

DISTRICT OF SAANICH
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AT THE SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2016

Present: **Chair:** Mayor Atwell
 Council: Councillors Brice (7:32 p.m.), Brownoff, Derman, Haynes, Murdock, Plant, and Sanders
 Staff: Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer; Carrie MacPhee, Director of Legislative Services; Sharon Hvozdanski, Director of Planning; Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Sharon Froud, Deputy Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk (7:32 p.m.)

Mayor Atwell called the regular Council meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. in Committee Room No. 2.

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Murdock:**
“That pursuant to Section 90 (1) (e) of the *Community Charter*, the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject matter being considered relates to the disposition of land or improvements.”
CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned to In Camera at 6:06 p.m.

The regular Council meeting reconvened in Council Chambers at 7:32 p.m.

Minutes **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:
“That Council adopt the minutes of the November 15, 2016 Special Council meeting and the November 21, 2016 Council and Committee of the Whole meetings.”
CARRIED

BYLAWS FOR FINAL READING

1110-30
Records
Management
Bylaw **RECORDS MANAGEMENT BYLAW**
Final Reading of “Records Management Bylaw, 2016, No. 9404”. To give legal effects to the District’s records management program.

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That Bylaw No. 9404 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”
CARRIED

PUBLIC INPUT ON COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

Public Input on Council Agenda Items

1030-30
Council Policy

1410-04
Report – Parks Canada 150 Plan

5170-20
Bike BC Grant Application

- K. Whitworth, Viewmont Avenue, stated:
- Clarification is needed regarding the budget increase of \$5,000 for the Temporary Art Program; she wonders if this is to design the Public Art Program for submission to the Strategic Planning process and if the design is being completed by staff or if it will be through a consultant.
 - The budget for the Canada 150 Events is now \$35,600, plus \$5,000 for the Temporary Art Program; she questions if the increase to the budget is a result of the design and print rack cards being added.
 - The recommendations are supportable; it is important that the planning process move forward.

- B. Williamson, Eldon Place, stated:
- The Canada 150 Events and Activities are supportable.
 - He wondered if the Advisory Committees were consulted regarding the Code of Conduct policy.

- L. Layne, San Lorenzo Avenue, stated:
- The Bike BC grant may assist with filling in the gaps for cyclists along McKenzie Avenue; he wondered if there is anything planned for the north side of McKenzie Avenue.
 - He also questioned if there are future plans for an upgrade to the roadway and construction of bike lanes from Saanich Road to Quadra Street.

- K. Harper, Bonair Place, stated:
- It may have been appropriate for the Governance Review Citizens Advisory Committee to review and provide input into the Code of Conduct policy.

RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

1410-04
Report – Legislative Services

xref: 1950-02
Insurance Portfolio

RENEWAL OF INSURANCE PORTFOLIO
Report of the Director of Legislative Services dated November 16, 2016 recommending that Council approve the renewal of the 2016/2017 insurance portfolio in the amount of \$441,903.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That Council approve the renewal of the 2016/2017 insurance portfolio in the amount of \$441,903.”

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

- The amount of the policy is approximately \$10,000 less than the previous year; there is a 2.5% increase in property values.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

The Director of Legislative Services left the meeting at 7:44 p.m.

1410-04
Report –
Engineering

xref: 5170-20
Bike BC Grant
Application

BIKE BC GRANT APPLICATION – MCKENZIE AVENUE UPGRADE

Report of the Director of Engineering dated November 22, 2016 recommending that Council endorse an application to the Provincial Government Bike BC Program for the McKenzie Avenue Upgrade project.

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes:
“That Council support an application to the Provincial Government Bike BC Program for the McKenzie Avenue Upgrade Project.”**

Councillor Derman stated:

- This is an important project for cycling in Saanich; safety improvements in this section of McKenzie Avenue will be beneficial.
- The Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility (BIPED) Advisory Committee endorsed the recommendation and expressed concerns that there were no plans to apply green hazard paint to alert exiting motorists to the possibility of cyclists.
- The project would substantially improve cycling connectivity.

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

- The challenge on the north side of McKenzie Avenue is the right-of-way; the south side has more room on the boulevard for a separated cycle track.
- There may be an opportunity to create a protected bike lane on the north side of McKenzie Avenue if future redevelopment occurs at the University Heights shopping centre.
- The McKenzie Avenue Upgrade project would begin in Q1 of 2017 and would take several months to complete.
- If the grant application is unsuccessful the work would still proceed; funding is available in the 2016-2020 Financial Plan.
- Grant funding would help augment other active transportation project priorities within Saanich.
- Improvements could be made at the exit from University Heights shopping centre, to the pedestrian environment and to accessibility at Shelbourne Street and Cedar Hill Avenue.
- Telephone poles cannot be relocated; therefore, the design needs to work around them.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- This is a popular cycling route; approval of the grant would mean safety improvements to this section of bike lane.

Councillor Plant stated:

- It is appreciated that staff continue to look for opportunities for grants.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1410-04
Report – Parks
Canada 150 Plan

CANADA 150 PLAN

From the November 21, 2016 Council meeting. Report of the Directors of Parks and Recreation and Planning dated November 23, 2016 recommending that Council approve the proposed work plan and budget of \$40,600 for the District of Saanich's 150 Events and Activities; approve installation in 2017 of a Canada 150 themed outdoor public art project as outlined in the report; and refer the Temporary Public Art program to the 2017 Strategic Planning process.

Councillor Sanders stated she would be withdrawing the motion from the November 21, 2016 meeting, "That Council approve the report of the Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory Committee Canada 150 Working Group dated October 27, 2016, endorsed by the Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory Committee."

MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That Council:

- 1. Approve the proposed work plan and 2017 budget of \$40,600 for District of Saanich's Canada 150 Events and Activities;**
- 2. Approve installation in 2017 of a Canada 150 themed, outdoor public art project in a location to be determined in accordance with the Comprehensive Art Policy; and**
- 3. Refer the Temporary Public Art program to Council's 2017 Strategic Planning process."**

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Parks and Recreation stated:

- The Temporary Art Program would be developed by staff; it will require funds to conduct public engagement.
- 150 trees would be planted throughout the year; however, celebrations would also take place during significant tree planting.
- It may be possible to incorporate plaques when planting significant trees.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Staff and the Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory Committee's Canada 150 Working Group are to be commended for their work and recommendations.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- Other municipalities have significant plans for celebrations; there will be a website available that will advertise Canada 150 events and activities taking place throughout the region.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- Ideas for celebrations will come from all residents and municipalities.

Councillor Plant stated:

- The Working Committee are to be thanked for the work that they will be undertaking during the year.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1410-04
Report –
Administration

xref: 1030-30
Council Policy

COUNCIL CODE OF CONDUCT

Report of the Chief Administrative Officer dated November 22, 2016 recommending that Council approve the Council Policy, Code of Conduct, 16/CNCL, as presented.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: "That Council approve the Council Policy, Code of Conduct, 16/CNCL, as presented."

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- The wording within the policy is aimed at re-emphasizing the one-employee model of local government.

- The policy reflects current practice.
- Work-related and directive contact should be through Department Heads or the Management Group; it is recognized that casual conversations are not inappropriate under the policy.
- There have been ongoing discussions at the Association of Vancouver Island and Coastal Communities (AVICC) and the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) regarding integrity, transparency and professionalism within local governments; the *Community Charter* is vague in relation to conduct.
- It is within Council’s authority to regulate their conduct and expectations; a Code of Conduct is an appropriate mechanism.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Plant, the meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

 The meeting reconvened at 10:55 p.m.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held November 28, 2016

1410-04
Report – Parks &
Recreation

xref: 1220-20
Glendenning

MOUNT DOUGLAS PARK ACCESS STUDY

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Derman: “That it be recommended that Council support, in principle, the recommendations in the Mount Douglas Park Access Study – Summary Report, with the exception of any recommendations in relation to additional parking on Glendenning Road.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That it be recommended that staff be directed to prepare a report on the possibility of options for designating more of the existing parking spaces at all the parking areas at Mount Douglas Park for individuals with mobility difficulties; and a possible system for issuing permits for people with mobility issues.”

CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Plant, the meeting adjourned at 10:57 p.m.

.....
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
DEPUTY MUNICIPAL CLERK

DISTRICT OF SAANICH
 MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
 HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
 SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2016 AT 8:08 P.M.

Present: **Chair:** Mayor Atwell
Council: Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Haynes, Murdock, Plant, and Sanders
Staff: Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer; Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Suzanne Samborski, Director of Parks and Recreation; Eva Riccius, Senior Manager, Parks; Gary Darrah, Parks Planning and Development Manager; Sharon Froud, Deputy Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

1410-04
 Report – Parks
 & Recreation

xref: 1220-20
 Glendenning
 Road

MOUNT DOUGLAS PARK ACCESS STUDY

Report of the Director of Parks and Recreation dated November 15, 2016 recommending that Council endorse the recommendations in the Mount Douglas Park Access Study – Summary Report, and direct staff to provide up to five additional parking spots on Glendenning Road, resulting in a total of ten parking spots at the Glendenning Trailhead, at a cost of up to \$80,000.

The Director of Parks and Recreation and the Parks Planning and Development Manager presented to Council and highlighted:

- The report is a result of nine months of study and analysis in relation to the access, parking habits and preferences of Mount Douglas Park users.
- The options minimize the impact on the special nature and character of the park.
- Modes of access that were reviewed were cycling, pedestrian, public transit, and vehicular; the existing formal trail networks and difficulty levels were also considered.
- The report provides baseline material that could also be considered during the Parks Master Planning process in 2018.
- Feedback was received via a community survey, a public Open House, a virtual Open House and through public consultation.
- Key findings were that 70% of respondents were “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with vehicle parking facilities in Mount Douglas Park.
- The number one choice for parking was Churchill Drive parking area, followed by Beach area, and Glendenning third.
- 72% of respondents did not support converting existing parkland for parking; 76% supported adding a few additional parking spots on Glendenning Road.
- Overall, respondents felt that parking facilities are good but there may be room for improvements.
- Key recommendations include: improve pedestrian connections to trails across major roadways within the park; improve the shoulder sidewalk on Blenkinsop Road between the Mercer trail and parking area of Blenkinsop; create effective signage to alert drivers about speed limits, pedestrians and cycling on Churchill Drive; consider adding a few additional parallel parking spaces where space permits on Glendenning Road near the trail entrance; and improve entrance/exit to the Beach parking area complete with pedestrian and bicycle facilities to make safer movement to the remainder of the park.
- Some recommendations should be referred to the Active Transportation Plan because there may be budget implications.

- The recommendation is to create five additional parking stalls along Glendenning Road; the estimated cost of up to \$80,000 includes proper base construction and the addition of split rail fencing to define the location of the five additional parking spots.
- There is an option of placing 5-10 additional parking stalls within the park; that would require the removal of two trees and public consultation.

In response to questions from Council, the Parks Planning and Development Manager stated:

- The data was collected after the “no parking” signs were installed; 3-4 cars were observed each day parking illegally on Glendenning Road after the “no parking” signs were installed.
- It may be possible to construct two parking spots in the hammerhead and have three parking spots on Glendenning Road.
- There may be opportunities to make some improvements to the other parking areas at Mount Douglas Park.
- Additional parking at the south end of Glendenning Road was not considered.
- There may be significant changes needed to the roadway design at the Beach access because of the limited site lines; it would be appropriate to discuss roadway design further as part of the Active Transportation Plan because there may be capital costs.
- The cost of providing additional parking within the park were not considered; the results of the survey showed that the respondents were not interested in pursuing additional parking within the park.
- The proposed location for the additional parking spots were chosen to minimize the damage to tree roots and to create a buffer space around the Garry oak trees; the Fire Department has confirmed the proposed locations are feasible.
- Glendenning Road is a connector road to be shared between vehicles and cyclists; formalizing the location of additional parking spots may help to create a safer cycling and pedestrian environment.

In response to questions from Council, the Senior Manager, Parks stated:

- The recommendations in the Urban Systems report were integrated into the staff report.

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

- The Active Transportation Plan would include discussions on items such as the synergy between intersections and cycling connectivity.
- The preliminary cost estimate for the additional parking is based on the conceptual design considering the road has environmental sensitivity and limitations to where parking could be located.
- It is estimated that it would cost \$30,000 for the additional parking spots and \$50,000 for other items such as the split rail fence and the relocation of the trail.
- Creating additional parking in the hammerhead is not the preferred option; the hammerhead is used as a turnaround.
- Costs would not necessarily be lower if parking was located in the hammerhead.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Parks and Recreation stated:

- Having parking a distance from the trail may detract from the accessibility of the park.

- 72% of survey respondents were not in favour of using parkland for parking; there would need to be further public consultation if that idea was being considered.

PUBLIC INPUT:

B. Wise, Glendenning Road, stated:

- On-street parking is a safety concern for residents when backing out of their driveways, and for pedestrians and cyclists; parking restrictions should be enforced and it needs to be clearly defined where parking is permitted.
- There is a need to change people's habits; there is also a need for designated disabled parking.

P. Savage, Bridgeport Place, stated:

- There is a need for additional parking spaces near the trailhead for those with limited mobility. There are shrubs that could be removed and Glendenning Road could be left alone.
- Enforcement is needed for vehicles parked in the "no parking" areas; speeding is not a concern on Glendenning Road.

E. Polinsky, Glendenning Road, stated:

- Glendenning Road is only 12 feet wide in most areas with a bridle path that runs beside the roadway; on-street parking causes safety concerns.
- The trail should be refurbished; additional disabled parking is supportable.
- The added signage at the entrance of Glendenning directing people to additional parking may have resulted in a decrease of vehicle traffic; Mount Douglas Park has adequate parking.

B. Loucks, Glendenning Road, stated:

- There may be an error in the interpretation of question 15 in the survey; some residents picked more than one answer so it is unclear if Glendenning is actually the third choice as a preferred parking location.
- There are additional parking spaces in close proximity to the Glendenning Trailhead; an online printable map of the Park and available parking locations might be helpful; there are a variety of different entrances to the park that could be used.
- It is not appropriate to spend \$80,000 on five additional parking spots; reserved disabled parking should be available at each trailhead.

L. Mesner, Glendenning Road, stated:

- Erosion has occurred from vehicles being parked on the boulevard; additional parking on Glendenning is not supportable.
- Speeding is a concern; there is additional parking located in other locations.
- Improvements to the Beach area parking lot may be appropriate.

D. Wick, Friends of Mount Douglas Park Society, stated:

- The Glendenning entrance to the park used to be the nicest entrance; now it is a muddy mess.
- The Official Community Plan (OCP) encourages alternative modes of transportation and discourages vehicle use.
- Access to the Beach parking lot is not safe and there is a lack of connectivity to the rest of the park.
- There is an access imbalance between the east and west parts of the park; priority should be given to the improvements to access the park.

L. Layne, San Lorenzo Avenue, stated:

- Glendenning Road should be preserved; the five existing spots at the Trailhead could be reserved for disabled parking.
- Concerns have been identified by residents in relation to speeding and erosion; people need to be made aware where alternative parking for the park is located.
- There is a need to look at the park as a whole.

B. Tabata, on behalf of the Gordon Head Residents' Association (GHRA), stated:

- The GHRA supports maintaining the turnaround at the north end of Glendenning Road; it is difficult to turn in that area and often drivers have to turn on private property to exit Glendenning.
- The GHRA also supports the changes proposed at the Douglas Trail and changes to Ash Road and Cordova Bay Road.
- Parking enforcement needs to be done on Glendenning Road.

D. Wise, Glendenning Road, stated:

- The report recommended a few parallel parking spots; the number has now crept up to 5-10 spots; on-street parking creates a safety concern for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The study does not speak to the traffic on Glendenning or at the intersection at Mount Douglas Cross Road; the more parking spots there are, the more traffic there will be on Glendenning Road.

S. Robson, Glendenning Road, stated:

- Increased parking on Glendenning is not supportable; this is a bike route.
- The addition of five parking spots, would double the traffic on Glendenning; that is not responsible or safe.
- Additional parking at the Cedar Hill parking lot would not adversely affect the traffic on Cedar Hill Road; spending \$80,000 to increase parking by five spots is fiscally irresponsible.
- Improvements to existing parking lots would be appropriate.

In response to questions, the Senior Manager, Parks, stated:

- Staff did not consider parking in the surrounding neighbourhoods as part of the scope of work for the report.
- The Urban Systems report looked at the use of the existing parking spaces; by adding that information to the data from survey respondents, the preferences for parking locations are able to be inferred.
- The survey results showed that local streets are not preferred parking locations; 86% of respondents also said that they are aware of other options for parking, and if their preferred location was full, they drove to the next closest location or parked on a nearby street.

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- An additional study could be requested on the impacts of on-street parking.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Mayor Atwell stated:

- There is a need for parking spaces for persons with limited mobility; that has to be weighed against the safety concerns and the preservation of the neighbourhood.
- It may be appropriate to have further public consultation on the matter.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The information that has been gathered for the report may be helpful for inclusion in the Parks Management Planning process; it is not appropriate to spend \$80,000 for five additional parking spots.
- There is a need to look at making the other accesses to the park safer; there was an appearance that there was an interest in getting more parking on Glendenning Road but the recommendations and the expense do not warrant altering Glendenning.
- The Parks, Trails and Recreation (PTR) Advisory Committee recommended being mindful of having parking near the easier walking trails and addressing the safety of people moving from parking to the trails.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Parking on Glendenning has resulted in damage to the boulevard; improvements to the Beach parking lot should be considered.
- There may be a need to increase the number of disabled parking spots; the aim should be to change people's habit of parking on the boulevard.
- Additional parking on Glendenning may result in increased traffic and diminishment of the quality of the park entrance; increased traffic is problematic and dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The work of staff is appreciated; the data should be brought forward as part of the Parks Master Planning process.
- Residents do not wish to have additional parking on Glendenning.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- Designating the five existing parking spots as disabled parking or time limiting parking could be considered; illegal parking on Glendenning should be enforced.
- Using fencing or plantings to deter parking on the boulevard could be considered; the ecological beauty of Glendenning should be protected.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Parking has damaged the boulevard; parking enforcement should be done.
- Installation of a split rail fence may protect the tree roots and help to define the trail; having an online map of the park and parking locations would be helpful.
- The focus should be on improvements to other parking locations.
- The recommendations should be considered as part of the Parks Master Plan and the Active Transportation Plan.
- Residents are concerned that on-street parking makes it dangerous to back out of their driveways.
- Ensuring that accessible parking is available is supportable and those spots could be identified in the online map of the park.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Parking on Glendenning should not be encouraged; the natural aspects of the neighbourhood should be preserved.
- Priority disabled parking should be further considered; there may be value in combining access with use and doing further review on why people go to the park; that may help with making future decisions for parking.
- There is a considerable amount of parking currently available; people may not be comfortable using the Beach access because of safety concerns.
- There may be a need to raise awareness of access points and the availability of parking.

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

- The Police Department provides parking enforcement duties; it is done on a complaint basis and through routine checking.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- Parking on Glendenning is not supportable; the damage to the boulevard is inappropriate; there is a need to consider ways to stop people from parking on the boulevard and to formalize the trail.

Motion: **MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That it be recommended that Council support, in principle, the recommendations in the Mount Douglas Park Access Study – Summary Report, with the exception of any recommendations in relation to additional parking on Glendenning Road.”**

Councillor Plant stated:

- The recommendations in the report should be considered in the near future rather than waiting for them to be considered as part of the Parks Master Plan and the Active Transportation Plan.
- Residents are not in favour of additional parking on Glendenning Road.

In response to questions from Council, the Senior Manager, Parks, stated:

- If the additional parking spots on Glendenning were approved, signage would need to clearly identify where parking was allowed and where parking was prohibited.
- The larger items in the report would have to be considered during the Financial Planning process; operational items would be done as part of regular business.

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- Operational matters are completed within existing budgets; other items may have financial or other implications that would have to be discussed further.
- There is interest in the protection of the environmental aspects of Glendenning Road; the addition of split rail fencing has financial implications.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- There is a demand for access to the park for those with mobility issues; status quo is not acceptable.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Motion: **MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Council direct staff to explore the costs of increasing parking inside Mount Douglas Park at the Glendenning Road entrance, with the understanding that there would be no net loss to the park by exploring options of reducing parking at the Beach Parking Lot, and to consult the public on such a plan.”**

Councillor Plant stated:

- It may be possible to expand the parking within the park by 5-6 spots; the tree removal needed to do this, may not be significant.
- It is appropriate to explore the costs to increase the parking within the park.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- There is clear data that the public does not want parking constructed within the park.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The public does not wish to use parkland for parking; it is not supportable to encourage more vehicular traffic on Glendenning.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The survey respondents said that they were not interested in using parkland for parking; through the Parks Master Planning process, the public could be asked whether or not they support additional parking within the park.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- There are five existing parking spots at Glendenning; parking was not decreased from Glendenning; signs were installed to enforce “no parking” on the boulevard.
- The boulevard should be remediated; the public do not wish to have additional parking in the neighbourhood.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- There is a cost in having staff explore options; residents have identified that they are not interested in using parkland for additional parking.
- There may be opportunities through the Parks Master Planning process to research options; disabled parking spots need to be identified.
- It is not supportable to remove trees to provide parking.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- There may be other options to alleviate parking concerns such as providing information on where additional parking is located.

Councillor Plant stated:

- Creative ways should be explored in providing additional parking at this entrance; a high number of survey respondents said that they wanted increased parking.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- There are concerns with the traffic and safety on Glendenning.
- Status quo is not acceptable.
- More information is needed in terms of options and potential costs; there is a need to designate disabled parking spots and for further education and public consultation.

**The Motion was then Put and DEFEATED
With Mayor Atwell and Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Haynes,
Murdock and Sanders OPPOSED**

Motion: MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That it be recommended that staff be directed to prepare a report on the possibility of options for designating more of the existing parking spaces on Glendenning Road for individuals with mobility difficulties; and a possible system for issuing permits for people with mobility issues.”

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That the motion be amended for the report to include all the parking areas at Mount Douglas Park.”

The Amendment to the Motion was CARRIED

The Main Motion, as Amended, was then Put and CARRIED

Motion as Amended:

“That it be recommended that staff be directed to prepare a report on the possibility of options for designating more of the existing parking spaces at all the parking areas at Mount Douglas Park for individuals with mobility difficulties; and a possible system for issuing permits for people with mobility issues.”

The Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- Staff would bring back a report with potential options for Council to consider and implications of those options.

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Plant, the meeting adjourned at 10:54 p.m.

.....
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....
DEPUTY MUNICIPAL CLERK