients. The existence of points does not mean that there are significant problems with your systems or staff. They are just recommendations to make good systems better.
**Status of Prior Year Recommendations**

There were a few carry-forward points from the prior year’s management letter. We track these points to ensure that recommendations are followed up and implemented (or alternatively found to be impractical).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Metered Utility Billings</strong></td>
<td>We noted that the District has documented the processes and controls related to metered utility billings. This addresses our concerns in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We recommended that a spot check of the quarterly metered billings be completed and properly approved by the authorized personnel by the approver initialing and dating the invoices reviewed as evidence of their approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRA Regulation 105</strong></td>
<td>No issues in this area have come to our attention during the course of the audit. We ask that you continue to keep this regulation in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was an information item relating to the CRA regulation that requires that any entity paying a non-resident person or company a fee in respect of services rendered in Canada must withhold 15% of the payment and remit this to the Government of Canada.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Year’s Observations and Recommendations**

1. **Review of Developer Contributed Assets Allocation**

   **Observation**

   We note that there is no formal review or approval of the allocation of developer contributions in-kind related to capital. There is a possibility of over or under-allocating capital asset addition amounts without secondary review, resulting in an inaccurate amortization expense being taken each year.

   **Recommendation**

   We recommend that Tangible Capital Asset addition allocation work be reviewed before being entered into the General Ledger.

   **Management’s Response**

   Management has noted this recommendation and concurs that an assigned resource in the Engineering department is required to facilitate the secondary review. Once the Engineering Director position is filled, management will coordinate the review of the Tangible Capital Asset addition allocation work with the appropriate person.
2. Contaminated Sites

*Observation*

We have previously mentioned to you the new public sector accounting standard that comes into force in 2015 known as “Liabilities for Contaminated Sites.” This standard requires that a government entity record a liability in regard to any properties that are not in use where there is environmental contamination above the legal standard. Importantly, the standard requires the government to methodologically review its properties to determine those properties at risk, and potentially to conduct environmental testing on high-risk properties.

The approach that this standard takes makes it quite onerous because of the requirement to actively go beyond just what you are already aware of. It is expected that many local governments will have no resulting ending liability under this standard, yet they will still have to expend significant effort to be able to show this. Because of the requirement to determine inventory of properties, review the history of those properties, and potentially engage external experts in the process; this is not something that can be left to the last minute.

*Recommendation*

Your staff are aware of these new standards and have developed preliminary plans for completing its requirements. We encourage them to start on this early in the fiscal year.

*Management’s Response*

*Management concurs with this recommendation.*

3. Early Adoption of Financial Instruments

*Observation*

Another set of new standards, known as the Financial Instruments Standards, are coming in 2016. These standards include: PS 3450 - “Financial Instruments” and related sections PS 1201 - “Financial Statement Presentation”, PS 2601 - “Foreign Currency Translation”, and PS 3041 - “Portfolio Investments”.

Although not mandated until 2016, these standards can be elected to be adopted early. We are encouraging some local government to consider early adoption along with a related election to record their investments at fair value. There are two main reasons why we believe this may be of value: first, the market value of investments is likely more relevant to most users then the historical cost method in use currently; and secondly, the standards require disclosure and analysis of risks related to financial instruments which we feel is poignant information for the readers of the financial statements.

In your case, most of your investments are in MFA pooled funds and term deposits. Due to the nature of these funds and the continual level of trading within the funds, it is believed that the market value approximates the historical cost amount. In other words, the amounts reported in the financial statements would likely not change. This means that the majority of the value will come from the expanded risk disclosures.
Recommendation

As there is the potential to purchase investments other than MFA pooled funds and term deposits, we recommend that management consider whether there is value in early adopting these standards in 2014 rather than waiting until the 2016 year.

Management’s Response

Management concurs with this recommendation.

4. Canada’s Anti-Spam Law

Observation

Canada has a new anti-spam law which comes into effect July 1, 2014. The law sets out a number of requirements for communicating electronically. The requirement that is creating the greatest amount of concern amongst senders of electronic information is the requirement to obtain prior consent from those to whom you would plan to send information to.

As municipalities and regional districts look to expand use of non-traditional methods in order to reach out to engage citizens, electronic communication can be expected to increase. We wanted to take this opportunity to point out that Canada’s anti-spam legislation does not apply to non-commercial activity. This means that governments that engage their citizens through email are not subject to this legislation (assuming, of course, that their communications do not involve selling or promoting a product).

Recommendation

The point is an informational item for your consideration.

We received excellent cooperation from everyone at the District of Mission during the audit. We thank yourself, Scott Ross and all of the Finance Department staff for their assistance in making the audit process as efficient as possible.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should you wish to further discuss any of the matters discussed in this letter.

Yours truly,

Bill Cox, CPA, CA
Partner through a corporation
BDO Canada LLP
Chartered Accountants

BC/mkn

c.c. Council
Appendix B - Management Representation Letter

May 5, 2014

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

Dear Sirs:

This representation letter is provided in connection with your audit of the consolidated balance sheet as at December 31, 2013, and the consolidated statement of operations and accumulated surplus, changes in net financial assets and cash flows for the year then ended of the District of Mission for the purpose of expressing an opinion as to whether the consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position as at December 31, 2013 and the results of its operations and cash flows for the year then ended of the District of Mission in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

We confirm that:

Financial Statements

1. We have fulfilled our responsibilities, as set out in the terms of the audit engagement dated December 4, 2013, for the preparation of the consolidated financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards; in particular the consolidated financial statements are fairly presented in accordance therewith.

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

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

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

5. The consolidated financial statements of the municipality use appropriate accounting policies that have been properly disclosed and consistently applied.
Information Provided

6. We have provided you with:

- access to all information of which we are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the consolidated financial statements, such as records, documentation and other matters;

- additional information that you have requested from us for the purpose of the audit; and

- unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom you determined it necessary to obtain audit evidence.

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

8. We have made available to you all:

- minutes of the meetings of the Council

9. All transactions have been recorded in the accounting records and are reflected in the consolidated financial statements.

10. We have disclosed to you all known instances of non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with laws and regulations whose effects should be considered when preparing consolidated financial statements.

11. We have identified to you:

- guarantees;

- indemnifications against damages, liabilities, costs, charges or expenses suffered or incurred by officers or directors as a result of their service, and/or by any subsidiaries; and

- non-monetary transactions and transactions for no consideration.

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

13. We are aware of the environmental laws and regulations that impact our municipality and, to the best of our knowledge we are in compliance. There are no known environmental liabilities or contingencies that have not been accrued for or disclosed in the consolidated financial statements.
Fraud and Error

14. We have disclosed to you the results of our assessment of the risk that the consolidated financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud, and have determined such risk to be low.

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

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

17. The effects of unadjusted misstatements are immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the consolidated financial statements taken as a whole. A list of the uncorrected misstatements is attached to the representation letter.

Existence, Completeness and Valuation of Specific Financial Statement Balances

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

19. All financial instruments have been appropriately recognized and measured in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards. Significant assumptions used in arriving at fair value of financial instruments are reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

20. Where the value of any asset has been impaired, an appropriate provision has been made in the consolidated financial statements or has otherwise been disclosed to you.

21. The inventories as set out in the consolidated financial statements represent all of the inventories to which the municipality held title as at the balance sheet date. Inventories do not include any goods consigned to the municipality, merchandise billed to customers or any items for which the liability has not been provided in the books. Appropriate provisions have been made for obsolete, slow-moving and defective inventories.
22. The employee future benefit costs, assets and obligation have been determined, accounted for and disclosed in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards. The source data and plan provisions provided are complete and accurate. The plans included in the valuation are complete. The determination of the discount rate and the use of specific actuarial assumptions are our best estimate assumptions. We feel that the extrapolations are accurate and have properly reflected the effects of changes and events occurring subsequent to the most recent valuation that had a material effect on the extrapolation.

General Representations

23. The nature of all material uncertainties have been appropriately measured and disclosed in the consolidated financial statements, including all estimates where it is reasonably possible that the estimate will change in the near term and the effect of the change could be material to the consolidated financial statements.

24. There were no direct contingencies or provisions (including those associated with guarantees or indemnification provisions), unusual contractual obligations nor any substantial commitments, whether oral or written, other than in the ordinary course of business, which would materially affect the consolidated financial statements or financial position of the municipality, except as disclosed in the consolidated financial statements.

25. We have informed you of all outstanding and possible claims, whether or not they have been discussed with legal counsel. When applicable, these claims have been appropriately disclosed in the consolidated financial statements.

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

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

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

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

30. No significant matters, other than those disclosed in the consolidated financial statements, have arisen that would require a restatement of the comparative consolidated financial statements.
We have made the following additional significant representations to you during the course of your audit which we understand that you have relied upon:

- The amounts used to calculate the post closure costs for the landfill liability are the municipality's best estimate of these costs.

- Amortization based on the expected useful life of the tangible capital asset and residual value is our best estimate for the consumption of a portion of the tangible capital asset for the year. Where the value of any tangible capital asset has been impaired, an appropriate provision has been made in the financial statements or has otherwise been disclosed to you.

Yours truly,

________________________________________  ________________________________
Signature                          Position

________________________________________  ________________________________
Signature                          Position
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Kris Boland, Manager of Finance
SUBJECT: 2013 Development Cost Charges Activity
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A – Development Cost Charges Summary

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

PURPOSE:
This report addresses the legislated annual reporting requirements for the year 2013, pertaining to development cost charges (DCCs) under Section 937.01 of the BC Local Government Act.

BACKGROUND:
In accordance with the BC Local Government Act Section 937.01, the District is required before June 30th of each year to prepare and consider a report regarding development cost charges with respect to the previous year. The report must include:

1. The amount of DCCs received;
2. The expenditures from the DCC reserve funds;
3. The balance in the DCC reserve funds at the start and at the end of the year; and,
4. Any waivers and reductions provided under section 933.1.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The attached Appendix A summarizes for 2013 the amount of DCCs received, the expenditures from the DCC reserve funds, and the balance in the DCC reserve funds at the start and at the end of the year.

Section 933.1 of the BC Local Government Act permits DCCs to be waived for certain categories of “eligible development”, such as not-for-profit rental housing, for-profit affordable rental housing, and developments designed to result in a low environmental impact, provided a bylaw is established that outlines the criteria for waivers. The District’s DCC Bylaw does not provide for any waivers under Section 933.1, therefore no waivers or reductions were granted in 2013.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
There are no financial implications associated with this report.
COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
This report addresses the legislated annual reporting requirements for the year 2013 pertaining to DCCs under Section 937.01 of the BC Local Government Act.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kris Boland, Manager of Finance

Reviewed by:
Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
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# Appendix A
## District of Mission
### Development Cost Charges Summary
#### for the year ended December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>DCC Name</th>
<th>Opening Balance</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Closing Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$188,067.32</td>
<td>$391,091.98</td>
<td>$370,789.30</td>
<td>$211,700.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$72.06</td>
<td>$229,840.50</td>
<td>$197,243.67</td>
<td>$985.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$117,280.52</td>
<td>$342,413.58</td>
<td>$458,153.05</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.64</td>
<td>$44,602.21</td>
<td>$44,603.85</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$10,699.66</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$399,740.78</td>
<td>$100,688.53</td>
<td>$44,603.85</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$15,459.47</td>
<td>$44,603.85</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14.34</td>
<td>$47,838.70</td>
<td>$44,603.85</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue
- **DCC Collections**: $391,091.98
- **Internal Loan Proceeds**: $13,446.28
- **Total Revenue**: $404,538.26

### Expenses
- **DCC Projects**: $680,076.00
- **Internal Loan Payments**: $313,302.72
- **Total Expenses**: $993,378.72

### Balance Before Interest Earnings
- **208,370.00**

### Interest Earnings
- **3,330.07**

### Closing Balance
- **211,700.07**
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services
SUBJECT: Investment Holdings Quarterly Report – March 31, 2014

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

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

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

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The following table summarizes the District’s investment holdings as at March 31, 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Return^A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFA Bond Fund</td>
<td>$15,936,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashable Term Deposits</td>
<td>22,121,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cashable Term Deposits</td>
<td>13,171,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Bank Account</td>
<td>6,134,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash and Portfolio Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,364,030</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note A - returns for the MFA Investment Funds are based on actual performance over the immediately preceding 12 month period.

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

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The District's total cash and portfolio investment balance is $57,364,030 as at March 31, 2014.

SIGN-OFFS:

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

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer  
Reviewed.
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
SUBJECT: 2014 Tax Rates Bylaw
ATTACHMENT: Appendix “A” – Estimated Increase in Property Tax and Utility Charges

RECOMMENDATION(S): Council consider and resolve:
1. That the District’s 2014 tax rates bylaw # 5432-2014 receive first three readings;
2. That Council has hereby considered its proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with its objectives and policies regarding the distribution of property taxes among the tax classes, as set out within its 2014-2018 financial plan bylaw [bylaw #5392-2013]; and
3. That the $90,000 additional revenue from 2014 non-market changes be transferred to the Financial Stabilization Reserve Fund, and that the Financial Plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to allow Council the opportunity to consider its proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with its objectives and policies and to give first three readings to the District’s 2014 tax rates bylaw.

BACKGROUND:
Pursuant to section 197 of the Community Charter, Council must pass a tax rates bylaw before May 15th of each year. The tax rates have now been established in bylaw #5432-2014 which is on the agenda for first three readings.

Per the Community Charter, tax rates need to be established for municipal revenue and for amounts collected for the year by means of rates established by the municipality to meet its taxing obligations in relation to another local government or other public body. In other words, the tax rates bylaw needs to include the District’s municipal tax rates (for general, policing, library, diking, business improvement area purposes) as well as the Fraser Valley Regional District and Fraser Valley Regional Hospital District tax rates which we set.

In prior years the tax rates set by other taxing authorities, namely the School, the BC Assessment Authority and the Municipal Finance Authority have not been included in our tax rates bylaw as these rates were not available at the time of bringing forward our bylaw. This year, we have received these rates therefore we are bringing forward the tax rates bylaw including these tax rates for inclusivity reasons.
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The various municipal tax rates included in bylaw #5432-2014, which is now being brought forward for first three readings, are consistent with Council’s financial plan and the overall 0% tax increase approved by Council. The impact of this bylaw on the average residential home in Mission is an estimated decrease in the property taxes levied of $17.80. This estimated decrease plus the increase to the utility user charges (water, sewer, garbage and recycling) of $22.08 will have a combined impact of $4.28 for residential properties with all utilities (see Appendix “A”) or an approximate 0.11% increase over 2013. For residential properties with rural recycling utility charge only, the impact will be an estimated decrease of $17.56, or approximately -0.61%.

Local governments must formally consider their proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with the objectives and policies as set out under Section 165(3.1)(b) [distribution of property taxes among property classes] of the Community Charter (included as Schedule “A” in the financial plan bylaw [2014 – 2018]), before adopting their annual property tax rates bylaw. The District’s property tax distribution for 2014, which is similar to prior years and the property distribution chart estimated as part of the financial plan bylaw report of December 2, 2013, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY CLASS</th>
<th>% OF MUNICIPAL PROPERTY TAXES COLLECTED FROM EACH TAX CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>73.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Housing</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Industry</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / Other</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Forest</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational / Non-Profit</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To show that the municipal tax rates for 2014 have been considered in conjunction with Council’s tax class property tax distribution policies and objectives, Council need to pass a formal motion stating so.

**Downtown Business Improvement Levy**

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

MISSION DOWNTOWN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREA
SCHEDULE A
BYLAW 5405 - 2014

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

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

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

For 2014, the BIA levy will generate $79,798 which will be passed on to the Mission Downtown Business Association on August 1, 2014, for the Business Promotion Scheme.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The non-market changes (NMC) or inventory for new lots or new buildings within the District came in higher than anticipated. The revised roll from BC Assessment as at March 31, 2013 showed the NMC value would generate a total of $440,749 in new property taxes, $90,749 higher than estimated in the 2014 financial plan. The increase in property tax revenue can be transferred to the financial stabilization reserve fund in 2014.

COMMUNICATION:
The public will be notified of the 2014 tax rate through this agenda, and when the 2014 tax notices are received by Mission property owners.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Pursuant to section 197 of the Community Charter, Council must pass a tax rates bylaw before May 15th of each year. Council must also consider its proposed tax rates for each property class in conjunction with its objectives and policies regarding the distribution of property taxes among the tax classes, as set out within its 2014-2018 financial plan bylaw [bylaw #5392-2013].

The various municipal tax rates included in bylaw #5432-2014, which is now being brought forward for first three readings, are consistent with Council’s financial plan and the overall 0% tax increase approved by Council. The impact on an average residential home in Mission is an estimated net increase of $4.28 when applying the tax rates from this bylaw and adding the 2014 municipal utility user charges. This is an approximate 0.11% increase over the 2013 tax notice. The impact on an average residential home with only the rural recycling utility charge is estimated to decrease by $17.56, or -0.61% over 2013.

Included in the tax rate bylaw is a Business Improvement Area levy on classes 5 and 6 (light industry and business) properties within the downtown business improvement area for the purpose of funding a Business Promotion Scheme to carry out certain works and services and to market and promote business within the BIA. For 2014, the BIA levy will generate $79,798 which will be passed on to the Mission Downtown Business Association on August 1, 2014, for the Business Promotion Scheme.

SIGN-OFFS:

Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector
 Reviewed by:
Kris Boland, Manager of Finance

Comment from the Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed.
## Estimated Increase in Property Tax and Utility Charges

**Average Property Assessment in 2013**: $393,000  
**Estimated Property Assessment in 2014**: $379,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL CLASS PROPERTY</th>
<th>Estimated 2014 Tax Rates</th>
<th>Estimated 2014 Tax Notice</th>
<th>2013 Tax Rates</th>
<th>2013 Tax Notice</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) in Dollars</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease) Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Residential Properties Connected to Water &amp; Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal &amp; Library Property Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal and Police Services</td>
<td>4.6388</td>
<td>1,760.42</td>
<td>4.4761</td>
<td>1,759.11</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Taxes</td>
<td>0.2125</td>
<td>80.64</td>
<td>0.2050</td>
<td>80.57</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Property Taxes</td>
<td>1,841.06</td>
<td>1,839.68</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes Collected on Behalf of Other Taxing Authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Taxes</td>
<td>2.1878</td>
<td>830.27</td>
<td>2.1457</td>
<td>843.26</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>-1.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV Region District</td>
<td>0.1063</td>
<td>40.34</td>
<td>0.1049</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FV Regional Hospital</td>
<td>0.2310</td>
<td>87.66</td>
<td>0.2344</td>
<td>92.12</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>-4.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Assessment Authority</td>
<td>0.0619</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>0.0619</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Finance Authority</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxing Authorities</td>
<td>981.84</td>
<td>1,001.02</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>-1.92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Property Taxes from all Sources</td>
<td>2,822.90</td>
<td>2,840.70</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>-0.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>474.72</td>
<td>465.48</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>361.08</td>
<td>354.00</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>165.24</td>
<td>162.00</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>130.08</td>
<td>127.56</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Utilities</td>
<td>1,131.12</td>
<td>1,109.04</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Taxes &amp; Utility Charges</td>
<td>$3,954.02</td>
<td>$3,949.74</td>
<td>$4.28</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Residential Properties With Only Rural Recycling Only

| Municipal & Library Property Taxes | | | | | | |
| Municipal Property Taxes | 1,841.06 | 1,839.68 | 1.38 | 0.08% |
| Other Taxing Authorities | 981.84 | 1,001.02 | 19.18 | -1.92% |
| Estimated Property Taxes from all Sources | 2,822.90 | 2,840.70 | 17.80 | -0.63% |
| Municipal Utilities | | | | | | |
| Rural Recycling | 17.64 | 17.40 | 0.24 | 1.38% |
| Municipal Utilities | 17.64 | 17.40 | 0.24 | 1.38% |
| Total Property Taxes & Utility Charges | $2,840.54 | $2,858.10 | ($17.56) | -0.61% |
DATE: May 5, 2014
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Ken Bjorgaard, Chief Administrative Officer
SUBJECT: Adoption of Recommendations from the April 14, 2014 Committee of the Whole (Corporate Services Committee) Meeting
ATTACHMENT: April 14, 2014 Committee of the Whole (Corporate Services) Meeting Minutes

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:
That the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in items COW14/005 through COW14/013 of the minutes of the Corporate Services Committee meeting held on April 14, 2014, be adopted.

Note: Committee of the Whole recommendations can be adopted one at a time or with exceptions to allow for additional consideration of individual recommendations.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to present Council with an opportunity to formally adopt the recommendations of the April 14, 2014 Committee of the Whole meeting.

BACKGROUND:
Recommendations made at “Committee of the Whole” meetings, if still in accordance with the will of Council, should 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 Corporate Services 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 are adopted and the minutes themselves are adopted.

The attached Committee of the Whole minutes of April 14, 2014 include the following motion:

Moved by Councillor Tilbury, and

RECOMMENDED: That staff prepare a report for the April 22, 2014 Regular Council meeting, proposing the Terms of Reference and estimated cost along with a shortlist of potential management consultants to perform an examination and evaluation by an external agency of staffing issues and operational capabilities at the District of Mission.

To date some input has been received from some but not all Council members on the Terms of Reference noted above including that the focus of the review should be on organizational health, staff morale, staff turnover and retention, and creating a respectful workplace. Other input focused on the impact of rapid change and the way change has been implemented.
In order to obtain quotations from consultants, Council needs to agree on a Terms of Reference. Staff request Council’s direction on this matter.

SIGN-OFFS:

Ken Bjorgaard, Chief Administrative Officer
Minutes of the Freestanding Committee of the Whole (Corporate Services Committee – Development Corporation and Economic Development) meeting of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on Monday, April 14, 2014 commencing at 3:00 p.m.

Committee 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
Jennifer Russell, Legislative Assistant
Kris Boland, Manager of Finance
Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer
Jennifer Kinneman, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
Christine Brough, Executive Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Councillor Tilbury expressed his desire to add two late items to the agenda and a lengthy discussion ensued regarding the permissibility of this under Schedule “D” Section 8 of Council Procedure Bylaw 5345-2013 which states the following:

8. LATE ITEMS

(a) An item of business not included on the Agenda will only be considered at a Council Meeting if:

(i) Council, by resolution, allows the inclusion of the late item; and

(ii) the item is in written form and any resolution proposed is in written form and distributed in advance of the Meeting.

Notwithstanding Council Procedure Bylaw 5345-2013, it was

Moved by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That “Late Item: Staffing Issues” be added to this agenda under Item 3 - Corporate Services.

OPPOSED Councillor Hensman
Councillor Nundal
Mayor Adlem

CARRIED

COW14/005 APR.14/14
Moved by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That “Late Item: Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives Position” be added to this agenda under Item 3 - Corporate Services.

CARRIED

COW14/007
APR. 14/14

Moved by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That the April 14, 2014 Corporate Services committee agenda be adopted as amended.

CARRIED

9. CORPORATE SERVICES

Late Item: Staffing Issues

Discussion ensued on the alleged morale issues at the District of Mission and it was:

Moved by Councillor Tilbury, and

RECOMMENDED: That staff prepare a report for the April 22, 2014 Regular Council meeting, proposing the Terms of Reference and estimated cost along with a shortlist of potential management consultants to perform an examination and evaluation by an external agency of staffing issues and operational capabilities at the District of Mission.

A point of order was raised regarding possible off-topic discussion, and the Chair allowed the discussion to continue.

A point of order was raised regarding inappropriate discussion, and the Chair ruled the discussion out of order.

A point of order was raised regarding inappropriate personal comments, and the Councillor in question withdrew his comments.

The Chief Administrative Officer noted that the Terms of Reference would need to be drafted and approved by Council before a viable shortlist of potential management consultants or costing could be determined.

The Mayor called the question on COW14/008 and it was:

CARRIED

COW14/009
APR. 14/14

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED: That it be known that the Council of the District of Mission supports the Chief Administrative Officer 100%.

CARRIED
Late Item: Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives Position

Moved by Councillor Luck, and

RECOMMENDED: That “Late Item: Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives Position” be deferred to a future meeting.
CARRIED

Operational Considerations for the District of Mission Development Corporation and Economic Development Function

A report dated April 14, 2014 from the Chief Administrative Officer and the Economic Development Officer regarding the future of the Development Corporation and economic development in the District of Mission was provided for the committee’s consideration.

The committee discussed the issue and it was:

Moved by Councillor Luck, and

RECOMMENDED: That the District of Mission Development Corporation be dissolved with the economic development office becoming responsible for providing property management, land development and core economic development services, with the definitive purpose and mandate of the combined activities to be determined.

Discussion ensued regarding the merits of retaining the Development Corporation for possible use in the future and it was:

Moved by Councillor Hensman, and

RECOMMENDED: That the motion be amended to retain the District of Mission Development Corporation as an inactive corporation.

OPPOSED Councillor Jewell
Councillor Luck
Councillor Nundal
Councillor Stevens
Councillor Tilbury
Mayor Adlem

DEFEATED

The Mayor called the question on the main motion, COW14/011, and it was:
CARRIED

10. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED
The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 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 March 3, 2014 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:    Tina Penney, Acting Manager of Corporate Administration
                          Tina Mooney, Administrative Clerk

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Adlem called the meeting to order.

Mayor Adlem began the meeting with an announcement that former Alderman Jim
Vosburgh had passed away and a moment of silence was observed for him.

2. RESOLUTION TO ALLOW ADDITIONAL DELEGATION

RC14/161  MAR. 03/14
Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED: That Rick Senft be permitted to appear as a late (five minute) delegation at
the Regular Council meeting of March 3, 2014.
CARRIED

RC14/162  MAR. 03/14
Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED:
1. That the following item be added to this agenda prior to the heading “Corporate
   Services”
   a) Late Item – Section 9(a) Approval for Purchase of Ladder Truck;
   b) Item 10(d) Request for Task force to Address Gaps in Affordable Housing
      Policy be moved to 9(b) under the new Section of Engineering and Public
      Works;
2. That the remainder of Agenda numbering be amended to reflect these changes.
CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

RC14/163  MAR. 03/14
Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of March 3, 2014 be
adopted, as amended.
CARRIED
4. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

RC14/164
MAR. 03/14
Angel Elias, Mission Hospice Society
Re: Request for Funding Assistance

Angel Elias, Executive Director of the Mission Hospice Society appeared before council to provide information about the Mission Hospice Society and the essential services and programs that are offered in the community. She asked for council's support with their Community Grants Application.

The Mayor announced that the Mayor’s Annual Golf Tournament proceeds will go to Mission Hospice this year and encouraged the community's participation.

RC14/165
MAR. 03/14
Janna Geier
Re: Traffic Safety on Wren Street

Janna Geier appeared before Council to discuss the safety issues with the speed of the motor vehicles on Wren Street and asked that Council consider installing a crosswalk and a sidewalk on Wren Street in the vicinity of West Heights Elementary School.

RC14/166
MAR. 03/14
Rick Senft, Mission Minor Hockey
Re: Request for Funding Assistance

Rick Senft appeared on behalf of Mission Minor Hockey to request $3,000.00 for the ice rental and conference room rentals at the Leisure Centre as Mission is hosting the BC Provincial Hockey Championships this year.

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Stevens, and

RESOLVED: That $3,000.00 be provided to Mission Minor Hockey to be used towards the ice rentals and conference rooms rentals and be funded from the Council Contingency Fund.

CARRIED

5. PUBLIC HEARING

RC14/167
MAR. 03/14
Zoning Amending Bylaw 5414-2014-5050(132)

R13-032 (District of Mission) – a bylaw to add a new Industrial General Two Zone (ING2) to Section 902, and to rezone 29920 Lougheed Highway, 7277 Nelson Street, 7150 Bank Street, and 33516 Harbour Avenue from Industrial General Zone (ING) to Industrial General Two Zone (ING2)

The purpose of the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendment is to:

(a) delete Section 1004 – Industrial General Zones in its entirety, and replace it with a new Section 1004 – Industrial General Zones which includes a new Industrial General Two (ING2) Zone permitting barge loading; and

(b) rezone the properties located at 29920 Lougheed Highway, the southern portion of 7277 Nelson Street, 7150 Bank Street and 33516 Harbour Avenue, and legally described as:
(Portion of) Parcel Identifier: 014-842-386 Lot C Plan 4578 (Parcel C, Group 1, REF PL 4578, EXC PCL D REF PL 2583);

Parcel Identifier: 000-639-648 Rem D.L 456 GP 1 Plan 3067 (Except Plan SRW PL908, & EXC PL 3067, PL LMP2169, LMP3745, BCP44961);

Parcel Identifier: 011-001-429 Parcel 1 Plan 9215 (Parcel ONE, Group 1, REF PL 9215); and

Parcel Identifiers : 011-001-551, 011-875-828, 026-048-981 Lot A BCP 13302 (Group 1, EXC PL PCL 1 (REF PL 8978) & EXC PL 44006 & 43417, Lot 68, Plan NWP611, District Lot 411, Group 1, New Westminster Land District, Parcel A, Plan BCP13302, District Lot 411, Group 1, New Westminster Land District)

from the Industrial General Zone (ING) to the Industrial General 2 Zone (ING2).

Mike Younie, Director of Development Services, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

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

The Acting Manager of Corporate Administration stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received.

1. Letter from Fraser River Sturgeon Conservation Society dated February 28, 2014 in opposition to this application; and

2. Email from Phyllis Young dated February 28, 2014 in opposition to this application.

Sarah Schreier is the Executive Director of Fraser Sturgeon Conservation Society which is a not-for-profit organization that protects and helps to rebuild the white sturgeon population in the Fraser Valley. She expressed concern with the proposed changes, how it will impact the sturgeon and recreational fishery businesses and the rearing area called the “Big Eddy”.

Steve Sharpe is in favour of the application as the changes in the bylaw will create more job opportunities.

Tracey Lyster expressed concern with the environmental health of the river due to the changes in this bylaw, the negative effects it will have on the sturgeon population and proposed waterfront development.

Dennis McKamay discussed the positive impacts this amendment would have on local businesses and supports the application.

Jim Armstrong noted that the issue of barging can be dealt with in an environmentally sustainable responsible manner that also meets the needs of the community.
Patrick Catherwood supports this application and noted that Mission is at the eastern end of navigable water on the Fraser River and this free transportation corridor is suited for barge traffic. This amendment will create new employment opportunities in our community.

Vic Carroa is the owner of STS Guiding Service expressed concern with tug traffic issues on sport fishing and discussed the conflicts that presently exist. He noted that Mission is a leader in sports fishing in the world for not only sturgeon but salmon. If barge traffic increases it also increases the conflicts that exist and that will negatively affect recruiting new businesses for the waterfront development planning.

Wilson Sieg is in favour of the application. This bylaw will enhance the economy in Mission. He discussed the history of the river and the protection of fish habitat in past years. The Fraser River is a working river and should allow barge loading in order to maintain the use.

Kenny Braich asked for clarification of a barge loading facility and why the properties owned by the Braich family were not included in this application as they have been using their properties for barge loading for many years.

Mike Younie, Director of Development Services, noted that barge loading is not being defined in the proposed amendment and any properties not included in the proposed amending bylaw can come forward requesting an amendment. He stated that the properties that are included in the proposed amendment have been actively using the current infrastructure as a barge loading facilities.

The Mayor noted that the Public Hearing is on the properties listed in the zone amending bylaw and Mr. Braich can schedule a meeting with the Director of Development Services regarding a rezoning application to his properties affected.

The Director of Development Services responded that this amending bylaw was a District of Mission initiative.

Heather Stewart expressed concern with the environmental impact. She asked council to promote a group that would include representation from both environmental and business groups to discuss the issues that have been put forward and ensure the river is serving everyone that has a stake in it including business, sport and commercial fishing.

Neil Zimmerman asked if there is a plan in place to bring awareness to individuals that may purchase properties that are on the waterfront that may have an assumption that those properties have exclusive rights for barge loading, especially particular properties in the Silvercreek Industrial Park. He also expressed concerns with noise with the increased traffic.

The Mayor responded that the current application is to take specific non-conforming properties and ensure they are conforming. Should property owners of other properties also wish to make an application for rezoning to allow for barge loading, they should see staff and at a future date Council can follow a similar process for those properties.
The Director of Development Services confirmed that no property has exclusive rights and any property owner can bring forward a rezoning application to Council for their consideration.

Sarah Schreier discussed the history of Fraser River and the research that has been performed on the Sturgeon population.

The Mayor asked about the distance that sturgeon travel in the River.

Sarah Schreier discussed the spawning and how far sturgeon can travel.

Vic Carroa noted that he promotes sturgeon and sport fishing in the community. They had a working study and discovered where there are large sturgeon habitats and Mission has one of the largest sturgeon populations in the area. He discussed various areas in the river that have been identified as sturgeon holes and discussed the challenges that are faced.

Mr. Catherwood noted that barge loading facilities are not in the spawning area and typically sturgeon spawn above the barge loading facility areas.

Sarah Schreier noted that the sturgeon breed in the proposed rezoning areas but spawn up the river.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Development Services responded that the application is not being brought forward for new facilities but for facilities that are being grandfathered in. He also advised that the only loads that would be monitored would be those that are classified as hazardous material travelling both up and downstream. Furthermore, he advised that there is rip-rap in those areas of the river that are not diked.

Sarah Schreier noted that according to data collected, sturgeon travel from Yale to Stevenson and sport fishing is not permitted where sturgeon is vulnerable. The Mission portion of the Fraser River is deemed healthy to support a sport fishery.

Mr. McKamay discussed the bank erosion that occurs throughout the year.

Mr. Braich noted that he supports the application but expressed concern that not all the properties currently being used as barge loading facilities were considered in this application.

The Mayor noted that a public hearing is for Council to listen to public comments concerning the application before them. He suggested that if Mr. Braich would like to bring his properties forward for consideration, then he can speak to the Development Services Department.

Jim Hinds asked if the current application is to reverse the properties that have been grandfathered and make them legal conforming properties.

The Mayor confirmed that is the purpose of the current application.

Peter Bulla noted that sturgeon in the Fraser River must be released after they are caught and this should increase the sturgeon population over time. He suggested that the various groups who have an interest in the river should work together.
The Mayor had called 3 times for any additional comments, and hearing no further questions or comments, declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5414-2014-5050(132) R13-032 (District of Mission), closed.

**Zoning Amending Bylaw 5420-2014-5050(133)**

(R13-026 – Fraser Pacific) – a bylaw to rezone property at 31870 Duncan Avenue from the Industrial Business Park One Zone (INBP1) and the Industrial General Zone (ING) to the Comprehensive Development 34 Zone (CD34)

The purpose of the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendment is to:
(a) add the Comprehensive Development 34 (CD34) Zone into Section 1201 “CD Zones”; and
(b) rezone a portion of the property located at 31870 Duncan Avenue and legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 011-654-198 Lot 1 Except: Firstly: Part on Statutory Right of Way Plan 52311; Secondly: Part Dedicated Road on Plan BCP14718; Sections 18 and 19 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 8588

from the Industrial Business Park One Zone (INBP1) and the Industrial General Zone (ING) to the Comprehensive Development 34 Zone (CD34) Zone, to allow for a mix of industrial uses while maintaining the existing heavy industrial uses.

Gina MacKay, Planner, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

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

The Acting Manager of Corporate Administration stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received.

1. Letter received from Jim Taylor, Stave Valley Salmonid Enhancement Society dated March 3, 2014 in support of the application.

Jim Armstrong stated that he is working with the proponent and many community organizations have been included in their discussions. He noted that Fraser River is a working river and they want to enhance the environment as it is important to the future of the community.

Danny Plecas expressed concerns with the containers, how they will be stored, where they will come from, the size of the containers and what equipment will be required for the barge loading facility. He is concerned that containers will be shipped and remain empty on the property.
Jim Armstrong responded that container movement is not being examined as part of this application. Rather there are many uses for the site and containers will be shipped and received from many points along the river.

Tracey Lyster expressed concern about hazardous waste materials being a permitted use on the property and asked if the property would include a hazardous waste recycling facilities.

The Planner responded that any waste resources are defined under the *Environment Management Act* and is controlled through the Province. She also noted that the proponents have considered soil reclamation and that may contain hydrocarbons.

Jim Armstrong responded to questions from the public noting that in the strategic plan, it was concluded that hazardous waste will not be handled on site and it is not part of their corporate plans.

Barb Strachan noted that many groups work together on numerous community issues to find solutions.

Jim Taylor noted that the proposal will substantially improve the industrial area. He noted that the recreational areas are important in the community and this ties in with the proposed application area and asked council to support the application.

Barb Strachan wanted to give thanks to businesses that supported the new garden on 7th Avenue.

Council asked for clarification on the definition of a container, if empty containers will be stored on site and if the amendment will increase jobs in the community.

Jim Armstrong noted that there are 25 proposals being considered through the feasibility study and once that is complete, the strategic plan will outline what industries will be supported.

The Mayor had called 3 times for any additional comments, and hearing no further questions or comments, declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5420-2014-5050(133) (R13-026 – Fraser Pacific), closed.

6. PROCLAMATIONS

**May 2014 as “Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Month”**

MS Society of Canada

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That May 2014 be proclaimed as “Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Month” within the District of Mission.

CARRIED
7. ADOPTION OF INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That the following items be received as information:

(a) Minutes of the Abbotsford Mission Water & Sewer Commission meeting held on December 10, 2013; and

(b) Minutes of the Cultural Resources Commission meeting held on January 8, 2014.
CARRIED

8. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.
CARRIED

9. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Approval for Purchase of Ladder Truck

Moved by Councillor Hensman, and

RECOMMENDED: That the purchase of a 100 foot ladder truck for US$929,900, plus applicable taxes, be approved, in accordance with policy FIN.24.
CARRIED

Request for a Task Force to Address Gaps in Affordable Housing Policy

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That staff create a Task Force, that includes membership from a number of stakeholder organizations who are interested in Affordable Housing, to:
   
   a) review existing policies and recommend possible amendments that would clarify the definition of affordable,
   
   b) develop criteria that clearly identifies what is considered affordable housing and when incentives would apply,
   
   c) That a council representative be added to the task force; and
   
   d) recommend incentives that would stimulate the development of affordable housing units.

2. That a report be forwarded to Council in June 2014 with findings and recommendations for Council’s consideration.
CARRIED
10. CORPORATE SERVICES

Reconsideration of Resolution in accordance with Section 131 of the Community Charter

Mayor Adlem stated that pursuant to Section 131(1) of the Community Charter, he is bringing back for reconsideration the following resolution of Council, made at the regular Council meeting of February 17, 2014:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Council, in view of the Mayor’s actions taken without its prior agreement or in opposition to Council’s expressed will, and the lack of respect shown by him towards staff, Council members and the general public, hereby record their lack of confidence in the Mayor and disassociate themselves from any actions or statements made by him on Council’s behalf, without a prior resolution of agreement by Council.

Discussion ensued regarding the reconsideration of the Resolution. No vote was taken.

Legislative Authority and Corporate Powers Role of Mayor and Council

A report from the Chief Administrative Officer and the Acting Manager of Corporate Administration dated March 3, 2014 regarding the legislated responsibilities of members of Council was provided for the Committee’s information.

Civic Engagement & Corporate Communications Policies and 2014 Engagement & Communications Plan

Moved by Councillor Luck, and

RECOMMENDED:
1. That District policies COM.1 and COM.2, attached to the report from the Manager of Civic Engagement & Corporate Initiatives dated February 17, 2014, be approved; and
2. That the 2014 Civic Engagement and Communications plan contained within the report from the Manager of Civic Engagement & Corporate Initiatives, dated February 17, 2014, be supported.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED: That a report to outline the recent history and format of the District’s Town Hall Forums be prepared and brought back for presentation to council on March 17, 2014.

CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be extended past 9:30 p.m. and not to exceed a one hour extension.
CARRIED

Council Procedure Bylaw – (1) Delegations defined; (2) Presentation defined; and (3) Commencement Time

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:
1. That staff be directed to prepare a Council Procedures Amending Bylaw that will:
   a) add definitions for “Delegations” and “Presentations” as defined in the report dated February 17, 2014 from the Legislative Assistant and A/Manager of Corporate Administration;
   b) maintain two delegations per meeting (10 minutes) as well as the possibility of adding late delegation(s) subject to Council approval (5 minutes);
   c) effect no change to the commencement time of Freestanding Committee of the Whole meetings (remain at 3:00 p.m. unless otherwise specified);
2. That the amending Bylaw be considered for 1st, 2nd and 3rd readings at a future regularly scheduled Council meeting and subsequently staff give public notice pursuant to section 94 of the Community Charter describing the proposed changes.
3. That the Bylaw be brought forward for final reading following the mandated public notification.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Stevens, and

RECOMMENDED: That the additional recommendation item 4:

That any requests from a proponent for a development and/or land use proposal wishing to appear before Council be considered and approved by Council at the time that order of business arises on the agenda.

be deferred.
CARRIED

“Sing Me A Song” Contest – Canada’s 150th Birthday Celebration

A report from the Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives dated March 3, 2014 regarding the “Sing Me A Song” program initiated by the Lieutenant Governor was provided for the Committee’s information.
2015 Budget Schedule

Moved by Councillor Luck, and


CARRIED

Lower Mainland Local Government Association (LMLGA) Resolutions Notice and Call for Nominations

A report from the Assistant Manager of Corporate Administration dated March 3, 2014 regarding the Lower Mainland Local Government Association (LMLGA) request for resolutions and Call for Nominations to the LMLGA Executive was provided for the Committee’s information.

Correspondence from Fraser Basin Council Re: Invitation to Participate in Regional Flood Management Strategy Initiative

Correspondence dated February 20, 2014 from the Fraser Basin Council regarding an invitation to partner with other Lower Mainland communities to address flood management was provided for the Committee’s information.

11. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Rezoning Application R13-015 (Slade Dyer & Assoc.) – 31798 Silverdale Avenue

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That a bylaw be prepared to amend District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008 by re-designating a portion of the property located at 31798 Silverdale Avenue from Urban Residential designation to the Suburban Residential designation labelled as Area “A” comprising 671.983 sq. metres (8201.91 sq. ft.) as shown on Appendix 2 in the report from the Planner dated March 3, 2014.

2. That a bylaw be prepared to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by rezoning portions of the property located at 31798 Silverdale Avenue from:
   a) Rural 16 (RU16) Zone to the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone labelled as Area “B” comprising 1.44 hectares (3.58 acres) as shown on Appendix 3 in the report from the Planner dated March 3, 2014; and
   b) Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone labelled as Area “C” comprising 6992.69 sq. metres (1.72 acres) as shown on Appendix 3 in the report from the Planner dated March 3, 2014.

3. That the bylaws be considered for first reading at the regular Council meeting on March 3, 2014.
4. That following these readings the bylaws be forwarded to a Public Hearing on March 17, 2014.

5. That in accordance with Section 941 of the Local Government Act and Council Policy LAN. 26, parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash-in-lieu to subdivision file S13-006.

6. That the final reading of the zone amending bylaw be held until the following have been satisfied:
   a) Any requirements received from external agencies regarding the proposed OCP amendment.
   b) The community amenity contribution in the amount of $2,815 per new lot is received.
   c) The servicing requirements, as outlined in Appendix 6, have been addressed to the satisfaction of the District Engineer.

OPPOSED: Councillor Tilbury
CARRIED

Development Variance Permit DV14-01 (Hale) – 33879 Knight Street

Moved by Councillor Hensman, and
RECOMMENDED: That Development Variance Permit Application DV14-01 to vary:
   a) Section 102 A. Definitions; Height (b) of the District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by reducing the provision that the calculation of height of a garage with a flat roof to be from the "highest point of a Building, less 3.0 metre" to the "highest point of a Building, less 0.5 metres" so as to increase the overall permitted height for an accessory building with a flat roof or a pitch less than 4:12 from 3.0 metres (9.8 feet) to a maximum of 5.5 metres (18.04 feet); and
   b) Section 501, D. 1. Setbacks of the District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by reducing the minimum rear setback for a Principal Building from 7.5 metres (24.6 feet) to 4.5 metres (14.8 feet) to allow for a covered patio to encroach into the rear yard setback

be approved.
CARRIED

An amendment to Council Resolution RC13/791 regarding the approved Development Variance Permit 12-009

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and
RECOMMENDED:
1. That Council Resolution RC13/791, which was approved on December 2, 2013, be rescinded; and
2. That Development Variance Permit application DV12-009 to vary District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by:
   a) Reducing the rear setback from proposed Lots H and I from 7.5 metres (24.6 ft.) to 6 metres (19.7 ft.);
b) Reducing the lot depth of proposed Lot S from 30 metres (98.4 ft.) to 28.9 metres (94.8 ft);

c) Reducing the lot depth of proposed Lot T from 30 metres (98.4 ft.) to 28.8 metres (94.8 ft.); and

d) Reducing the lot frontage of proposed Lot I from 6 metres (19.68 ft.) to 5.2 metres (17.06 ft.),

be approved.

CARRIED

2013 Climate Action Revenue Incentive Program (CARIP) and Reporting of Climate Action Goals

A report from the Director of Development Services dated March 3, 2014 regarding the amount of Carbon Tax being refunded to the District for 2013 and Mission’s progress toward meeting its climate action goals was provided for the Committee’s information.

Major Development Project Update

A report from the Administrative Clerk – Land Use dated March 3, 2014 regarding the status of the significant commercial, industrial, institutional and residential developments in Mission was provided for the Committee’s information.

12. RESOLUTION TO RISE AND REPORT

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That the Committee of the Whole now rise and report.

CARRIED

13. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC14/172 to RC14/188, except item RC14/184 (rezoning for 31798 Silverdale Avenue), 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 RC14/184 (rezoning for 31798 Silverdale Avenue), be adopted.

OPPOSED: Councillor Tilbury

CARRIED
14. BYLAWS

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5414-2014-5050(132), a bylaw to add a new Industrial General Two Zone (ING2) to Section 902, and to rezone 29920 Lougheed Highway, 7277 Nelson Street, 7150 Bank Street, and 33516 Harbour Avenue from Industrial General Zone (ING) to Industrial General Two Zone (ING2), be read a third time.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED:

1. That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5420-2014-5050(133), a bylaw to rezone property at 31870 Duncan Avenue from the Industrial Business Park One Zone (INBP1) and the Industrial General Zone (ING) to the Comprehensive Development 34 Zone (CD34), be read a third time; and

2. That adoption of the Zoning Amending Bylaw be withheld until the following have been satisfied:
   a. That a development agreement between the property owner and the District of Mission be registered against the title of the property securing works to provide for future pedestrian access and/or connectivity through or adjacent to the site including any engineering works and related access agreements.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Luck, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission User Fees and Charges Amending Bylaw 5416-2014-4029(7), a bylaw to replace Schedule 2 to update the Parks, Recreation and Culture Admissions and Rental Fees, be adopted.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Jewell, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Cemetery and Crematorium Amending Bylaw 5417-2014-858(18), a bylaw to replace Schedule C to update the fees, be adopted.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Refuse Collection and Disposal Amending Bylaw 5418-2014-1387(54), bylaw to replace Schedule A to reflect the 2% rate increase for 2014, be adopted.
CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Luck, and
RESOLVED: That District of Mission Water Amending Bylaw 5419-2014-2196(23), a bylaw to add an additional acceptable type of water meter, be adopted.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and
RESOLVED: That District of Mission OCP Amending Bylaw 5421-2014-4052(32), a bylaw to redesignate a portion of the property at 31798 Silverdale Avenue from Urban Residential to Suburban Residential, be read a first time.
OPPOSED: Councillor Tilbury
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and
RESOLVED: That in accordance with Section 882 of the Local Government Act, Council has considered District of Mission Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw 5421-2014-4052(32) in conjunction with the District's Financial Plan (including the Capital Expenditure Plan and Operating Expenditure Plan) and the Waste Management Plan.
OPPOSED: Councillor Tilbury
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Luck, and
RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5422-2014-5050(134), a bylaw to rezone portions of the property located at 31798 Silverdale Avenue from the Rural 16 Zone (RU 16) and Urban Residential 558 Zone (R558) to the Suburban 36 Zone (S36), be read a first time.
OPPOSED: Councillor Tilbury
CARRIED

15. MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Luck, and
RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:
(a) Regular Council Meeting (for the purpose of going into a Closed meeting) – February 17, 2014; and
(b) Regular Council Meeting – February 17, 2014.
CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That consideration of adopting the minutes of the regular Council meeting held on February 3, 2014 be deferred until staff have the opportunity to amend the Appendix “A” (transcript) portion of those minutes.

CARRIED

16. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

17. MAYOR’S REPORT

The Mayor reported on various activities, meetings and events attended since the last regular Council meeting.

18. MEMBERS’ REPORTS ON COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND ACTIVITIES

Councillors Stevens, Tilbury, Luck, Nundal, Jewell and Hensman reported on various activities, meetings and events attended since the last regular Council meeting.

19. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the public.

20. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Jewell, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 p.m.

WALTER (TED) ADLEM, MAYOR

TINA PENNEY, ACTING CHIEF
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(Acting Corporate Officer)
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION
held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission,
British Columbia, on April 7, 2014 commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Ted Adlem
Councilor Dave Hensman
Councilor Jeff Jewell
Councilor Tony Luck
Councilor Larry Nundal
Councilor Nelson Tilbury

Council Members Absent: Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: Ken Bjorgaard, Chief Administrative Officer
Tina Penney, 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. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of April 7, 2014 be adopted.
CARRIED

3. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Presentation of Certificates of Recognition to Mission’s Athletes
in the BC Winter Games, and
Statement by Simon Gibson, MLA, given in the House
regarding the 2014 BC Winter Games in Mission

Mayor Adlem presented Certificates of recognition and appreciation of outstanding commitment and participation in the 2014 BC Winter Games to:

Tamara Skulstad, gymnastics
Adam Holtby, speed skating
Janie Green, speed skating
Shivani Bahadur, speed skating

Kristofer Unipan, competing in gymnastics, was not able to attend the meeting.
Barclay Pitkethly, Fraser Valley Regional District
Re: Translink Trip Diary Report

Barclay Pitkethly, Director of Regional Programs at Fraser Valley Regional District, appeared before Council to provide information about Translink’s 2011 trip diary survey data for ridership in the Fraser Valley. Mr. Pitkethly showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided information about regional travel trends, changes in traffic volume, and specific trip data for Mission.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5423-2014-5050(135)
(R13-029 – Schell) – a bylaw to rezone property at 12468 Cardinal Street from the Rural 36 (RU36) Zone to the Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 12468 Cardinal Street and legally described as:

- Parcel Identifier: 001-228-498
- Lot 3 Except: Firstly: Part Subdivided by Plan 59264 and Secondly: Part Subdivided by Plan 63951; Section 21 Township 18 New Westminster District Plan 44812

from the Rural 36 (RU36) Zone to the Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) Zone to accommodate a secondary dwelling unit on each lot.

Gina MacKay, Planner, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

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

The Acting Manager of Corporate Administration stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

Steelhead Community Association Board of Directors dated April 4, 2014, putting forward the question of future monitoring concerns for the un-permitted concrete structure referred to in the staff report.

It was noted that full copies of all comments received were available for public viewing at the Public Hearing, and had been previously distributed to Council.

Gord Lawson, Port Coquitlam, stated that he is the owner of the adjacent property and although he has no issue with the current proposal, there was previous damage done to his property when the original concrete foundation was built by the previous owner.
Mr. Lawson expressed concern regarding how the matter had been handled by District staff in the past, and asked Council to provide an assurance that his property issues will be resolved and that he will be kept informed of what is happening.

In response to questions regarding the concrete foundation that was previously built on the subject property without a permit, the Planner stated that before the subdivision can be approved, the applicant will have to either remove the foundation or provide a report with approval from an engineer that the structure is safe for use as a house foundation.

Staff were directed to provide a further report to Council regarding the private property issues.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5423-2014-5050(135) (R13-029 – Schell), closed.

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5424-2014-5050(136)
(R13-033 – Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to rezone property at 33644 Cherry Avenue from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to the Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone

The purpose of the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendment is to rezone the property at 33644 Cherry Avenue and legally described as:

Parcel Identifier: 009-322-051
Lot 10 Section 27 Township17 New Westminster District Plan 24265

from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to the Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone to create four (4) residential compact lots.

Gina MacKay, Planner, showed a PowerPoint presentation that provided the following information:

1. purpose and outline of the proposal;
2. subject property map and site photos;
3. surrounding area designation and lot size;
4. proposed site plan;
5. development and servicing requirements;
6. development variance permit; and
7. land use question.

The Acting Manager of Corporate Administration stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

Shannon Jones, dated March 31, 2014, in opposition to the proposed development and stating various concerns.

Mike and Jaana Critchley, dated April 2, 2014 requesting that the Public Hearing be rescheduled, with a response dated April 3, 2014 from the Acting Manager of Corporate Administration.

Mike and Jaana Critchley, dated April 2, 2014, in opposition to the proposed development and stating various concerns.

Julie Tatla, dated April 4, 2014, in support of the proposed development.
Sherry Johnson, dated April 4, 2014, in support of the proposed development.

Harjinder Gill, dated April 4, 2014, in support of the proposed development.

Chip Gill, dated April 4, 2014, in support of the proposed development.

John G. Tait (and Carol Tait), dated April 1, 2014, in support of the proposed development with comments regarding tree removal. The Taits own the neighbouring property to the east.

It was noted that full copies of all comments received were available for public viewing at the Public Hearing, and had been previously distributed to Council.

Peter Bulla, Mission, stated he supports the application as it fits in with other developments along Cherry Avenue.

In response to Mr. Bulla’s question regarding storm drainage, the Director of Development Services responded that typically storm run-off is directed through rock pits, however in this case the geotechnical engineer has recommended against that practice for this proposal.

Dan McNabb, Mission, stated that he is in favour of the proposal and in favour of the tree removal. Mr. McNabb is the owner of the adjacent property to the west.

Harry Gill, Mission, stated that he is in favour of the application.

Bolvinder Gill, Mission, stated that he is in favour of the application.

Jamie Hayes, Mission, asked if the four new houses would be detached homes, and whether the intention was to sell or rent them out.

Gary Toor, the applicant, replied that the houses would be detached and that they would be listed for sale.

In response to questions from Council regarding lot sizes in the immediately surrounding area, the Planner stated that approximately 50% of surrounding lots are the same size or smaller, and the other 50% same size or larger.

At the request of Council, the Acting Manager of Corporate Administration read out in their entirety the letters from Shannon Jones, Jaana Critchley and John Tait.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Development Services and the Planner responded as follows:

- Additional storm water runoff from the proposed development to the storm sewer system would be negligible.

- Another option for storm water drainage is for the developer to acquire an easement from the owner of the downslope property on Blueberry Drive, or to possibly use amended soil to try to get the water back into the land.

- A covenant that includes geotechnical requirements will be required as part of the subdivision approval for each proposed lot, and will be registered on title to the land.
• There is no tree retention bylaw outside of the Silverdale area.

A point of order regarding process and the timing of Council questions was raised by Councillor Nundal. The Chair allowed the questions from Council to continue.

In response to further questions from Council, the Director of Development Services, the Engineering Technologist and the applicant’s geotechnical engineer responded as follows:

• The Planning Department can send letters to the surrounding neighbours that explains the tree retention/replanting requirements.

• There is a clause in the District’s Soil Removal Bylaw that states a permit is not required if the amount of soil removed from any one parcel of land does not exceed 100 cubic metres in one year.

• Geotechnical engineers have insurance in the amount of $1 million per single incident and $2 million aggregate, which is the industry standard.

Tony Miniaci, Mission, stated that the only soil removed from the subject property was limited to the demolition of the pre-existing house.

The Chief Administrative Officer stated that the District of Mission carries municipal liability insurance, and that if and when claims against the District are commenced, the insurer makes certain that the appropriate parties are held responsible.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5423-2014-5050(135) (R13-029 – Schell), closed.

5. PROCLAMATIONS

May 5 through 11, 2014 as “Mental Health Week”
Mission Mental Health Advisory Committee

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and
RESOLVED: That May 5 through 11, 2014 be proclaimed as “Mental Health Week” within the District of Mission.
CARRIED

6. ADOPTION OF INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Moved by Councillor Luck, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and
RESOLVED: That the following items be received as information:
(a) Mission Institution Report – January and February 2014;
(b) Minutes of the Economic Development Select Committee meeting held on December 18, 2013;
(c) Minutes of the Economic Development Select Committee meeting held on January 16, 2014;
(d) Minutes of the Cultural Resources Commission meeting held on February 14, 2014;
(e) Minutes of the Seniors Centre Task Force meeting held on December 11, 2013; and
(f) Minutes of the Seniors Centre Task Force meeting held on February 25, 2014.
CARRIED

7. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

8. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

2014 Special Occasion Beer Garden License Requests

The Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture noted that since the publication of the staff report dated April 7, 2014, the application from Rockin’ River Productions Inc. to be declared a community special event had been received. The Director asked Council to consider the application from Rockin’ River Productions Inc. in the recommendation along with the other applicants listed in Appendix A to the report.

Moved by Councillor Luck, and
RECOMMENDED: That the events noted in Appendix A, in the report from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture dated April 7, 2014, and circulated to the Committee to Approve Public Events (CAPE), including Rockin’ on the River Music Fest, be declared Community Special Events for the purposes of securing a Special Occasion License from the BC Liquor Control and Licensing Branch.
CARRIED

9. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Appointment of a Council Representative on the Affordable Housing Task Force

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and
RECOMMENDED: That Councillors Jenny Stevens and Tony Luck be appointed to represent Council on the Affordable Housing Task Force.
CARRIED

Business Case for Developing a Seniors Centre

Moved by Councillor Luck, and
RECOMMENDED: That the Business Case for a Seniors Centre, attached as Appendix A to the report from the Director of Long Range Planning and Special Projects dated April 7, 2014, be supported in-principle and that it be used as part of a call for Expressions of Interest from potential development partners who will apply for a $10,000 Canada
Mortgage and Housing grant to undertake a Detailed Feasibility Study.
CARRIED

Development Variance Permit Application DV13-013 (Toor) –
32853 Trenholm Avenue

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and
RECOMMENDED: That Development Variance Permit Application DV13-013 to vary District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009, SECTION 601 RESIDENTIAL COMPACT ZONES, Part F. Floor Space, Subsection 1, by increasing the Maximum Floor Space for the subject property within the Residential Compact 372 (RC372) Zone from 270 sq. m. (2,906 sq. ft.) to 384 sq. m. (4,141 sq. ft.), be approved.
CARRIED

Imposition of Latecomers Charges on Cedar Street and Cameron Avenue

Moved by Councillor Tilbury, and
RECOMMENDED:
1. That latecomer charges, as outlined in the Engineering Technologist’s report dated April 7, 2014, be imposed on the parcels having benefitted from the extended services installed in conjunction with subdivision S11-001;
2. That the 10 year collection period specified in the District of Mission Land Use Policy LAN. 7 be extended to the maximum 15 year collection period specified in section 939 of the Local Government Act; and
3. That the Mayor and Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to enter into a Latecomer Agreement with the owner of the land that is being subdivided or developed.
CARRIED

Telecommunication Tower at 35471 Lougheed Highway

A report from the Manager of Planning dated April 7, 2014 regarding Scott Telecom Services Inc.’s application to Industry Canada to install a telecommunication tower at 35471 Lougheed Highway was provided for the Committee’s information.

Moved by Councillor Hensman, and
RECOMMENDED: That provision of final direction to Scott Telecom Services Inc. on the design of the telecommunications tower at 35471 Lougheed Highway be deferred pending receipt of a design that more closely matches previous directions of Council.

OPPOSED: Councillor Jewell
Councillor Luck
Councillor Nundal
Councillor Tilbury

DEFEATED
Discussion ensued regarding the appearance of the proposed telecommunications tower.
Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED: That staff communicate to Scott Telecom Services Inc. that the alternative tower design as set out on page 122 of the agenda (typical monopole with equipment flush mounted) would be satisfactory to Council.

OPPOSED: Mayor Adlem  
Councillor Hensman  
Councillor Jewell

DEFEATED

A point of clarification was raised about Council’s direction on the proposed telecommunications tower. It was confirmed that staff are directed to advise the proponent that Council would like to see a more aesthetically pleasing tree design, and that the proponent is invited to come back to speak to Council.

Sale of District Road Right of Way – Farrington Street

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:
1. That bylaw #5425-2014 describing the closure of 3,570 square metres of Farrington Street right of way outlined on the plan attached as Appendix 1 to the planner’s report dated April 7, 2014 be considered for first, second and third readings;
2. That subsequent to the bylaw readings, staff give public notice pursuant to sections 26(1)(3) and 94 of the Community Charter identifying the land, the purchaser of the land and the agreed upon consideration of the land, in the April 11th and April 18th, 2014 issues of the Mission Record; and
3. That the bylaw be brought forward, together with any comments received, for final reading on April 22, 2014.

CARRIED

Rezoning Application R14-002 (George) – 8260 Peacock Street

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:
1. That a bylaw be prepared to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by rezoning the property located at 8260 Peacock Street from Urban Residential 465 Zone (R465) to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (R465s);
2. That the bylaw be considered for first and second readings at the regular Council meeting on April 7, 2014;
3. That following these readings, the bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on April 22, 2014; and
4. That the final reading of the zoning amending bylaw be held until the following have been satisfied:
a) BC Building Code requirements as outlined in Appendix 4 attached to the report from the planner dated April 7, 2014, are addressed to the satisfaction of the District’s Building Inspector; and

b) That the applicant pays for and installs a residential water meter.

CARRIED

Rezoning Application R14-003 (District of Mission) – Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment to Increase the Maximum Permitted Lot Coverage for Existing Undersized lots within the Urban Residential Area

Moved by Councillor Hensman, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That a bylaw be prepared to amend the text of District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by adding to:
   a) Section 501 URBAN RESIDENTIAL ZONES, Part E Lot Coverage; the following provision:
      “2. Notwithstanding Section 501 part E.1, where a Lot in the Urban Residential area existed prior to 1980 and has Lot Area less than 465 sq. m (5,005 sq. ft.), the Lot Coverage may be increased to 45%.”
   b) Section 501 URBAN RESIDENTIAL ZONES, Part F Floor Space; the following provision:
      “3. Notwithstanding Section 501 part F.1, where a Lot in the Urban Residential area existed prior to 1980 and has Lot Area less than 465 sq. m (5,005 sq. ft.), the Floor Space Ratio may be increased to 0.70.”
   c) Section 502 URBAN RESIDENTIAL SECONDARY DWELLING ZONES, Part E Lot Coverage; the following provision:
      “2. Notwithstanding Section 502 part E.1, where a Lot in the Urban Residential area existed prior to 1980 and has Lot Area less than 465 sq. m (5,005 sq. ft.), the Lot Coverage may be increased to 45%.”
   d) Section 502 URBAN RESIDENTIAL SECONDARY DWELLING ZONES, Part F Floor Space; the following provision:
      “3. Notwithstanding Section 502 Part F.1, where a Lot in the Urban Residential area existed prior to 1980 and has Lot Area less than 465 sq. m (5,005 sq. ft.), the Floor Space Ratio may be increased to 0.70.”

2. That the bylaw be considered for first and second readings at the regular Council meeting on April 7, 2014; and

3. That following these readings, the bylaw be forwarded to a Public Hearing on April 22, 2014.

OPPOSED: Councillor Jewell

CARRIED
Summary of Public Information Meeting regarding a proposal to develop two Rural Residential properties located at 8977 and 8990 West Edwards Street into Urban Residential

A report from the Manager of Planning dated April 7, 2014 with a summary of the public information meeting held regarding a proposal to develop two Rural Residential properties located at 8977 and 8990 West Edwards Street into Urban Residential was provided for the Committee’s information.

Moved by Councillor Luck, and

RECOMMENDED: That staff continue to process (initiate interdepartmental and external agency review) Official Community Plan Bylaw Amendment Application R13-027 and prepare a report along with the associated rezoning application submission that introduces Official Community Plan and Zone Amending Bylaws for urban development on the subject properties located at 8977 and 8990 West Edwards Street and that the report include recommendations to move the Bylaws to 1st Reading and a subsequent Public Hearing.

OPPOSED: Mayor Adlem
Councillor Hensman
Councillor Nundal

DEFEATED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That staff continue to process (initiate interdepartmental and external agency review) Official Community Plan Bylaw Amendment Application R13-027 and prepare a report for the associated rezoning application submission that introduces a Zone Amending Bylaw for urban development on the subject properties located at 8977 and 8990 West Edwards Street and that the report include recommendations to move the Bylaw to 1st Reading and a subsequent Public Hearing;

2. That a bylaw be prepared to amend District of Mission Official Community Plan Bylaw 4052-2008 by amending OCP Map 1 to re-designate the portions of property located at 8977 and 8990 West Edwards Street, identified as Area “A” on Appendix F in the report from the Manager of Planning dated April 7, 2014 from Rural Residential to Urban Residential.

3. That the Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw be considered for 1st reading at the regular Council meeting on April 7, 2014.

4. That upon due consideration of Sections 879 and 881 of the Local Government Act, and in accordance to Council Policy LAN. 47, consultation referrals will be forwarded to:
   a. Fraser Valley Regional District;
   b. First Nations;
   c. School District No. 75;
   d. Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection;
   e. Department of Fisheries and Oceans;
   f. Land Reserve Commission;
g. Utility Companies; and
that the persons, organizations and authorities receiving those consultation referrals are considered to be those affected for the purposes of this Policy; and

5. That after 1st reading of the Official Community Plan Amending Bylaw and prior to adoption, Council consider the financial implications of the proposal in accordance with Section 882 of the *Local Government Act*. 

Discussion ensued regarding the options before Council pertaining to the proposed development and regarding the public hearing process in general.

A point of order was raised, and the Chair allowed the discussion to continue.

The Chair called the question on the recommendation and the motion was voted on.

The motion was CARRIED with opposition noted as follows:

OPPOSED: Councillor Jewell
Councillor Tilbury

**Clarification of Roadwork Requirements of the Subdivision Control Bylaw**

A report from the Engineering Technologist dated April 7, 2014 regarding the road work requirements for rezoning applications under the Subdivision Control Bylaw was provided for the Committee’s information.

**Developer Presentations as Part of First Reading Reports**

A report from the Director of Development Services dated April 7, 2014 regarding the opportunities available to developers to present information to Council as part of staff’s first reading reports, and prior to the close of the public hearing process, was provided for the Committee’s information.

**Fraser Basin Council Request for Funds for Fraser River Regional Flood Management Strategy**

A report from the Director of Development Services dated April 7, 2014 regarding the Fraser Basin Council request for funds for the Fraser River Regional Flood Management Strategy was provided for the Committee’s information.

Councillor Luck excused himself from the meeting at 8:56 p.m. to attend to a personal matter.

Mayor Adlem called for a five minute recess at 8:59 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:03 p.m.

Moved by Councillor Jewell, and

RECOMMENDED: That the Mayor and Chief Administrative Officer meet with the Fraser
Basin Council and be granted authorization to contribute up to $2,000 to the proposed Fraser River Regional Flood Management Strategy on behalf of the District of Mission, at their discretion.

**OPPOSED:** Mayor Adlem  
Councillor Hensman  
Councillor Nundal

**DEFEATED**

**RC14/262**  
APR. 07/14

**Excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on November 26, 2012 and related Staff Report dated November 5, 2012 (R12-026 – Perkin)**

An excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on November 26, 2012 and a copy of the related staff report dated November 5, 2012 was provided to the Committee as background information to assist in the consideration of adoption of Zoning Amending Bylaw 5320-2012-5050(90), for the property at 13169 Bell Street.

**RC14/263**  
APR. 07/14

**Excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on January 21, 2013 and related Staff Report dated January 7, 2013 (R12-033 – Welch Avenue Quarry Co.)**

An excerpt from the Minutes of the Public Hearing held on January 21, 2013 and a copy of the related staff report dated January 7, 2013 was provided to the Committee as background information to assist in the consideration of adoption of Zoning Amending Bylaw 5341-2013-5050(98), for the property at 32900 Welch Avenue.

**10. CORPORATE SERVICES**

**RC14/264**  
APR. 07/14

**Council Chambers’ Sound System**

A report from the Acting Assistant Manager of Corporate Services dated April 7, 2014 regarding various issues relating to the Council Chambers sound system and web stream audio was provided for the Committee's information.

**RC14/265**  
APR. 07/14

**Resolution Released from Closed Council - 2014 Community Service Awards**

The following resolutions were released from the March 3, 2014 Closed Council meeting:

1. That Brian Antonson and Pam Alexis, as the President and the Vice President of the BC Winter Games Board and the driving force behind the 2014 BC Winter Games, each be awarded an Exceptional Accomplishment and Leadership Award;

2. That the 2014 BC Winter Games Directors (including the Ambassador at Large) and Directorate Chairs each be awarded a Special Accomplishment Award in recognition of all of the time and effort that they put into ensuring that the 2014 BC Winter Games were a tremendous success;

3. That, notwithstanding District of Mission policies AWA.04 – Sports Hall of Fame and AWA.05 – Sports Hall of Fame Procedure, the 2014 BC Winter
Games Board and the 2014 BC Winter Games Directorate Chairs be inducted into the District of Mission Sports Hall of Fame at the May 31, 2014 Community Service Awards Ceremony, in recognition of their efforts in organizing a Gold Medal event for Sports in the Province of British Columbia;

4. That Laura Laidlaw be awarded an Against the Odds Achievement Award in recognition of 12 years of volunteerism at Family Place and Family Tree House and for her efforts as a spokeswoman for people living with cerebral palsy;

5. That Cycling4Diversity Foundation be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of their efforts to encourage intercultural relationships and combat racism by educating students and citizens on the benefits of embracing cultural diversity in our schools and communities;

6. That Marilynne Davis be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of her volunteer efforts on behalf of All Saints Church, Mission Community Services, the Business and Professional Women’s Club, Mission Heritage Park, and many other organizations within the community;

7. That Jane Donatelli be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of over three decades of volunteerism in the community and, in particular, at Silverdale Elementary School;

8. That John and Linda Fisher be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of their volunteerism at Christine Morrison Hospice, and for their many efforts to bring comfort and joy to others during challenging times;

9. That Lou Foster be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of his willingness to help others and for his volunteerism with Mission Adopt-A-Block Society and at Mission Heritage Park;

10. That Danny Plecas be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of his extensive efforts as a volunteer, which include but are not limited to his involvement with the Pleasant View Housing Society, the Mission Association for Seniors Housing, the Mission Literacy in Motion Association, Mission Community Services, and Lifetime Learning;

11. That Sophie Zehner be awarded a Community Service Award in recognition of her efforts on behalf of the Mission Old Age Pensioner’s Organization Branch #28, the Mission Seniors Centre Association, the Ukrainian Church and Hall, and her work as an advocate for seniors within the community;

12. That Jamie Nokes be awarded a Crime Prevention and Community Safety Award in recognition of his tireless efforts as a volunteer with the Auxiliary Constable Program at the Mission Detachment of the RCMP;

13. That Doug Olund be awarded a Crime Prevention and Safety Award in recognition of his volunteer efforts while a member of the Mission Fire Department (44 years of service), during which time he has volunteered for almost every community event associated with the department, including Muscular Dystrophy fundraising, Fire Safety Week events, truck displays at schools and businesses, Remembrance Day celebrations, and
Christmas Parade events;

14. That the Seniors Centre Task Force be awarded a Special Accomplishment Award in recognition of the leadership and tireless dedication of its members on behalf of the District of Mission and its seniors’ community;

15. That Siwal Si’wes Advisory Council be awarded a Special Accomplishment Award in recognition of its efforts to improve educational opportunities for aboriginal students and help foster an awareness of and respect for all Aboriginal people;

16. That, in recognition of the 100th anniversary of Guiding in Mission, the Mission Girl Guides be awarded the Long Term Distinguished Service Award;

17. That Dan Williams be awarded a Community Service Award (Sports) in recognition of his tireless efforts on behalf of the Mission Minor Baseball Association and the Challenger Program (for those with special needs);

18. That Marion Buker be awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition of her volunteerism on behalf of many community organizations over the years, including: the Girl Guides (Brownie Leader), the Mission Hospital Auxiliary, and the Cancer Society (fundraising);

19. That Mike Freeman be awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition of over three decades of volunteerism on behalf of the Mission Minor Softball Association;

20. That Mona Freeman be awarded a Lifetime Achievement Award in recognition of over three decades of volunteerism on behalf of the Mission Minor Softball Association;

21. That Bob Ingram be awarded the Citizen of the Year Award in recognition of his leadership and his volunteer efforts on behalf of a myriad of community groups, including: the Seniors Centre Association, the Mission Association of Seniors Housing Board, and the Mission Community Services Society Board of Directors (Chair), and the Seniors Centre Task Force; and

22. That Ron Leger be awarded the Freeman of the City Award in recognition of his outstanding dedication and lifelong service to the community.

11. RESOLUTION TO RISE AND REPORT

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That the Committee of the Whole now rise and report.
CARRIED

12. ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in
items RC14/247 to RC14/265, except items RC14/256 (zoning bylaw text amendment),
RC14/258 (proposed West Edwards development) and RC14/261 (Fraser Basin Council),
be adopted.
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in
item RC14/256 (zoning bylaw text amendment), be adopted.
OPPOSED: Councillor Jewell
Councillor Tilbury
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in
item RC14/258 (proposed West Edwards development), be adopted.
OPPOSED: Councillor Jewell
Councillor Tilbury
CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Jewell, seconded by Councillor Tilbury, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole, as contained in
item RC14/261 (Fraser Basin Council), be adopted.
OPPOSED: Mayor Adlem
Councillor Hensman
Councillor Nundal
CARRIED

13. BYLAWS

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED:
1. That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5423-2014-5050(135), a bylaw to
rezone property at 12468 Cardinal Street from the Rural 36 (RU36) Zone to the
Rural 16 Secondary Dwelling (RU16s) Zone, be read a third time; and

2. That the final reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw be held until the following have
been satisfied:
   a. the community amenity contribution in the amount of $2,815 is received; and
   b. any other items that Council may require resulting from the Public Hearing or
      Council consideration of the application.
CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED:

1. That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5424-2014-5050(136), a bylaw to rezone property at 33644 Cherry Avenue from the Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to the Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone, be read a third time; and

2. That the final reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw be held until the following have been satisfied:
   a. the community amenity contribution in the amount of $8,445 ($2,815 per new lot) is received;
   b. the servicing requirements, have been addressed to the satisfaction of the District’s Engineer; and
   c. any other items that Council may require resulting from the Public Hearing or Council consideration of the application.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED:

1. That District of Mission 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) and Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to Rural Residential 7 Zone (RR7) and Suburban 36 Zone (S36), be read a third time; and

2. That the final reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw be held until the following requirement(s) have been satisfied:
   a. the community amenity contribution in the amount of $2,815 (per newly created lot) is received.

OPPOSED: Councillor Tilbury

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5320-2012-5050(90), a bylaw to rezone property at 13169 Bell Street from Rural 16 Zone (RU16) to Rural Residential 7 Zone (RR7), be adopted.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5341-2013-5050(98), a bylaw to rezone property at 32900 Welch Avenue from Rural 80 Zone (RU80) to Industrial Resource Extraction Zone (INR), be adopted.

CARRIED
Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Highway Closing and Undedication (Farrington Street) Bylaw 5425-2014, a bylaw to close and undedicate an unconstructed portion of Farrington Street, be read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5427-2014-5050(137), a bylaw to rezone property at 8260 Peacock Street from Urban Residential 465 Zone (R465) to Urban Residential 465 Secondary Dwelling Zone (R465s), be read a first and second time.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5428-2014-5050(138), a text amendment to increase the maximum permitted lot coverage for existing undersized lots within the Urban Residential Area, be read a first and second time.

OPPOSED: Councillor Jewell

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Nundal, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That District of Mission OCP Amending Bylaw 5429-2014-4052(33), a bylaw to redesignate portions of property at 8977 and 8980 West Edwards Street from Rural Residential to Urban Residential, be read a first time.

OPPOSED: Councillor Jewell
          Councillor Tilbury

CARRIED

Discussion ensued regarding various aspects of the proposed development, including potential servicing, amenities and the timing of construction. It was noted that information regarding the possibility of a phased development agreement would be included in a subsequent staff report.

14. MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Regular Council Meeting (for the purposes of going into a Closed meeting) – March 17, 2014; and

(b) Regular Council Meeting – March 17, 2014.

CARRIED
15. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Jewell at 9:26 p.m., and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be extended past 9:30 p.m. until all items of business have been concluded.

OPPOSED: Councillor Nundal
          Councillor Tilbury

CARRIED

16. MAYOR’S REPORT

The Mayor reported on various activities, meetings and events attended since the last regular Council meeting.

17. MEMBERS’ REPORTS ON COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND ACTIVITIES

Councillors Tilbury, Jewell and Hensman reported on various activities, meetings and events attended since the last regular Council meeting.

18. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the public.

19. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

WALTER (TED) ADLEM, MAYOR
      KEN BJORGAARD, CHIEF
      ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
      (Interim Corporate Officer)
Minutes of the SPECIAL 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 Wednesday, April 9, 2014 commencing at 3:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Ted Adlem
Councillor Dave Hensman
Councillor Jeff Jewell
Councillor Tony Luck
Councillor Larry Nundal
Councillor Nelson Tilbury

Council Members Absent: Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present: Ken Bjorgaard, Chief Administrative Officer
Tina Penney, 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 Hensman, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and

RESOLVED: That, pursuant to Sections 90 and 92 of the Community Charter, this Special Meeting of Council be closed to the public as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:

- Section 90(1)(a) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality;
- Section 90(1)(b) of the Community Charter – personal information about an identifiable individual who is being considered for a municipal award or honour, or who has offered to provide a gift to the municipality on condition of anonymity;
- Section 90(1)(c) of the Community Charter – labour relations or other employee relations;
- Section 90(1)(e) of the Community Charter – the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality;
- Section 90(1)(f) of the Community Charter – law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the conduct of an investigation under or enforcement of an enactment; and
- Section 90(1)(k) of the Community Charter – negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are
at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public.

CARRIED

3. **RECESS TO CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING**

   SC(C)14/008
   APR. 9/14

   The meeting recessed at 3:00 p.m.

4. **RECONVENE TO SPECIAL MEETING OF COUNCIL**

   SC(C)14/009
   APR. 9/14

   The meeting reconvened at 3:06 p.m.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

   SC(C)14/010
   APR. 9/14

   The meeting adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

_________________________        _____________________________________
WALTER (TED) ADLEM      KEN BJORGAARD
MAYOR  CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(Interim Corporate Officer)
Minutes of the SPECIAL 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 Thursday, April 17, 2014 commencing at 4:33 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

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order.

2. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC

Moved by Councillor Hensman, seconded by Councillor Stevens, and
RESOLVED: That, pursuant to Sections 90 and 92 of the Community Charter, this Special Meeting of Council be closed to the public as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:
- Section 90(1)(c) of the Community Charter – labour relations or other employee relations.

CARRIED

3. RECESS TO CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING

The meeting recessed at 4:34 p.m.

4. RECONVENE TO SPECIAL MEETING OF COUNCIL

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Nundal, and
RESOLVED: That the meeting be reconvened.

CARRIED

The meeting reconvened at 6:26 p.m.
5. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Councillor Stevens, seconded by Councillor Hensman, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

_________________________        _____________________________________
WALTER (TED) ADLEM      KEN BJORGAARD
MAYOR                  CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
(Interim Corporate Officer)