

DISTRICT OF SAANICH  
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD AT THE SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2017**

Present:           **Chair:**       Acting Mayor Wergeland  
                  **Council:**   Mayor Atwell and Councillors Brice, Derman, Haynes, Murdock, Plant (left the meeting at 6:20 p.m. and returned at 8:05 p.m.), and Sanders  
                  **Staff:**       Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer; Sharon Hvozdzanski, Director of Planning; Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Cameron Scott, Manager of Community Planning; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

Acting Mayor Wergeland called the regular Council meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in Committee Room No. 2.

In Camera Motion   **MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That pursuant to Sections 90 (1) (c) and (g) of the *Community Charter*, the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject matters being considered relate to labour relations or other employee relations and litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality.”**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment       On a motion from Councillor Haynes, the meeting adjourned to In Camera at 6:02 p.m.

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

**AWARDS PRESENTATION**

1090-20  
Awards  
Presentation

**PARALYMPIC SILVER MEDALISTS**

Mayor Atwell presented a Certificate of Recognition to Jackie Gay and John McRoberts acknowledging their outstanding silver medal performance in the SKUD 18 keelboat event at the 2016 Paralympic Games in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Minutes

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: “That Council adopt the minutes of the January 9, 2017 Special Council, Council and Committee of the Whole meetings.”**

**CARRIED**

---

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

T. Rose, Beckton Road, stated:

- He questions if a referendum is required for the tender for the Rithet Reservoir Drain Project because it is such a large amount.

In response, the Director of Finance stated:

- A referendum is not required as the amount is within the assent free zone established by Municipal Liabilities Regulation 254/2004.

A. Beck, James Heights, stated:

- 88% of Saanich residents who voted were in favour of holding a governance review.
- The committee members were chosen because of their expertise, professional background and wide ranging skill sets; at times, delays in the governance review process have been frustrating.
- Council is urged to support Option 2 so that a robust report can be provided.

H. Charania, Genevieve Road, stated:

- An overwhelming number of Saanich residents who voters were in support of a governance review; more than half of the original budget is already spent or committed.
- Council is urged to support the budget outlined in Option 2 as a maximum amount, but the committee should set their budget target as the amount in Option 1.
- The committee should attempt for quality of community consultation rather than quantity; committee members are urged to remain neutral and impartial and prepare a fulsome report while staying within budget.

E. Dahli, Mount Baker View Road, stated:

- Residents voted to have a review of governance in Saanich; it is important that the report be done properly which may mean that it costs more.
- Council is urged to consider Option 2; the cost for this review is comparable to other projects that Saanich has undertaken.

P. Meekison, Woodhaven Terrace, stated:

- Public input is critical to the process; the more that the public is engaged, the more they are likely to buy into the outcome.
- Council should consider Option 2 and the corresponding budget.

M. Henderson, Goyette Road, stated:

- Of the approximate 81,000 registered voters in Saanich, only 35% voted; of the 35% that voted, 88% were in favour of the ballot question to hold a governance review.

R. Wickson, Inez Drive, stated:

- The voters felt there was a need to review governance in Saanich; the public consultation process that has been undertaken is appreciated.
- It is necessary to provide the appropriate funding to undertake the review.

C. Horn, Knight Avenue, stated:

- This is a unique and exciting process with a large scope; it is precedence setting.
- It is important to do the review to its fullest potential; Option 2 is supportable.

P. Lancaster, Wyndeatt Avenue, stated:

- The governance review is a critical examination that has been duplicated in other countries; there are a number of issues that are being considered in Saanich that require good and better mechanisms for public consultation.
- The governance review is very important to the future of all residents; when Council is considering funding, they should consider what it will take to get the job done properly.

## RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

1300-20  
FCM Membership  
Dues

### FEDERATION OF CANADIAN MUNICIPALITIES – MEMBERSHIP DUES

Invoice from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities requesting payment of 2017 membership dues in the amount of \$17,123.34 and travel funds in the amount of \$2,016.69 (amounts are inclusive of applicable taxes).

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Council authorize payment to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities for the 2017 membership dues in the amount of \$17,123.34 and travel funds in the amount of \$2,016.69 (amounts are inclusive of applicable taxes).”**

**CARRIED**

1410-04  
Report -  
Engineering

### AWARD OF TENDER 34/16 – RITHET RESERVOIR DRAIN PROJECT

Report of the Director of Engineering dated January 11, 2017 recommending that Council award Tender 34/16 Rithet Reservoir Drain Project to Don Mann Excavating Ltd., in the amount of \$577,124 (excluding GST).

xref: 5370-30  
Tender 34/16

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That Council award Tender 34/16 for the Rithet Reservoir Drain Project to Don Mann Excavating Ltd., in the amount of \$577,124 (excluding GST).”**

**CARRIED**

## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

1790-20  
Governance  
Review

### GOVERNANCE REVIEW CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GRCAC) – SAANICH GOVERNANCE REVIEW PROJECT WORK PLAN OPTIONS AND BUDGET SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

Report of the Chair of the Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee (GRCAC) dated December 7, 2016 recommending that Council approve work plan Option 2 and corresponding Budget Option 2 as outlined in the report.

J. Schmuck, Chair, Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee (GRCAC) and J. Kroeker-Hall, consultant, Sirius Strategic Solutions Ltd., presented to Council and highlighted:

- Once the budget is approved, the number of public engagement sessions will be determined; the official launch of the review will take place on February 9, 2017.
- A number of public engagement sessions and Town Hall meetings have been scheduled for the Spring; in order to reach the broader public, advertising will take place via the Saanich website, social media, the

- Saanich News and through Saanich Community Association Network.
- A survey will be distributed to Saanich residents asking residents what issues concern them; the data obtained will provide important information for the final conclusions in the report.
- Public engagement will conclude at the end of May; the final report will be completed and delivered by October, 2017.
- After the report is completed, it is expected that the GRCAC will be disbanded.
- The GRCAC is committed to making the governance review a success and providing positive feedback for Saanich.
- Only about half of the original budget remains; Option 2 allows for more public engagement sessions than Option 1.
- Both budget options in the report are based on the assumption that the costs for administrative support would be borne by the committee; the Scope of Work indicates that administrative support is a District responsibility.
- If that cost is determined to be the responsibility of the District, the request for funding would be decreased.
- It is important to craft options that provide flexibility on how to identify groups to be included in consultation; it is also important to reach out to a broad array of community groups in a variety of ways.
- It would be appreciated if the budget could be approved tonight so that the committee can proceed.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 Councillor Plant arrived at the meeting at 8:05 pm.  
 \*\*\*\*\*

- In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:
- The Terms of Reference that were included in the original Request for Proposal for the consultant indicated that administrative time would be provided by Saanich staff; prior to that, the process was based on Council's direction that the work would be at "arms length" from Council and staff.
  - Some administrative support had been dedicated and those costs were charged to the original budget; it was expected that going forward, costs would be assumed by the committee.
  - Given that the Terms of Reference state that administrative support would be provided by Saanich staff, it will be necessary to review how that support will be provided as the funds have not been budgeted for in departmental budgets.
  - Saanich does not receive a bulk discount rate for advertising; Saanich's Print Shop could be used for printing but there are costs associated with using that service that would have to be charged back to the committee's budget.

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Plant: "That Council approve Work Plan Option 2 and corresponding Budget Option 2, as outlined in the report of the Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee and Sirius Strategic Solutions dated December 6, 2016 and December 2, 2016 respectively."**

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The undertaking of the governance review is appreciated; the report will be valuable in providing insight on potential ways to improve governance in Saanich.
- The foundational process depleted a great deal of the original budget.
- The review needs to be undertaken as rigorously and professionally as possible; there are other ongoing projects that have comparable costs.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The Province has completed a review of their own which includes the relationships between municipalities in the region; the GRCAC should focus on a review of Saanich's governance and not duplicate the work already completed by the Province.
- Council has already acknowledged that more funding would be needed to continue with the review; staff should be made available to provide support.
- This is a unique situation; the funds are needed to allow the committee to do the work.
- Members of the committee were chosen because of their knowledge and expertise; committee members have dedicated a tremendous amount of time.
- Option 2 is supportable with the expectation that the number will be adjusted to reflect the decreased funding for administrative support.

Councillor Derman stated:

- It is hard to establish a budget for a new initiative; Council has to ensure that the process can be fully and satisfactorily carried out.
- The additional funding will cause difficulty during budget deliberations; the committee should be seen as neutral and as objective as possible and deal with procedural issues only.
- If there is a sense that the committee strayed into policy interest, it may weaken the final report; the Province has undertaken a review resulting in recommendations for inter-municipal governance in the region.
- The GRCAC should focus on Saanich governance.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- It is unclear if increased funding will make a difference to an outcome but there is a need to ensure that residents do not feel that funding made a difference.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

The Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- The intention is that the process be started immediately; a subsequent motion will give staff a clear direction to include the funding outlined in Option 2 in the 2017 budget.
- The 2017 budget process will be a challenge; Council will have to make difficult decisions this year in terms of service provision.

**MOVED by Mayor Atwell and Seconded by Councillor Derman: "That Council approve that \$70,010 as outlined in Budget Option 2, be included in the 2017 Financial Plan."**

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

- The motion as worded does not give a specific direction as to where the money would come from; the committee needs to know that they have the funding to move forward with the process.
- The motion ensures that the funding would be included in the Financial Plan; it will not be an option to reject funding for the review during Financial Planning discussions as the work would be underway.
- A request for one-time funding from 2016 surplus funds could be made, but there are other priorities that would be competing for those funds.

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That the motion be amended by adding that \$70,010 as outlined in Budget Option 2, be funded from 2016 surplus.”**

Councillor Plant stated:

- If there is a 2016 surplus, it is appropriate to submit a one-time resource request.

**The Amendment to the Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

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

The Motion as Amended:

“That Council approve that \$70,010 as outlined in Budget Option 2, be included in the 2017 Financial Plan to be funded from 2016 surplus.”

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Haynes, the meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:06 p.m.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

*From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held January 23, 2017*

2160-20  
Regional Growth  
Strategy

### **2016 REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY – PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO 2003 REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY (RGS)**

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Council not accept “Bylaw 4017, Capital Regional District Regional Growth Strategy, Bylaw No. 1, 2016” for the following reasons as outlined in Option 1 of the report of the Director of Planning dated January 13, 2017:**

- There is insufficient direction for growth management within the Growth Area to provide a predictable land use pattern that could focus transportation and infrastructure investment and create less carbon intensive development; and
- The proposed criteria for water servicing extensions are insufficient to prevent significant additional development in outlying rural areas that would contribute to transportation issues, increase greenhouse gas emissions and divert development away from land inside the Growth Area boundary.”

**CARRIED**

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That the regular Council meeting adjourn and Council reconvene the In Camera meeting in accordance with Sections 90 (1) (c) and (g) of the Community Charter.”**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Haynes, the meeting adjourned at 11:09 p.m.

.....  
ACTING MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....  
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, JANUARY 23, 2017 AT 8:39 P.M.**

Present: **Chair:** Councillor Wergeland  
**Council:** Mayor Atwell and Councillors Brice, Derman, Haynes, Murdock, Plant, and Sanders  
**Staff:** Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer; Sharon Hvozdzanski, Director of Planning; Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Cameron Scott, Manager of Community Planning; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

1410-04  
Report -  
Planning

**4355 VIEWMONT AVENUE – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND REZONING**  
Report of the Director of Planning dated December 15, 2016 recommending that Council postpone further consideration of the development to allow the applicant to rework the proposal for a proposed 38 unit townhouse development.

xref: 2860-20  
West Saanich  
Road

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Planning stated:  
- Bus pass programs have typically been considered as a community contribution when there were requests for parking variances; community contributions are meant to benefit the broader community and bus passes only benefit first owners.  
- Feedback from BC Transit indicates that there does not appear to be a significant/sustained increase in ridership as a result of the bus pass program.  
- If the applicant proposed substantive changes to the application tonight, Council should send the proposal back to staff for review or for further public consultation and review by the Community Association; if Council believed that potential changes were not substantive, the application could be forwarded to Public Hearing.

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

- Staff would work with the applicant to discuss installation of stop signs at driveway exits.

**APPLICANT:**

E. Geric, Mike Geric Construction Ltd.; T. James, KPL James Architecture; and K. Grant, Keith N. Grant Landscape Architecture Ltd., presented to Council and highlighted:

- Neighbours agree that the site should be developed but prefer townhomes, rather than a condominium building; the new design is a 60% reduction in density.
- The Royal Oak Community Association (ROCA) and neighbours are in favour of the new design; the only way that more green space could be achieved on the property would be to construct a condo building.
- The applicant would commit to a covenant to restrict the use of garages to parking for vehicles.
- The community contribution package includes the addition of curb and sidewalk and \$50,000 towards a playground at Royal Oak Middle School.
- The site plan was developed for maximum efficiency while maintaining livability; all units are three storeys except for the two pairs flanking the entry points; the two storey units at the entry points are stepped down to soften the massing and scale at the entrances.
- The project is designed for families; because Bryden Park is close by, the site design includes multiple private outdoors spaces for each unit rather than larger group play areas.
- The majority of the units are three bedrooms with porches and one or two decks each.
- The design has been revised with a reduction of units from 38 to 36 to allow for more green space; that will also allow two more visitor parking stalls so that a parking variance would not be required.
- The proposed front yard setback along Viewmont Avenue will produce a lively streetscape and an enhanced design for home owners; the interior side yards are adequate for decks, patios and fenced yards.
- The height variance requested is for the three storey units.
- New trees will be planted and a contribution will be provided for replacement of trees to be planted elsewhere in the Royal Oak area; the streetscape consists of boulevard trees and grass.
- Onsite hard and soft landscape will consist of permeable pavers, planting at the unit entry points and driveway edges, privacy hedging and two seating areas.
- Sustainable features include water efficient drip and spray head sprinklers with a smart controller system and the use of permeable pavers; rain gardens and bio swales will improve storm water management.
- There is a commitment to constructing to BUILT GREEN® Gold energy efficiency, installation of air thermal heat pumps and the necessary conduits to be considered solar ready for the future installation of solar photovoltaic or hot water heating systems and the possibility of the installation of solar panels.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- The decision on which two units would be removed was made in an attempt to break up the perceived row house look and give the opportunity for casual movement throughout the site.
- Stop signs will be located at driveway exits.
- Bio swales are shallow depressions in a grass area; rain gardens consist of plant material and would be relatively wet therefore not an appropriate location



for a play area; the green spaces where the two units would be removed could be used as a play area.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

C. Robinson, Casa Linda Drive, on behalf of R. Wanbon, stated:

- Saanich Tennis Club members are concerned with the lack of parking on Viewmont Avenue; the tennis courts will be repaired and resurfaced and it is necessary to ensure the stability of the foundation under the courts; due diligence should be in place to ensure appropriate drainage occurs following the construction of the townhouse development.
- The proposed development is supportable.

S. Evans, Strom Ness Place, stated:

- There is a need for more townhomes to allow families to get into the housing market.
- The proposed development is close to parks, schools, and the recreation centre; affordable housing options are supportable.

M. de Medeiros, Viewmont Avenue, stated:

- The proposed development is supportable; it will result in a healthy community.
- The community amenities are appreciated.

L. McKeachie, Viewmont Avenue, stated:

- The combination building/townhouse development was not supportable; the changes to the design are appreciated.
- It will be an attractive development that focuses on families and community.

K. Whitworth, Viewmont Avenue, stated:

- The reduction to 36 units is supportable; the commitment to being solar ready, utilization of smart growth strategies, registration of a housing agreement, the additional landscaping and the front unit spacing on Viewmont Avenue are appreciated.
- The addition of the new sidewalk is appreciated and will complete the pedestrian environment to the park.
- She questions how tall the plantings between the back patios will be.

M. Henderson, on behalf of the Royal Oak Community Association (ROCA), stated:

- The new design is a better fit for the community and has addressed concerns of neighbours; neighbours prefer driveways facing the street on the Viewmont Avenue side.
- Concerns remain regarding increased traffic, parking configuration, lack of green space for active use of children, lack of a turnaround area for large vehicles, the amount of light from that may come from BC Hydro property and affect residents, and the amount of interior storage.
- Tandem parking may not be the best option for parking; having side by side parking may be more appropriate; neighbours are concerned that on street parking on Viewmont Avenue may increase.
- The addition of fencing may turn the interior of the site into community courtyard and make for a safer development.

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:**

- Fencing along the north, south and east property lines would be 5 feet in height; patio fencing would be 4 feet in height; plant material would vary in size between 18 inches and 5 feet high.
- There would be no impact to the tennis courts.

**Motion:**

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That a Public Hearing be called to further consider the rezoning application for a proposed 36 unit townhouse development on that Part of Lot 5, Section 8A, Lake District, Plan 2255 lying to the North West of a boundary parallel to and perpendicularly distant 211.2 feet from the North Westerly boundary of said lot (4355 Viewmont Avenue)."**

Councillor Plant stated:

- The work that has been done to address the concerns of neighbours is appreciated; the applicant should consider the comments and suggestions of ROCA.
- The proposed development is in close proximity to shopping, recreation and services.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The community has been engaged in the process; this is an attractive development.
- Saanich needs a greater supply of housing options in corridors and centres.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The proposed development is crowded on the site and is close to the border of a light industrial area; that may affect the liveability of residents.
- There are concerns of the use of tandem parking and the lack of functional, useable green spaces for families.
- It may be appropriate to make the central green space larger and more functional.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Neighbours are in favour of the proposed development; there is a risk that removing units and adding green space could affect affordability.

In response to a question from Council, the Director of Planning stated:

- Construction of underground parking is expensive; this site is relatively flat therefore it does not have the grade change to construct underground parking efficiently.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- The revisions are an improvement over the original design; a centralized green space would be appreciated.
- It is important that access to green space is close to residences; the neighbours are in support of the proposed development.
- Converting the proposed rain gardens into more green space may be appropriate.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- There is concern with the lack of green space, the number of driveways and the amount of density; the development is crowded on the site.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Neighbours are supportive; there is concern with the proximity of the property to the BC Hydro property and the potential impact on future residents.
- There is a park close to the proposed development but there could be the addition of a community space on the property given the reduction in the number of units.
- The applicant should consider ROCA's concern with tandem parking.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The revisions to the design are a compromise between residences and green space; the neighbours are in favour of the proposed development and it will benefit the community.

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

- The current design as presented would go forward to the Public Hearing.
- If Council feels that the changes to the design are substantial, there is the opportunity to postpone consideration while Council further reviews the proposal.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The applicant should construct as solar ready.

**CARRIED  
with Councillor Derman OPPOSED**

\*\*\*\*\*  
 The Director of Engineering left the meeting at 10:14 p.m.  
 \*\*\*\*\*

1410-04  
Report –  
Planning

xref: 2160-20  
Regional Growth  
Strategy

**2016 REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY – PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO 2003 REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY (RGS)**

Report of the Director of Planning dated January 13, 2017 recommending that Council not support Bylaw 4017 “Capital Regional District Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 1, 2016”.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Community Planning stated:

- The 2003 RGS Bylaw links water servicing to the growth containment boundary and sewer servicing and does not permit extensions except in the cases of fire suppression, public health or environmental issues; the proposed 2016 bylaw includes some criteria for extensions for water servicing outside the growth containment boundary including majority approval from the Capital Regional District (CRD) Board. A provision also has also been added to permit water service along existing lines that service agricultural lands within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) provided there is no increase to density.
- View Royal and Esquimalt Councils have rejected the proposed bylaw, ensuring it will be entering into a dispute resolution process.
- If Saanich rejects the proposed bylaw, they would partner in selecting the dispute resolution process and through the Council motion provide input into the issues that would be part of that process.
- If Saanich accepts the proposed bylaw, they would have the option to still participate in the dispute resolution process, but would not have input into the type of process that is used or the issues to be discussed as part of the process.

- Staff comments would not form part of the communications to the CRD but specific rationale for rejection could be included.

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

- It will be important for Saanich to participate in the dispute resolution process regardless of the decision made in relation to the proposed bylaw; it is necessary to make Saanich's policy perspective clear.

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

- In terms of determining and measuring sustainability, there are agreed upon standards; an excerpt in the Official Community Plan (OCP) references the foundational work of the Brundtland Report which speaks of "not making decisions that would preclude those coming behind us from having an equal quality of life that we enjoy"; livability is also well defined through long standing planning and urban design principles

#### **PUBLIC INPUT:**

J. Anderson, Lauder Road, stated:

- Saanich Council is to be complimented on the leadership provided at the Capital Regional District; Saanich should go on record to highlight concerns with the proposed bylaw.
- The initiative on transportation needs to be strengthened; if there are to be "centres", mobility and linkages need to be priorities.

T. Barry, Lily Avenue, stated:

- Saanich is the largest and most significant partner in the RGS; the proposed changes in the bylaw provides incentives and subsidies to other municipalities.
- Growth needs to be contained and be located as close to centres as possible or built as properly planned "nodes" with amenities.
- This is an opportunity to give direction to the CRD to create a RGS that reflects sustainability priorities.

R. Wickson, Inez Drive, stated:

- The RGS is an opportunity to influence regional intrusions; all decisions should reflect Saanich's goals.

C. Horne, Knight Avenue, stated:

- The RGS is concerning; other municipal RGS include plans for where growth will happen.
- The proposed bylaw influences other municipalities through their regional context statement of their OCP in that they must adhere to the RGS.
- It is important that First Nations are included in consultation for the RGS.

#### **COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**

**Motion:**

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Brice: "That it be recommended that Council not accept "Bylaw 4017, Capital Regional District Regional Growth Strategy, Bylaw No. 1, 2016" for the following reasons as outlined in Option 1 of the report of the Director of Planning dated January 13, 2017:**

- **There is insufficient direction for growth management within the Growth Area to provide a predictable land use pattern that could focus**

transportation and infrastructure investment and create less carbon intensive development; and

- **The proposed criteria for water servicing extensions are insufficient to prevent significant additional development in outlying rural areas that would contribute to transportation issues, increase greenhouse gas emissions and divert development away from land inside the Growth Area boundary.”**

Councillor Derman stated:

- The region needs to aim for a compact region around a central core; removing the word “centre” has decreased the ability for that to take place.
- The emphasis on climate change mitigation has weakened; the bylaw should reflect using climate change mitigation as a lens through which decision making will take place.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- It is disappointing that municipalities and the CRD were not able to work together collaboratively and that arbitration is necessary; it is indicative of a region divided.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Council has supported different strategies that are not reflected in the proposed bylaw; it is necessary to go on record and use Saanich’s influence to hold out for a better plan for a more sustainable community.
- Council should maintain its environmental integrity.

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That the meeting continue past 11:00 p.m.”**

**CARRIED**

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The staff report is thorough and concise; “using climate change mitigation as a lens” need to be defined in terms of a Saanich perspective.
- This is a vote to support Saanich’s vision.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- It will be important to be at the table to ensure that what Saanich feels strongly about is represented; the proposed bylaw is disappointing.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- In 2003, some municipalities may have felt there would be flexibility in the bylaw; it is important to move forward and build relationships with other municipalities.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

Adjournment      On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

.....  
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK