

DISTRICT OF SAANICH  
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**MONDAY, JULY 20, 2015 AT 7:00 PM**

Present:           **Chair:**       Mayor Atwell  
                  **Council:**   Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Haynes, Plant, Sanders and Wergeland  
                  **Staff:**       Andy Laidlaw, Chief Administrative Officer (7:06 pm); Sharon Hvozanski, Director of Planning; Valla Tinney, Director of Finance; Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

Minutes           **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That Council adopt the minutes of the July 7, 2015 Special Council meeting and the July 13, 2015 Council and Committee of the Whole meetings.”**

**CARRIED**

Public Input on   **PUBLIC INPUT ON COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS**  
Council Agenda  
Items

1310-40  
CRD Sewage  
  
5280-20  
Budget Guidelines

T. Rose, Beckton Road:  
Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy  
- At least 20 acres is needed for a sewage treatment plant; potential sites are available on Elk and Beaver Lake lands.  
- The lands available on Elk and Beaver Lake are not in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), are accessible, isolated and are publically-owned; a single-site solution with multiple modular units is preferable.  
- Two units should be built as pilot projects and other units built over the years allowing for a staggered investment; the pipeline should be above ground along Highway 1 or 17 and covered with an earth berm.

B. Furber, Arbutus Road:  
Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy  
- The property is not being used for farming and is not arable; the applicant is not asking to remove the property from the ALR.  
- The Capital Regional District (CRD) will review properties and evaluate whether or not they are technically feasible; as part of the selection process of the CRD, further public input will take place.  
- The CRD should be the ones to decide whether the site is feasible.

H. Charania, Genevieve Road:  
Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy; Privately Owned Sewage Treatment Sites; and 2016 Budget Guidelines  
- Land use management is guided by the Official Community Plan (OCP), ALR and the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB); public works and infrastructure projects are often exempted from these constraints.  
- The length and size of pipes and associated energy costs are a concern; the potential costs of archeological work should be a factor in a decision.

- The potential for greenhouses and use of renewal energy are appreciated; the site may be feasible for a decentralized sewage treatment plant.
- Discussion should take place on options B and C of the 2016 Budget Guidelines; status quo is not recommended.

A. House, Erskine Way:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The property is in the ALR and is not zoned for industrial use; it is in close proximity to residences, an elementary school, Ronald McDonald House, Victoria General Hospital, a protected wetland, and a multi-use commercial/residential development; the impact of a sewage treatment plant on neighbouring properties should be considered.
- If the land is put forward to the CRD, the Eastside Select Committee will review and residents in the Westside may not have the opportunity to provide feedback.
- Council should reinforce the previous decision made not to forward the site for consideration.

E. Dahli, on behalf of the Cadboro Bay Residents Association:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The Residents Association supports the property being considered as a candidate for a sewage treatment plant.

S. Henry, Holland Avenue:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The resolution is contrary to the OCP and threatens the continuation and reason for the UCB; it is imperative to maintain agricultural land.
- The addition of greenhouses on the property will not ensure food security; precedence may be set for removing agricultural land from the ALR.
- Council should reject this resolution; it jeopardizes the protection of farmland and environmentally sensitive areas.

B. Loucks, Glendenning Road:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- Protecting the ALR is necessary; the public perception is that a sewage treatment project will have an environmental benefit; using ALR land for a sewage plant reduces the likelihood that this will be achieved.
- The CRD decided that ALR land should be excluded from consideration for a treatment site.

V. Husband, Sea View Road:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The ALR, OCP and Regional Growth Strategy are planning instruments; food growing lands need to be protected even if they are not currently in production.
- The Watkiss Way site should not be considered for sewage treatment; precedence may be set in removing land from the ALR.
- Development should be kept within the UCB.

**B. Little, Esquimalt:**Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- A decision is not being made tonight to use the site for sewage treatment; the decision being considered tonight is to send the site to the CRD for consideration.
- The property is in a centralized location within the region and is near an existing sewer line; there is the potential for resource recovery.
- The owner is amenable to the site being used; the public should have a chance to discuss whether this site is feasible.

**J. Farquharson, Director, Sewage Treatment Action Group:**Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy; CRD Referral – Publicly Owned Sewage Treatment Sites; Privately Owned Sewage Treatment Sites

- Almost 1,000 residents provided comments in relation to a sewage treatment strategy; the public who provided input did not have the necessary information required to evaluate the sites.
- Residents have asked that no more sites be forwarded to the CRD until technical analysis is available.

**K. Whitcroft, Inverness Road:**Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy; Privately Owned Sewage Treatment Sites; 2016 Budget Guidelines

- Pipes for sewage treatment should be under urban centres and could potentially re-energize resource recovery.
- Privately owned sites should not be considered.
- In relation to the Budget Guidelines, additional revenue may be generated by enforcing the requirement for occupancy permits for secondary suites.

**A. Rawes, South Valley Drive:**Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The property should be forwarded to the CRD for consideration; the process should be respected.
- Evaluation of sites is the responsibility of the CRD; given the comments of the public, the risk of the CRD selecting this site for a treatment plant is low.
- This may not be the best use of the land; it is in the ALR.
- Creating a park on this property would preserve the tree canopy; other uses for the site could be explored.
- This site should be sent to the CRD in the interest of transparency and respect for the process but Council can indicate that they are opposed to the selection of the site and provide reasons.

**B. Lake, Bearwood Court:**Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The ALR contains appropriate and inappropriate land for farming; there is productive agricultural land outside the UCB that could be considered for inclusion in the ALR.
- Consideration of Watkiss Way is supportable; if the site is removed from the ALR, other properties that are productive could be added.

R. Parks, representing the owner of Watkiss Way property:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The owner has not requested that the property be removed from the ALR; the owner will work with Saanich to find land suitable for farming to be included in the ALR.
- Soil reports show that the property is non-arable; the addition of greenhouses on the property will increase food production.
- The property is located in the centre of the region's infrastructure; Vancouver Island Health Authority (VIHA) and First Nations support consideration of the site.

M. Todd, Blue Ridge Place:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- Agricultural land in the region is decreasing; Saanich should demonstrate their commitment to preserving agricultural land and not forward this property for consideration.

R. Boyd, Lynnfield Crescent:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- There is a risk to future generations if properties with merit are not considered.

D. Dickson, Monarch Place:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy; Privately Owned Sewage Treatment Sites

- Council should reconsider sending the site to the CRD; sending the property supports a transparent process.

M. Najari, Leeds Place:

CRD Referral – Publicly Owned Sewage Treatment Sites; Privately Owned Sewage Treatment Sites

- Residents need to be given the proper information to make decisions; the public cannot select sites until they know what kind of system will be used.
- Knowing what the footprint will be may help with the selection of appropriate sites.

J. Lubick, Maxine Lane:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The property should be considered; this is farmland that is not arable.
- A lot of money has already been spent on the CRD sewage treatment project with nothing to show for it; we need to look outside the box.

A. Bickerton, Burnside Road West:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- There are other greenhouses in the neighbourhood; the property should be considered by the CRD although it is doubtful that it will be selected.
- Because of drought conditions, wells are drying out in the area; a sewage treatment plant in the neighbourhood would allow the water to be put back in the ground.

B. Williamson, Eldon Place:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- It is too early in the process to decide not to use this property; there will be other opportunities in the process to make decisions.
- Experts should be given the opportunity to evaluate the property.

K. Whitworth, Viewmont Avenue:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- Sending the Watkiss Way property for consideration is not supportable; due process has taken place through CRD Open Houses, workshops and web polls.
- Future use of the property should be considered; precedence may be set for removing land from the ALR.
- The Eastside Select Committee has made their decision and chosen sites; Saanich sits on this committee and should uphold their decision.
- Mayor Atwell and Councillor Haynes may have a conflict of interest because they received campaign funds from the owner of this property.

P. Ferguson, Quadra Street:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- Consideration of this site makes sense; it needs to be judged on its' own merits and against other sites being considered.

P. Whitworth, Viewmont Avenue:

Watkiss Way Sewage Treatment Strategy

- The proposal to consider Watkiss Way is ill-conceived; to establish a sewage treatment plant on this location would require removing the land from the ALR, moving the UCB to include the land and having the property rezoned from agricultural to industrial use.
- There would be no way to ensure that the land will not be used for further urban growth; further densification in this location is not supportable.
- There are other landowners that may wish to remove their properties from the ALR; this is precedence-setting.

## RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

### **WATKISS WAY SEWAGE TREATMENT STRATEGY**

In accordance with Section 9 of the Council Procedure Bylaw, Mayor Atwell is returning for Council reconsideration, the following resolution defeated at the June 22, 2015 Council meeting: *"That the Watkiss Way site be considered as a candidate for the pending Capital Regional District (CRD) Waste Water Management Treatment project."*

Mayor Atwell stated:

- After examination of the public reaction to the previous decision of Council, he elected to bring this item back to Council for reconsideration; it is the prerogative of the Mayor to bring an item back to Council.
- The Saanich Peninsula Plant is on former ALR land which was non-productive; this site has the potential for being a candidate for a decentralized site and would not require a long, expensive pipe coming from the harbour.

1310-40  
CRD Sewage

- It is close to the Marigold Pump Station and the new Craigflower Pump Station; Victoria General Hospital is across the street from this property and is considered an industrial site.
- If this site is forwarded for consideration, experts will determine the value of the property and its future potential.

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That the Watkiss Way site be considered as a candidate for the pending Capital Regional District (CRD) Waste Water Management Treatment project."**

Councillor Haynes stated:

- A conflict of interest does not exist.
- The land is not being removed from the ALR; the best use of land in the ALR is for food production.
- Forwarding the site to the CRD for consideration will let residents provide feedback and experts be given the opportunity to review.

Councillor Derman stated:

- 43 sites were put forward by Saanich to the CRD for consideration; the ALR and UCB are factors that need to be considered.
- Land in the ALR is not under the direct control of Council or the owner; the ALC does not automatically approve removal of land from the ALR therefore it is unsure if the land is available.
- The site does not meet the criteria required to be a candidate for a sewage plant.

Councillor Brice stated:

- 43 technically feasible sites have been forwarded to the CRD for consideration; the CRD has multiple options being considered for both centralized and decentralized systems.
- OCP policies protect agricultural land for current and future generations.
- Preparation of the OCP policies included extensive public consultation.

In response to questions from Council, the Legislative Manager stated:

- Council Procedure Bylaw, 2015, No. 9321 identifies three opportunities for reconsideration of a matter, two of which are required to take place within a 30 day timeline; an applicant can request reconsideration under the appeal procedures.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Due to public perception, it may have been better if the applicant would have brought this item back for reconsideration; the Eastside Select Committee has only considered which locations would be physically feasible for a sewage plant.
- It is not the intention to remove the land from the ALR; a number of sites being considered will require rezoning.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- This site was not selected because it is not technically feasible; public consultation has already taken place on the selected sites; centralized sites have been chosen by the Eastside Select Committee.
- Watkiss Way wasn't selected to be put forward; the OCP supports the ALR and UCB as significant policies.
- She does not support reconsideration of the motion.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- ALR lands should be protected; the property is outside the UCB; changing the UCB would require a referendum.
- Industrial use on this property is not supportable; the site was considered and deemed not technically feasible.
- Public consultation has taken place; the owner could consider putting greenhouses on the land now to make it productive.

Councillor Plant stated:

- The site should be sent to the CRD to allow public input; other sites have been eliminated based upon feedback from the public.
- Not considering this property would be a disservice to residents; the site could be considered as part of a distributed system.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Privately owned sites were not considered by Council; Watkiss Way should be reviewed by experts for feasibility.
- Other sites that do not meet the selection criteria are being considered; the criteria for selecting sites varies between municipalities.
- The addition of greenhouses and the potential of resource recovery would be a net gain for the area.
- The UCB is discontinuous; there are other properties that are located along the border of the UCB that are not included in the UCB.

**The Motion was DEFEATED  
with Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman and Sanders OPPOSED**

1310-40  
CRD Sewage

#### **CRD REFERRAL – PUBLICLY OWNED SEWAGE TREATMENT SITES**

Report of the Director of Engineering dated July 16, 2015 requesting Council indicate their support for any or all of the suggested sites for inclusion in a distributed treatment plan option by the CRD's Eastside Select Committee.

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That Council submit the three sites: Marigold Pump Station (901 Marigold Avenue), Penrhyn Pump Station (2620 Sinclair Road) and an area of the helicopter landing pad and a portion of the parking lot at the Royal Jubilee Hospital (2355 Richmond Road) for inclusion in a distributed treatment plan option by the Capital Regional District's Eastside Select Committee."**

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The three sites were put forward as a result of public consultation.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Engineering stated:

- The request for these sites to be included came from the CRD; discussion has not taken place with the Royal Jubilee Hospital.
- Analysis has not been done in terms of the effect on Bowker Creek.

Councillor Derman stated:

- CRD pump sites were not considered in the original site selection process because it was assumed that since the CRD controlled them, the sites would not require rezoning; they already have sewer infrastructure on them.
- They may be viable sites for a distributive system; if Vancouver Island Health Authority (VIHA) decides they do not want the Hospital considered as an option, it won't be.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Preliminary discussions have taken place with VIHA.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

1310-40  
CRD Sewage

#### **PRIVATELY OWNED SEWAGE TREATMENT SITES**

Report of the Director of Engineering dated July 16, 2015 requesting direction on whether any of the privately owned sites should be presented to Council for consideration and possibly be forwarded to the Eastside Selection Committee.

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That the privately owned site on the 4300 block of Interurban Road be forwarded to the Capital Regional District (CRD) for consideration as a location for a potential waste water treatment plant."**

Councillor Plant stated:

- This land is not in the ALR and is approximately five hectares; it could be considered as a location for a distributive system.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The CRD has identified sites to be considered; the scope of the investigation should not be narrowed.
- Private industry should be asked for viable solutions for waste water treatment; it may be possible to offset costs of treatment through resource recovery.
- Every viable solution should be explored.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Options will be brought forward by Urban Systems and will be presented for public consultation; the deadline for submissions is past.
- Other available sites could be considered in the future.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- In the previous sewage treatment process, there were issues finding an appropriate site; sending an extra site may be the saving solution.
- It is up to the professionals to evaluate sites for feasibility.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The sites that have been forwarded for consideration have been through a public consultation process; the public has not had the opportunity to comment on this site.



Councillor Derman stated:

- The private sector should be canvassed to come up with solutions and asked if they can recommend better sites.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The request was received after the deadline for submissions.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- There was a deadline for submission and it is past; public consultation has already been done on the other sites.

Councillor Derman stated:

- A request for Expressions of Interest will be done, will include a list of the selected sites and will ask companies to provide the best possible solution; competitive negotiation will ensure the private sector is canvassed.
- There may be an opportunity to look at different sites at this point.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The Eastside Select Committee set the deadline for submissions; the sites selected have already gone through a public consultation process.
- Sending this site forward may open the door for more sites to be considered.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- The deadline was the same for the three publicly owned properties that Council has voted to send to the CRD; the public has not had the chance to comment on those publicly owned properties.

Councillor Plant stated:

- There is no harm in sending sites forward after the deadline; the experts will know if the sites meet the criteria.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Engineering stated:

- The Marigold Pump Station is the closest trunk system to this property.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The deadline for submissions is past; no public consultation has taken place for this property.

**The Motion was DEFEATED  
With Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Sanders and Wergeland  
OPPOSED**

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That any additional properties that come forward for consideration will be sent directly to the Capital Regional District (CRD)."**

Mayor Atwell stated:

- The CRD has agreed by motion that sites will not come directly to the CRD; this motion would amend the CRD process.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Engineering stated:

- An area near the University of Victoria was put forward for consideration.

Councillor Plant stated:

- There are other areas near University of Victoria that may be considered and this motion would restrict that.

**The Motion was DEFEATED  
With Mayor Atwell and Councillors Brownoff, Derman, Haynes, Plant,  
Sanders and Wergeland OPPOSED**

5280-20  
Legal Budget

### **2015 LEGAL BUDGET AND ACTUALS**

Report of the Director of Finance dated July 10, 2015 recommending Council receive the report for information.

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That the report of the Director of Finance dated July 10, 2015 be received for information.”**

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Finance stated:

- Currently, there is no full time lawyer on staff; the budget for Legal Services during the years that there was a full time lawyer on staff was approximately \$200,000.
- In 2014, legal fees exceeded the \$200,000 budget.
- A number of different legal counsel are used.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

5280-20  
Budget Guidelines

### **2016 BUDGET GUIDELINES**

Report of the Director of Finance dated July 14, 2015 recommending Council provide direction to staff regarding the 2016 Financial Plan.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Finance stated:

- The report is intended to give Council the opportunity to deliberate on the 2016 budget process; staff are looking for direction to proceed.
- Budget guidelines options are provided for discussion.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Imposing a budget cap may result in a reduction of services; obtaining public feedback via a survey should be considered.

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That in advance of considering the budget guidelines options, a public engagement process to review services and service levels be undertaken through a survey and other means to obtain public input.”**

Councillor Plant stated:

- Town Hall meetings in the Fall explaining the pros and cons of a budget cap should be considered as opposed to a survey; making a decision on the budget guidelines options now is too early.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Town Hall meetings could be considered in addition to a survey; some residents may not be comfortable speaking in front of an audience.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Council has to be prepared to make hard decisions if that is the wish of residents.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- It could be a challenge getting public consultation done to coincide with the budget cycle.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Finance stated:

- A report on Public Participation for the Financial Plan is forthcoming; public participation will educate residents on how decisions could impact services.
- The report will outline what public participation could look like and what the capabilities of current staffing are given other significant projects.

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Derman: “That further consideration of the 2016 Budget Guidelines and the engagement process for the Financial Plan be postponed pending receipt of the report from the Director of Finance.”**

Councillor Derman stated:

- Education will be an important aspect of the public participation process; the public values the services that the municipality provides.
- It is important to find out the needs of the public.

Councillor Plant stated:

- Scheduling three public meetings gives staff direction on how Council wishes to proceed; deferring this item may result in not meeting budget timelines.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Finance stated:

- Current Council policy states that public input into the budget process will take place.

**The Motion to Postpone was CARRIED  
with Mayor Atwell and Councillors Plant and Wergeland OPPOSED**

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Finance stated:

- Historically, budget guidelines are established in June.
- Departments are waiting for a decision from Council to begin budget preparation.
- Setting budget caps is challenging; in previous years, reduction scenarios were developed.
- Public process will include the options for reductions.
- If reductions are identified as a result of public participation, changes may not be able to be made until 2017.
- A joint Council and Police Board meeting to discuss budget may be advantageous.

Councillor Plant stated:

- Having pre-published budget caps is desirable; expectations will be clear during budget preparation.

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That with the intent of establishing a tax increase cap linked to the cost of living, which would apply to all departments, including Police, Council direct staff to prepare budget reduction scenarios and include the consequences of reducing service levels."**

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Finance stated:

- Reduction scenarios identify specific items where services may be provided in a different way, where efficiencies can be made or where service levels can be adjusted with the least amount of impact to the public.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The Finance, Audit and Personnel Standing Committee should work with staff to prepare the reduction scenarios.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Direction has to be given to the Police Board early in the process to ensure they can accommodate a budget cap.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Budget reduction scenarios will outline the consequences of reducing the budget by various amounts and then it can decide whether it is viable; budget reduction will affect different departments in different ways.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- A joint meeting between Council and the Police Board is needed; some departments may have items that cannot be reduced.
- Strategic Plan initiatives require a financial commitment.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The Citizen Survey identified that Police and Fire are priorities.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Budget reduction scenarios create an educational piece for residents.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Finance stated:

- It is easier to create budget reduction scenarios because staff have data available from previous years.

Councillor Plant stated:

- A status quo budget is a better option until the public has been consulted.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Going to the public without facts would be a disservice to them; budget reduction scenarios will outline some of the services that may be affected.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Budget reduction scenarios gives the public real information about what the consequences are.

Councillor Plant stated:

- Budget reduction scenarios pre-supposes that budget cuts are inevitable; property taxes will have to increase to cover legal obligations.
- A status quo budget is advised until after public consultation.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED  
with Mayor Atwell and Councillor Plant OPPOSED**

5370-30  
RFP 20/15

**AWARD OF RFP 20/15 – CAB AND CHASSIS C/W AERIAL DEVICE AND CHIP BODY**

Report of the Director of Engineering dated July 8, 2015 recommending Council award Request for Proposal 20/15 for one cab and chassis with aerial device and chip body to Altec Industries Ltd. in the amount of \$217,993 including the value of the trade in unit (excluding taxes).

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Request for Payment 20/15 for one cab and chassis with aerial device and chip body be awarded to Altec Industries Ltd. in the amount of \$217,993 including the value of the trade in unit (excluding taxes).”**

**CARRIED**

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES**

3030-30  
50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of  
Municipal Hall

**50<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL**

Recommendation from the June 25, 2015 Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory Committee that Council convene a Special Meeting on December 1, 2015 to commemorate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Saanich Municipal Hall, with presentations and a re-enactment of the first meeting held in the new Council Chambers.

Xref: 1420-40  
Arts, Culture &  
Heritage Advisory  
Committee

**MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Council convene a Special Council meeting on December 1, 2015 to commemorate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Saanich Municipal Hall, with presentations and a re-enactment of the first Council meeting held in the new Council Chambers.”**

**CARRIED**

1420-30  
Healthy Saanich  
Advisory  
Committee

**MOMS LIKE US PRESENTATION**

Recommendation from the June 17, 2015 Healthy Saanich Advisory Committee that Council invite Moms Like Us to give a presentation to Council on the development of an accredited Clubhouse in Greater Victoria.

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Council invite Moms Like Us to give a 20 minute presentation to Council on the development of an accredited Clubhouse in Greater Victoria.”**

**CARRIED**

1410-20  
Reports from  
Committees

**REPORTS FROM SAANICH ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRS**

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Plant:**  
**“That the reports from Saanich Advisory Committee Chairs be rescheduled to a future meeting of Council.”**

**CARRIED**

In Camera Motion

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That in accordance with Section 90 (1) (a), (c) and (i) of the *Community Charter*, the In Camera meeting reconvene following the Open Forum and be closed to the public as the subject matters being considered relate to:**  
**- Personal information about an identifiable individual who holds a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality;**  
**- Labour relations or other employee relations; and**  
**- Receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.”**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Plant, the meeting adjourned at 10:50 pm.

.....  
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK