I. 6:00 P.M., COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 2
Motion to close the meeting to the public in accordance with Section 90 (2)(b) of the Community Charter.

II. 7:30 P.M., COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES
1. Council meeting held June 19, 2017
2. Committee of the Whole meeting held June 19, 2017

B. BYLAWS FOR FINAL READING
1. DELEGATION AUTHORIZATION BYLAW (DIRECTOR OF PARKS AND RECREATION)
   Final reading of “Delegation Authorization Bylaw, (Director of Parks and Recreation), 2017, No. 9442”. To delegate the administration of the Significant Tree Grants to the Director of Parks and Recreation.

C. PUBLIC INPUT (ON BUSINESS ITEMS C, D & E)

D. RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION
1. CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT (CRD) BYLAW NO. 4127, ARTS AND CULTURE SUPPORT SERVICE ESTABLISHMENT BYLAW NO. 1, 2001, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 4, 2017
   P. 3
   From the June 12, 2017 Council meeting. Request from the CRD that Council consent to the adoption of Bylaw No. 4127, Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017.

2. HIGH PERFORMANCE AQUATICS AT SAANICH COMMONWEALTH PLACE
   P. 22
   Report of the Director of Parks and Recreation dated June 16, 2017 recommending that Council direct staff to:
   a) pursue Provincial and Federal support for the creation of a renewed three-party operating and funding agreement that supports high performance aquatic sports at Saanich Commonwealth Place; and
   b) provide a detailed analysis and report outlining the financial, community and resource implications if Saanich continued to support and subsidize high performance aquatic sports at Saanich Commonwealth Place without the assistance of other levels of government.

3. FEDERAL GAS TAX STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FUND APPLICATION FOR THE SAANICH COMMONWEALTH PLACE MECHANICAL SYSTEM UPGRADE PROJECT
   P. 31
   Report of the Director of Engineering dated June 15, 2017 recommending that Council endorse the application to the Federal Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund for the Saanich Commonwealth Place Mechanical System Upgrade.

E. REPORTS FROM SAANICH ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRS
   P. 34
   1. Report from the Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee
   2. Verbal Update from Council Committee Chairs
F. REPORTS FROM DIRECTORS

1. 2016 ANNUAL REPORT PRESENTED TO THE PUBLIC

To make the Annual Report available for public inspection pursuant to s. 98 of the Community Charter. Submissions and questions from the public will be received at the meeting on July 17, 2017 pursuant to s. 99 of the Community Charter. (Distributed Separately)

*** Adjournment ***

AGENDA

For the Committee of the Whole Meeting

** IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING**
The Council Meeting in the Council Chambers

1. 3333 GLASGOW AVENUE – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT


2. 931 BECKWITH AVENUE – APPLICATION FOR INCLUSION IN SEWER SERVICE AREA

Report of the Director of Engineering dated March 16, 2017 recommending that Council approve the application to include 931 Beckwith Avenue into the Sewer Service Area.

3. APPLICATION TO PAINT A MURAL ON THE RETAINING WALL AT THE NORTH ENTRY TO THE SEATON STREET TUNNEL

Report of the Director of Planning dated June 16, 2017 recommending that Council authorize the installation of a mural on the retaining wall at the north entry to the Seaton Street tunnel, based on the conceptual illustration and the artistic process as outlined in the report.

*** Adjournment ***

“IN CAMERA” COUNCIL MEETING IMMEDIATELY Follows
May 19, 2017

RE: Bylaw No. 4127, Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017

Attached is a copy of CRD Bylaw No. 4127 at third reading. Please place this Bylaw on your next Council agenda with a request to give consent to the adoption of the Bylaw in accordance with Section 346 of the Local Government Act.

The purpose of the Bylaw is to:
- Rename non-Group 1 participants as “Group 2”
- Update assessment calculation methods and changes to minimum contribution levels
- Add the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area to the Service (Group 2)

In order to amend the establishing bylaw of this service, consent is required from 2/3rds of participants which include the Township of Esquimalt, District of Highlands, District of Metchosin, District of Oak Bay, District of Saanich, Town of Sidney, City of Victoria, Town of View Royal and the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area Director.

As background, please find attached staff reports, the proposed bylaw as well as the draft consolidated bylaw.

If you require additional information prior to forwarding this request to Council, or if you wish to have CRD staff present when Bylaw No. 4127 is presented to Council, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Emilie Gorman
Deputy Corporate Officer
Legislative and Corporate Services
T 250.360.3127
E egorman@crd.bc.ca

Encl. (3)
CRD Bylaw No. 4127
CRD Bylaw No. 2884 (Draft Consolidation)
CRD Staff Report
Bylaw No. 2884, “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001,” is amended as follows:

a) By adding to end of Section 2 “and the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area”

b) By deleting Section 3 in its entirety and substituting the following:

“3. Participating Areas:

(1) The Township of Esquimalt, District of Highlands, District of Metchosin, District of Oak Bay, District of Saanich, Town of Sidney, City of Victoria, Town of View Royal, and the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area are the participating areas for this service.

(2) In this bylaw, “Group 1 Participating Areas” in each year means the Township of Esquimalt, District of Oak Bay, District of Saanich, City of Victoria, and the Town of View Royal.

(3) In this bylaw, “Group 2 Participating Areas” in each year means the District of Highlands, District of Metchosin, Town of Sidney and the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area.

c) By deleting Sections 6 and 7 in their entirety and inserting a new section 6:

“6. Apportionment

(1) The amount of annual costs recovered by requisition in accordance with Section 4 (a) of this bylaw, shall be apportioned among the Participating Areas by dividing the costs into two equal parts, one part to be apportioned on the basis of population and one part to be apportioned on the basis of assessments and applying the formulae in Section 6 (2) below.

(2) For the purpose of this section:

(a) Group 1 Participants:

(i) Population is the total population estimate as determined annually by the Regional Planning Services Department of the Capital Regional District, and
(ii) **Assessments** are the annual converted value of land and improvements in the Participating Areas.

(b) **Group 2 Participants** (subject to Section 6 (2)(c) below):
   (i) **Population** is 30% of the population estimate as determined annually by the Regional Planning Services Department of the Capital Regional District, and
   (ii) **Assessments** are 30% the converted value of land and improvements in the Participating Areas, or
   (iii) A greater percentage amount if indicated in writing by a Participating Area.

(c) **Transitional provisions for New and Existing Group 2 Participants**:
   (i) New Participants are subject to 6 (2)(b) above except in the first year of participation their percentage is a minimum of 10% and in their second year of participation their percentage is a minimum of 20%
   (ii) Participants contributing at less than 20% at the date of adoption of this bylaw, must contribute at a minimum percentage of 20% for 2018.”
   (iii) New Participants may withdraw from the Service within two years of joining provided that written notice that the Participant intends to withdraw is delivered to the CRD Corporate Officer on or before July 1st of the first or second year of membership to be effective as of January 1st the following year.
   (iv) Participants described in section 6 (2) (c)(ii) may withdraw from the Service within two calendar years of adoption of this bylaw provided that written notice that the Participant intends to withdraw is delivered to the CRD Corporate Officer on or before July 1st of the first or second year since adoption, to be effective as of January 1st the following year.

d) By renumbering Section 8 to Section 7, by deleting Section 9 in its entirety, and by renumbering Sections 10 and 11, to Sections 8 and 9.

2. This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as the “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017”.
CONSENTED TO BY AT LEAST TWO THIRDS of the Councils of the Township of Esquimalt, District of Highlands, District of Metchosin, District of Oak Bay, District of Saanich, Town of Sidney, City of Victoria, Town of View Royal and the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area Director.

READ A FIRST TIME this 10th day of May 2017.

READ A SECOND TIME this 10th day of May 2017.

READ A THIRD TIME this 10th day of May 2017.

APPROVED BY THE INSPECTOR OF MUNICIPALITIES this ______ day of __________________, 2017.

ADOPTED this ___ th day of 2017.

________________________________ ______________________________
CHAIR CORPORATE OFFICER
To the Chair and Directors of the Capital Regional District Board:

The Arts Commission reports and recommends as follows:

1. **17-165 Bylaw 4127: A Bylaw to Amend Bylaw Number 2884, Being “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001”**

That Bylaw No. 4127, “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017” be introduced and read a first time, a second time and a third time.

*(Background information can be found in the attached staff reports from February 22, 2017, and April 26, 2017. Note that at the April 26 meeting, and as reflected in the amended Appendix A, the Commission added a further clause to Bylaw 4127; namely, section 6(2)(c)(iv), to provide a time-limited withdrawal provision for designated, existing Group 2 participants similar to that provided for new participants in section 6(2)(c)(iii).*
SUBJECT  Bylaw 4127: A Bylaw to Amend Bylaw Number 2884, Being “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001”

ISSUE
An additional amendment to Bylaw 4127 requires review and approval by the Arts Commission.

BACKGROUND
At their meeting of February 22, 2017, the Arts Commission recommended approval by the Capital Regional District (CRD) Board of Bylaw 4127, to amend Bylaw 2884, the Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw, with the following amendments:

- Rename non-Group 1 participants as “Group 2”.
- Establish the participation level for new Group 2 participants as a minimum 30% of their Group 1 level.
- Provide a means for new Group 2 participants to increase to the minimum 30% level over three years beginning at 10% in their first year and 20% in their second year.
- Provide direction for Group 2 participants currently contributing less than 20% to increase to 20% beginning in 2018.
- Update the assessment calculation methodology for cost sharing, using current CRD standards.
- Add the Southern Gulf Islands as a Group 2 participant per their request.

Prior to the recommendation moving forward to the CRD Board, at their meeting of March 29, 2017, the Arts Commission requested an additional amendment to Bylaw 4127 providing a two-year trial for new Group 2 participants only. The additional amendment has been added as 6 (2)(c)(iii).

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1
That the CRD Arts Commission recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:
That Bylaw No. 4127, “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017” be introduced and read a first time, a second time and a third time.

Alternative 2
That the staff report and bylaw be referred back to staff for further information.

IMPLICATIONS
The additional amendment to Bylaw 4127 provides a two-year period whereby a new Group 2 participants may withdraw from the service in the first or second year of membership.
CONCLUSION

The additional amendment 6 (2)(c)(iii) adds a two year withdrawal provision for new Group 2 participants.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the CRD Arts Commission recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

That Bylaw No. 4127, “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017” be introduced and read a first time, a second time and a third time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted by:</th>
<th>James Lam, Manager, Arts Development Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concurrence:</td>
<td>Nelson Chan, MBA, CPA, CMA, Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrence:</td>
<td>Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JL:hh:ngm

Attachment: Appendix A Bylaw 4127
SUBJECT Bylaw 4127: A Bylaw to Amend Bylaw Number 2884, Being “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001”

ISSUE

Amendments effecting changes to non-group 1 participation in the Arts Development Service and adding Southern Gulf islands as a participant.

BACKGROUND

At their May 11, 2016 meeting, the Arts Commission (then Committee), requested staff to provide wording and bylaw amendments that would set the point of entry for non-group 1 participation at a minimum of 10% of a participant’s group 1 level and require an increase to 30% within five years. Community engagement around the #BuildingOurArtsFuture arts implementation plan, and a pending request from Southern Gulf Islands to join the Service, has put off the amendment until now.

Bylaw 4127 proposes the following amendments:

- Creates a naming convention for non-group 1 participants as “Group 2”.
- Establishes the participation level for new Group 2 participants as a minimum 30% of their Group 1 level.
- Provides a means for new Group 2 participants to increase to the minimum 30% level over three years beginning at 10% in their first year and 20% in their second year.
- Provides direction for Group 2 participants currently contributing less than 20% to increase to 20% beginning in 2018.
- Updates the assessment calculation methodology for cost sharing, using current CRD standards.
- Adds the Southern Gulf Islands as a Group 2 participant per their request.

ALTERNATIVES

That the CRD Arts Commission recommend:

1. To the CRD Board that Bylaw No. 4127, “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017” be introduced and read a first time, a second time and a third time.

2. That the staff report and bylaw be referred back to staff for further information.

IMPLICATIONS

Amendments to Group 2 participation levels will change the minimum contribution required to participate in the service from a voluntary amount to a standard amount based on a formula. The changes establish a minimum of 30% as the required contribution for Group 2 membership with allowances for new and/or current Group 2 participants to reach the 30% level in increments.
CONCLUSION

The main purpose of the Bylaw 4127 is to revise the contribution level required for Group 2 participation in the Arts Development Service. The proposed amendments set the Group 2 contribution level at 30% of the Group 1 amount, with options to reach 30% over time.

Updating the assessment cost sharing methodology using the standard Regional District converted assessments will streamline the workflow related to the calculation of municipal contributions, as well as bring it into better alignment with the Local Government Act.

The proposed amendments will also establish “Group 2” as the naming convention for non-group 1 participants.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the CRD Arts Commission recommend to the CRD Board that Bylaw No. 4127, “Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017” be introduced and read a first time, a second time and a third time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted by:</th>
<th>James Lam, Manager, Arts Development Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concurrence:</td>
<td>Diana Lokken, CPA, CMA, General Manager, Technology and Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrence:</td>
<td>Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A: Bylaw No. 4127
Appendix B: Draft Consolidated Bylaw No. 2884
CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT
BYLAW NO. 2884

******************************************************************************
A BYLAW TO ESTABLISH THE GIVING OF
ARTS AND CULTURAL GRANTS AS A SERVICE
******************************************************************************
(as amended by Bylaws 3481, 3616 and 4127)

WHEREAS under section 176(1)(c) of the Local Government Act the Capital Regional District may provide assistance for the purpose of benefiting the community or any aspect of the community;

AND WHEREAS there is a desire on the part of the municipalities which currently participate in the Greater Victoria Inter-Municipal Committee (“IMC”) to move activities of the IMC to the Capital Regional District and establish a service to carry out these same activities;

AND WHEREAS the participating municipalities of the IMC, being the City of Victoria, the District of Saanich, the District of Oak Bay and the Township of Esquimalt have established a Greater Victoria Arts Commission to provide advice on matters involving the arts within the Greater Victoria area and there is a desire to allow for the establishment of committees to provide advice to the Capital Regional District on these same matters;

AND WHEREAS the Board of the Capital Regional District considers it desirable to establish for the regional district a service to provide for the giving of assistance for the purpose of benefiting the community or an aspect of the community to be known as the “Arts and Cultural Support Service”;

AND WHEREAS the Board of the Capital Regional District wishes to proceed under section 796 of the Local Government Act to establish the service under Division 4.1 of Part 24 of the Local Government Act;

AND WHEREAS the Board of the Capital Regional District has obtained the consent of the Councils of the municipalities of Victoria, Saanich, Oak Bay, Esquimalt, Highlands, Metchosin, View Royal and Sidney;

(Bylaws 3481, 3616)

AND WHEREAS under section 804(2)(g) of the Local Government Act with respect to a service established to provide assistance under section 176(1)(c) the cost of providing the service may be apportioned among the municipalities or electoral areas benefiting from the assistance, with the service area deemed to be all those areas and the Board of the Capital Regional District wishes to establish a service for the purpose of providing assistance with the cost of the service being apportioned among the municipalities or electoral areas benefiting from the assistance;
NOW THEREFORE, the Board of the Capital Regional District in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. **Service**

   The service hereby established is the provision of assistance in relation to the arts and culture for the purpose of benefiting the community or an aspect of the community to be known as the “Arts and Culture Support Service”.

2. **Boundaries**

   The boundaries of the service area shall be the boundaries of the municipalities of Victoria, Saanich, Oak Bay, Esquimalt, Highlands, Metchosin, View Royal and Sidney and Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area.

   *(Bylaws 3481, 3616, 4127)*

3. **Participating Areas**

   (1) The Township of Esquimalt, District of Highlands, District of Metchosin, District of Oak Bay, District of Saanich, Town of Sidney, City of Victoria, Town of View Royal, and the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area are the participating areas for this service.

   (2) In this bylaw, “Group 1 Participating Areas” in each year means the Township of Esquimalt, District of Oak Bay, District of Saanich, City of Victoria, and the Town of View Royal.

   (3) In this bylaw, “Group 2 Participating Areas” in each year means the District of Highlands, District of Metchosin, Town of Sidney and the Southern Gulf Islands Electoral Area.

   *(Bylaw: 4127)*

4. **Cost Recovery**

   The annual cost of providing the service shall be recovered by one or more of the following:

   (a) property value taxes imposed in accordance with Division 4.3 of Part 24 of the *Local Government Act*;

   (b) fees and charges that may be imposed under section 797.2 of the *Local Government Act*;

   (c) revenues raised by other means authorized by the *Local Government Act* or another act;
(d) revenue received by way of agreement, enterprise, gift, grant or otherwise.

5. **Maximum Requisition**

The maximum amount that may be requisitioned under sections 805 and 805.1 of the *Local Government Act* for the annual cost of the service shall be the greater of:

(a) $1,980,000; or

(b) an amount equal to the amount that could be raised by a property value tax of $0.102 per $1,000 which, when applied to the net taxable value of land and improvements of the initial Group 1 Participating Areas (Victoria, Saanich, Oak Bay and Esquimalt) within the service area, would yield a maximum amount that may be requisitioned under sections 805 and 805.1(a) for the service.

6. **Apportionment**

(1) The amount of annual costs recovered by requisition in accordance with Section 4 (a) of this bylaw, shall be apportioned among the Participating Areas by dividing the costs into two equal parts, one part to be apportioned on the basis of population and one part to be apportioned on the basis of assessments and applying the formulae in Section 6 (2) below.

(2) For the purpose of this section:

(a) **Group 1 Participants:**

   (i) **Population** is the total population estimate as determined annually by the Regional Planning Services Department of the Capital Regional District, and

   (ii) **Assessments** are the annual converted value of land and improvements in the Participating Areas.

(b) **Group 2 Participants** (subject to Section 6 (2)(c) below):  

   (i) **Population** is 30% of the population estimate as determined annually by the Regional Planning Services Department of the Capital Regional District, and

   (ii) **Assessments** are 30% the converted value of land and improvements in the Participating Areas, or

   (iii) A greater percentage amount if indicated in writing by a Participating Area.
(c) **Transitional provisions for New and Existing Group 2 Participants:**

(i) New Participants are subject to 6 (2)(b) above except in the first year of participation their percentage is a minimum of 10% and in their second year of participation their percentage is a minimum of 20%

(ii) Participants contributing at less than 20% at the date of adoption of this bylaw, must contribute at a minimum percentage of 20% for 2018.

**8.7. Voting**

On a vote of the Board of the Regional District in respect of the amount to be placed in the annual budget with respect to annual grant funding, each director representing a Group 1 Participating Area is entitled to five votes and each director representing any other participating area is entitled to one vote.

**40. 8. Advisory Committee and Operation**

Without limiting the powers of the Regional District under the *Local Government Act*, the Board may establish one or more committees to:

(a) advise the Board on matters regarding the service; and

(b) manage the administration and operation of the service.

**44.9. Citation**

This Bylaw may be cited as “*Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 2001*”.

READ A FIRST TIME THIS 25th day of April 2001.

READ A SECOND TIME THIS 25th day of April 2001.

READ A THIRD TIME THIS 25th day of April 2001.

APPROVED BY THE INSPECTOR OF MUNICIPALITIES THIS 12th day of June 2001.

ADOPTED THIS 27th day of June 2001.

Christopher Causton Carmen Thiel
CHAIR SECRETARY

3. **Participating Areas:**

   (1) The municipalities of Victoria, Saanich, Oak Bay, Esquimalt, Highlands, Metchosin, View Royal and Sidney are the participating areas for this service.

   *(Bylaws 3481, 3616)*

   (2) In this bylaw, “**Group 1 Participating Areas**” in each year means the municipalities of Victoria, Saanich, Oak Bay, Esquimalt, View Royal and any other participating area that indicates in writing to the Regional District prior to October 31st in the prior year that it wishes to fully participate in annual grant funding costs subject to cost sharing under section 7(3)(c) for the service established by this bylaw.

   *(Bylaws 3616)*

6. **Minimum**

   Each participant that gives notice under section 7(3) shall contribute a minimum of $500 annually.

7. **Apportionment**

   (1) In this section the following words and phrases have the following meanings:

   (a) **class of property** means class of property as defined in the Prescribed Classes of Property Regulation, B.C. Reg. No. 438/81 or similar enactment as it exists from time to time;

   (b) **converted assessed value** for a municipality means the converted value, determined under paragraph 7(2) of:

      (i) the assessed value under the *Assessment Act*, in the previous year, of lands and improvements taxed by the municipality for general municipal purposes in the previous year according to the assessment roll; and
      
      (ii) the Crown value;

   (c) **Crown land** means land and improvements owned by the Crown or an agent of the Crown in a previous year if the municipality received or is due
to receive a grant in lieu of taxes, in respect of the year before the current year;

(d) “Crown land value” will be:

(i) in the case of Crown land other than Crown land owned by the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, the lesser of the assessed value under the Assessment Act for the previous year and the value which would result in a property tax equal to the grant in lieu of taxes if the land and improvements were not crown land, and

(ii) in the case of Crown land owned by the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, the assessed value under the Assessment Act for the year before the previous year, and

(iii) in the case of Crown Land owned by the Government of Canada or by an agent of the Government of Canada, the value, in the year before the previous year, of land and improvements which would result in a property tax equal to the grant in lieu of taxes if the land and improvements were not Crown land.

(e) “non-specific grant costs” means an amount that a participating area has indicated in writing to the Regional District prior to October 31 in any preceding year that it wishes to raise to have available to provide funding to a person or organization through the service established by this bylaw.

(f) “population” means the population for each municipality most recently published by the Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Finance and Corporate Relations.

(g) “specific individual grant costs” means the amounts which a participating area has indicated in writing to the Regional District that it wishes to raise to provide funding to a specified person or organization through the service established by this bylaw.

(2) For the purpose of this part, the assessed value of land and improvements will be converted by adding together the products obtained by multiplying the assessed value for each class of property by the percentage set out below for the class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Property</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) The amount of the annual costs recovered by requisition in accordance with section 4(a) of this bylaw shall be apportioned among the participating areas as follows:

(a) Specific individual grant costs shall be apportioned to:

(i) Group 1 Participating Areas; and

(ii) any other participating area where the participant indicated in writing to the Regional District prior to October 31 in the preceding year that it wished to participate in the making of specific individual grants,

in the amount which each such participating area is deemed to benefit from the assistance.

(b) Non-specific grant costs shall be apportioned to:

(i) Group 1 Participating Areas; and

(ii) any other participating area where the participant indicated in writing to the Regional District prior to October 31 in the preceding year that it wished to participate in the making of non-specific grants,

in the amount which each such participating area is deemed to benefit from the assistance.

(c) Annual grant funding costs shall be apportioned to Group 1 Participating Areas:

(i) 50% on the basis of the converted assessed value of land and improvements; and

(ii) 50% on the basis of population.

(4) For the purposes of 7(3)(a) and (b), a participating area is deemed to benefit from assistance in the amount that the participant indicated in writing to the Regional District should be requisitioned for specific individual grants or non-specific grants or both.

9. **Grants in Lieu of Taxes**
For the purpose of sections 807(1) to (3) of the Local Government Act, funds paid to the Regional District in respect of the service established by this bylaw will be held to the credit of the participant making the payment.
COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  June 12, 2017

CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT (CRD) BYLAW NO. 4127, ARTS AND CULTURE SUPPORT SERVICE ESTABLISHMENT BYLAW NO. 1, 2001, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 4, 2017

Request from the Capital Regional District (CRD) that Council consent to the adoption of Bylaw No. 4127, Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017.

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Council consent to the adoption of the Capital Regional District Bylaw No. 4127, Arts and Culture Support Service Establishment Bylaw No. 1, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017, in accordance with Section 346 of the Local Government Act.”

Councillor Plant stated:
- Saanich is a key participant in the Regional Arts and Culture Support Service; there are currently two levels of participation.
- Currently Group 2 municipalities have a minimum $500 buy-in; the amendment establishes a 10% threshold for Group 2 participants, with increases over two years to 20% and 30% and formalizes Group 2 participation in the service.
- The goal of the amendment is to encourage other municipalities to participate in the service.
- Consent is also being requested to permit the South Gulf Islands to join at a Group 2 level.

Councillor Brownoff stated:
- The bylaw amendment would also change how the service is funded; currently the bylaw calculates the apportionment for Group 1 from a municipal intercultural formula; the amendment results in the apportionment being based on assessments.
- It is unclear what the financial commitment for Saanich would be.

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:
- The maximum allowable requisition would change as a result of the bylaw amendment; the maximum amount could only be requisitioned with approval of the CRD Board on which Saanich has representation.

Councillor Plant stated:
- Municipalities have been having difficulty effecting the assessment conversion properly; the formula, as revised, was recommended for clarity.
- The requisition under the current formula allows for $6.5 million; it is not anticipated that funding would increase.

Councillor Sanders stated:
- The language in the amendment, specifically “dividing the costs into two equal parts” is unclear; there is a need for a clearer formula and more details with respect to the maximum requisition.

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:
- The bylaw establishes a maximum potential requisition; the maximum requisition is essentially a place holder and is fluid depending on assessments.
- The actual requisition for the service is determined through the budget process; the CRD board, on which Saanich has representation, have full control of establishing the budget.
- The establishment of a maximum requisition does not impact the amount of future funding at the municipal level.

Mayor Atwell stated:
- It may be useful to have a table showing how much money would be levied through the funding formulas for 2015-2017.

Councillor Wergeland stated:
- Further clarification is needed.

Councillor Brice stated:
- The CRD board approves the budget; it is important to clarify the financial impact for Saanich.

Councillor Haynes stated:
- More information on the funding formulas for the past years and the voting weighting would be appreciated.

Councillor Plant stated:
- Once a municipality is a participant in the service, it would have an equal vote; the CRD board approves the budget and at that time, voting would be done based on participant weighted.

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:
- The amendment may be beneficial to Saanich in that it may reduce the financial implications for Saanich; Saanich is always going to pay more than other municipalities because of its size.

MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That the item be postponed to allow staff to obtain further information in relation to the proposed amendments to the bylaw.”

Councillor Plant stated:
- The bylaw amendment has been approved by the CRD Board; clarification on the amendments may be in order.
- A revision to the bylaw amendment would require a longer process.

Councillor Sanders stated:
- There is a need to clarify the funding formula.

Mayor Atwell stated:
- It would be helpful to have a table that shows the funding costs for Saanich under the previous formula compared to the proposed new formula.

The Motion to Postpone was then Put and CARRIED
Report

To: Mayor and Council
From: Suzanne Samborski, Director, Parks & Recreation
Date: 06/16/2017
Subject: High Performance Aquatics Sports at Saanich Commonwealth Place

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council direct staff to:
   a. pursue Provincial and Federal support for the creation of a renewed triparty operating and funding agreement that supports high performance aquatic sports at Saanich Commonwealth Place, and
   b. provide a detailed analysis and report outlining the financial, community and resource implications if Saanich continued to support and subsidize high performance aquatic sports at Saanich Commonwealth Place without the assistance of other levels of governments.

PURPOSE

1. Provide background information on the history of the current Operating Agreement at Saanich Commonwealth Place (SCP).
2. Provide information on alternate operating models the District could consider if high performance sport was not supported financially or philosophically at SCP.
3. Seek direction from Council.

DISCUSSION

In 1994, the District of Saanich, entered a 25 year Operating Agreement to support high-performance aquatic sport, as part of the 1994 Commonwealth Games legacy. The agreement expires August 31, 2019.

The multi-party agreement between the District, the Province of British Columbia and the Government of Canada created a $4,000,000 Trust Fund to support operational costs of the competitive zones (the 50-metre Competition Pool and the Dive Tank) at SCP.

Designed as a sinking fund, the Trust Fund was created through $1,500,000 contributions from each of the senior levels of government and $1,000,000 from the
District of Saanich. Under the 25 year Operating Agreement, the fund provides $330,000/year to the District of Saanich and gives the Aquatic Sports Clubs priority access to the competitive zones at below-market rental rates.

Additionally, Canada Sport Centre Victoria (CSCV) occupies a 4,800 square foot office space at no cost, which is used to support a number of high performance sport organizations. The intent is any agreement between CSCV and the District to occupy this space will expire concurrently with the Operating Agreement in 2019.

Presently, SCP hosts more than 800,000 annual visitors and is home to five (5) high performance aquatic sports supporting approximately 700 athletes.

Many of the athletes and coaches who access SCP through high performance programs, have represented Canada at various international meets, most recently at the 2012 London and 2016 Rio Summer Olympic Games.

In addition to their regular training and practice sessions, the clubs host between 40-50 competitions (from regional to national meets) at SCP each year, drawing provincial, national and international visitors and profile to Greater Victoria. It is estimated that these events contribute $8-12,000,000 dollars per year to the region in "economic impact". However, the hosting guidelines and specifications determined by the sport governing bodies are expected to change significantly over the next few years. Consequently without expansion of the facility, SCP’s ability to continue to host national and international competitions will be impacted.

ALTERNATIVES

Presently, SCP is the only high performance aquatic venue in the region. However, as it reaches some level of redundancy in the high performance sport market on an international and national hosting level, it may be timely to explore other options.

Further, with the expiry of the Operating Agreement, the District has the opportunity to take a fresh look at the role of high performance aquatics sports in building a healthy community, and the role that SCP plays in the delivery of recreation and wellness services to the District.

Staff outline four operating models that could be considered at SCP. A further breakdown of challenges, benefits and opportunities is provided in Appendix A.

A. Extension of Current Model
The District of Saanich would continue to work in partnership with the Province of British Columbia and the Federal Government and/or others (eg. Swim Canada) to support to high performance aquatic sports within Saanich Commonwealth Place. The current model supports the sports of Swimming, Diving, Synchro, Waterpolo and Triathlon.
The basic concept of this model is that in exchange of priority access and lower than market rental rates for pool space for the high performance clubs, the District of Saanich receives ongoing additional funding from the partners to offset the cost of operation of the competitive zones.

B. Community Model
In response to current and expected future demands for aquatic programs and services, the District could re-assign the competitive pool and diving tank for community use, reducing the time allocated to high performance. The District of Saanich would be responsible for all operational resources.

Adoption of this model would need to be phased in to allow the clubs time to adjust to paying more for pool space, while having less access for both training and hosting competitions, while SCP staff develop and introduce new community programs and services, along with a revised allocations policy.

C. District Model
The District alone would provide all necessary financial and other resources to high performance sport to keep pool allocations status quo.

The primary assumption in this model is that the key components of the current Operating Agreement would continue, including:

- Priority access of the clubs
- Below market rental rates for pool space to high performance clubs
- Continuation of maintaining the high performance areas and equipment as world class aquatic competitive zones

D. Sponsorship Model
In this model, the District would solicit corporate sponsors to provide the necessary financial and other resources to high performance sport. The generation of sponsorship can take months and sometimes years to secure and is a complex process. The District does not currently have the resources to obtain the required level of sponsorship. Full or partial corporate sponsorship of all high performance activities could be pursued.

Grand-scale corporate sponsorship on the Island has not been as lucrative as once was thought, and finding large-scale sponsors for a very narrow market segment is even more unlikely. Plus, the requirements for more seating and additional lanes impeding future large-scale event hosting at SCP creates an additional barrier to garnering large-scale sponsorship.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Depending on the outcomes of discussions with the federal and provincial governments regarding a new agreement, and then depending on what business model Council chooses, the financial implications will vary. Until we have a report recommending a preferred model and more work and investigation is completed, there will not be any financial implications.

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS

The 2015-2018 Strategic Plan does not have any reference to High Performance Aquatic Sports.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan:
Objective 15.7 - Continue Funding Commonwealth Legacy

Identify alternative funding sources/approaches to ensure the continuation of the Saanich Commonwealth Place High Performance Legacy Fund

OCP:
5.2.1 "Volunteerism is also an important element of community life, strengthening connections and involvement. Without volunteer support, many worthwhile projects would never be undertaken. For example, groups such as the Friends of Mount Douglas Park and numerous sports organizations..."

5.2.1.1. Continue to work with Neighbourhood Associations, service organizations, sports groups, business and other stakeholders to support and strengthen the community.

6.0 Saanich also has a strong and diverse core of economic activity in retirement services, health care, education, sports, tourism, high technology, film, research, and agritourism
CONCLUSIONS

The current model of high performance aquatic sport at Saanich Commonwealth Place is coming to an end in 26 months. This operational model is now an “exception to the rule”, as both new and established Canadian facilities like Saanich Commonwealth Place, do not have operating agreements that provide financial support for senior levels of government.

Pursuing the creation of a renewed three-party operating and funding agreement that supports high performance aquatic sports at Saanich Commonwealth Place, and providing with a detailed analysis and report outlining the implications if Saanich continued to support and subsidize high performance aquatic sports at Saanich Commonwealth Place without the assistance of higher level governments, will assist Council in determining the future of high performance aquatic sport in the region.

Prepared by

Tom Bryce
Manager, Saanich Commonwealth Place

Approved by

Suzanne Samborski
Director, Parks and Recreation

Approved by

Kelli-Ann Armstrong
Senior Manager, Recreation

TB/ka
Attachments (1)

ADMINISTRATOR’S COMMENTS:

I endorse the recommendation from the Director of Parks and Recreation.

Administrator
## APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial/Operating Benefits</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive zone is close to capacity during prime time (weekdays 3-8pm)</td>
<td>Competitive zone is close to capacity during prime time (weekdays 3-8pm)</td>
<td>Current operating model could continue; with full sponsorship neither the clubs nor the public would see much change in operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from hosting training and competitions are approximately $250,000/year</td>
<td>Revenues from hosting training and competitions would be expected to remain at approximately $250,000/year</td>
<td>Revenues from hosting meets and events and the regional economic spin off from these competitions would continue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated regional economic spin off from hosting aquatic sport event is $8 – 12,000,000</td>
<td>With the older adult population increasing, an instant increase in demand for subsidized older adult programs would be expected</td>
<td>Estimated regional economic spin off from hosting aquatic sport event is $8 – 12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual contribution of $330,000 from sinking fund to offset SCP's operation costs of the competitive zones</td>
<td>Reduction of need for repair and replacement of high performance equipment: maintenance staff capacity would be improved</td>
<td></td>
<td>Substantive sponsorship can include sign up bonuses and community contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs employ coaches and managers that contribute to the region's economic prosperity</td>
<td>Clubs employ coaches and managers that contribute to the region's economic prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Benefits</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 youth participate in aquatic sports clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700 youth participate in aquatic sports clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs provide introductory programs to local schools and grass-root development</td>
<td>Clubs could continue to provide introductory programs to local schools and grass-root development programs at SCP; community youth in healthy, active lifestyle at affordable price point the District could not maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs at SCP; community youth in healthy, active lifestyle at affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>price point the District could not maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches and athletes from the region have competed in the Olympics and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international competitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>The tri-party governance model ensures leadership from Clubs plan and schedule meets and events; provides capacity to SCP staff for facility management and programming</td>
<td>Additional and consistent pool access to the public would be available during prime time and weekends; additional &quot;Everyone Welcome Swims&quot; would be available</td>
<td>Leadership from Clubs plan and schedule meets/events would be expected to continue; provides capacity to SCP staff for facility management and programming</td>
<td>Depending on the level of sponsorship, a new working agreement with all Clubs would be negotiated; key components of a new agreement would include: access to pool space for practices and competitions, pool rental rates and items currently not included in agreement - equipment storage and office spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 athlete enhancement fee is charged at each competition at the Centre; these</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funds are invested back into facility specialized training and competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current change room capacity challenges would be addressed as the separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team change rooms could now be used by the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current timing booth and bleacher spaces could be re-purposed for storage and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new programming spaces as the requirements for these spaces would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Operating Challenges</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards for facilities to host international qualifying meets have changed over time; SCP only meets the standards for pre-qualifying events; a reduction in meets and events is expected; future capital investment to extend competition pool tank an additional 2 lanes would need to be considered</td>
<td>Same level of rental revenues from the clubs ($250,000) and the $330,000 operating agreement contribution could no longer be counted on; the District would need to realign budget expectations including the possible increase in subsidy to the facility</td>
<td>The District would be responsible for all operating costs; annual contribution from current operating agreement would not be available; operating subsidy to SCP would need to increase no less than $330,000/year</td>
<td>Historically, there has been very limited corporate sponsorship of amateur sport both in Victoria and across Canada.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial and Federal Governments may not be interested in extending the Operating Agreement and its annual financial contribution; KPMG assessment estimates net operating deficit in 2019 as $419,930 for competitive zone</td>
<td>With fewer meets and competitions being hosted, the positive regional economic spin off will be reduced</td>
<td>Competitive zone unavailable for public swims during prime time (weekdays 3-8pm)</td>
<td>Additional and new resources would be required to pursue a full and/or long term sponsor with no guarantee one would be found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs for regular replacement or repair of equipment like diving boards, timing and scoring/technical equipment constant and not covered by agreement ($40,000 per year); capacity of Saanich maintenance staff is impacted</td>
<td>Council would need to be prepared to increase the annual operating subsidy to SCP</td>
<td>Costs for regular replacement or repair of equipment like diving boards, timing and scoring/technical equipment constant and not covered by agreement ($40,000 per year); capacity of Saanich maintenance staff is impacted</td>
<td>Sponsorships requires high front end investment by the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and success of clubs results in not enough equipment storage; outdoor storage containers have been purchased and bleachers are stored outside</td>
<td>Issue of not enough equipment storage would remain; more outdoor storage containers would need to be purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Challenges</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little to no opportunity for community participation in competitive zones during prime time</td>
<td>Moving to the community model would require substantial engagement with the existing aquatic sport clubs; a 25 year change in practice</td>
<td>Residents may question why the District would be financially supporting High Performance to such a degree when some athletes are not Saanich residents and prime time pool space is limited to the public</td>
<td>Residents may question why the District would be financially supporting High Performance to such a degree when many athletes are not Saanich residents and prime time pool space is limited to the public</td>
<td>Sponsorship is not always viewed favourably by residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to number of meets and events, inconsistent and limited access to competition zones for the public on weekends</td>
<td>Space and time for clubs would decrease; corresponding decrease in participation in clubs and programs the clubs support (e.g.: regional elementary schools swim team program and annual competition)</td>
<td>Competitive zone unavailable for public swims during prime time (weekdays 3-8pm)</td>
<td>Should a sponsorship be secured, residents may question why the District would be financially supporting High Performance to such a degree when some athletes are not Saanich residents and prime time pool space is limited to the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Corporation of the District of Saanich

Report

To: Mayor and Council
From: Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering
Date: 6/15/2017
Subject: Federal Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund Application for the Saanich Commonwealth Place Mechanical System Upgrade Project

RECOMMENDATION

That Council endorses the application to the Federal Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund for the Saanich Commonwealth Place Mechanical System Upgrade.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the report is to seek Council endorsement for a Federal Gas Tax Strategic Priorities Fund (SPF) application for the SCP Mechanical System Upgrade that is administered through the Union of British Columbia Municipalities.

DISCUSSION

All local governments outside of the Metro Vancouver Area are encouraged to prepare applications for the next round of Federal Gas Tax funding delivered through the SPF. The SPF provides up to 100% funding for eligible capital and capacity building projects. The purpose of the SPF is to provide funding for strategic investments that are large in scale, regional in impact or innovative and support the Gas Tax Fund national objectives of productivity and economic growth, a clean environment, and strong cities and communities.

The objective of this round of funding is to fully commit the remaining funding available for the Strategic Priorities Fund under the current Administrative Agreement. It is anticipated that a minimum of $180 million will be available to eligible local governments, making it the largest single intake for the Federal Gas Tax Fund in BC.

The SPF will provide at a maximum $6 million per funded project. Project applications over $6 million remain eligible provided that additional costs are confirmed through other funding sources.
The SPF allows for up to two applications of which Council has already endorsed an application for the Shelbourne Valley Action Plan Short Term Mobility Improvement project. The Saanich Commonwealth Place Mechanical System Upgrade project is a second application that was submitted prior to the June 1, 2017, deadline but needs Council endorsement in order to be considered by the Ministry.

Staff intend to design and construct the replacement of the current mechanical system that is nearing end of life. The project looks to not only replace critical infrastructure but also has the potential of approaching 100% renewability for the facility through a 90% reduction in its current carbon footprint. The cost estimate for this work is $4.0 million.

The program guidelines for the funding state that eligible projects within the Capital Infrastructure Projects Stream may include "...Sport and Recreation Infrastructure." Eligible costs for the SPF Capital Infrastructure Projects Stream are the "expenditures associated with acquiring, planning, designing, constructing or renovating a tangible capital asset..."

The SCP Mechanical System Upgrade is an ideal project for the funding as it meets the Gas Tax national objectives and aligns with the criteria outlined within the SPF program guidelines. If successful, the SPF will provide committed funding that will enable advancement of other major capital infrastructure projects to be completed concurrently.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
The preliminary design work required was incorporated and adopted in 2017-2021 Financial Plan as part of the Community Facilities 5 year capital plan.

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS
The project supports many areas within the Saanich Vision and Official Community Plan by strengthening environmental integrity and community connections through recreational facilities, and managing the built environment. The project will also be a major catalyst for moving the organization and the community toward its GHG reduction targets and 100% renewable energy goals.

CONCLUSIONS
The Strategic Priorities Fund is an application based program available to local governments to support infrastructure improvements related to sport and recreational infrastructure. Staff plan leverage external funding where possible to address the replacement of critical infrastructure at the facility and to support Corporate GHG reduction targets and Community renewability goals.
ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS:

I endorse the recommendation from the Director of Engineering.

Paul Thorkelsson, Administrator

cc: Suzanne Samborski, Director of Parks & Recreation
Council Update
June 26, 2017

Mayor and Council:

I am pleased to provide an update on the progress of the Governance Review Citizen Advisory Committee. Since I last briefed you six months ago a significant amount of work has been completed and a lot of valuable information has been collected.

Highlights of the Committee’s work to date include:

- Engagement – February to June
  - Official launch of formal public engagement process on February 9
  - Public survey and other online consultation from March 1 to June 15, resulting in 250 survey responses
  - Two public workshops and two town hall meetings between April and May, involving 122 participants
  - “Pop-up” events at shopping centres (Tuscany Village, Uptown), UVic, Camosun College, Saanich Cycling Festival between April and June
  - Targeted engagement with groups such as students (UVic), seniors, Community Associations, Saanich Community Association Network (SCAN), Saanich Advisory Committees
  - The survey and online consultation concluded on June 15. We extended the deadline from May 31 and conducted a last communications push to get the message out about the final opportunities for feedback; a marked increase in submissions was noted during the final two weeks
  - Regional government outreach through a presentation at the CRD Governance Committee and invitation to a focus group
  - Presentations and discussion at the GRCAC monthly meetings

- Awareness Raising – February – June
  - Ads in the Saanich News, Facebook and Twitter posts, and website updates were important methods of getting our message out and making people aware of the multiple ways they could provide input.
  - Informational materials were available on the website and at all engagement sessions. One provided important background information on governance, and context for the committee’s review, such as the areas of governance we would be focusing on. A second handout detailed the various opportunities to get involved, including meetings, the survey and other online consultation tools, and email submissions direct to the committee.
  - Chair interviews with radio (CFAX) and print media

We have been impressed with the amount of thoughtful, considered input we have received, and appreciate the time that people have taken to complete the survey, either online or in hard copy, to share their ideas at meetings and to email us information, comments and suggestions.
Although the quality of the feedback has been good, the number of participants in the survey and the public meetings has not been as high as we had hoped. Some people participated in more than one type of engagement, so we cannot say how many unique voices we actually heard from. There are any number of reasons for low participation levels in public processes like citizen engagement, and voting, and we cannot be certain of the reasons in the case of the Governance Review.

Next Steps:
While the broader public consultation process has concluded, the GRCAC and our consultants from Sirius Strategic Solutions, will continue with targeted engagements over the next few weeks. We are holding more sessions than contemplated in the budget, as we aim to conduct as comprehensive a process as possible within the time available. Outreach has already begun for most of the following consultations:

- Individual meetings with Saanich Mayor and Councillors
- Saanich management and staff
- Saanich Police Department
- Saanich Fire Department
- Elected officials from other local municipalities
- Saanich youth advisory group
- Accessibility community
- Business community
- Academic/research community

In addition, the GRCAC and consultants will now be turning our attention to research, and the review and analysis of the data collected from all of the different streams. This includes survey responses, consisting of both quantitative and qualitative data; feedback from engagement sessions; and comments and submissions provided to the committee’s email address.

Conclusion:
As you can see, it has been a busy six months since we last met, and a considerable amount of progress has been made. We have talked to a lot of individuals and groups, have heard from a few hundred people, and will continue to be available to those who wish to share their ideas. We look forward to reviewing the feedback and incorporating it in our deliberations and the development of recommendations for Council.

I extend my appreciation to the GRCAC and our consultants for their dedication to this project and for their support and assistance in keeping the process on track and moving forward. I would also like to offer our sincere thanks to the Saanich staff who have provided us with excellent support and advice over the last several months. In particular, Kelsie McLeod and Tara Zajac in Communications, who have assisted in taking our social media and website updates and ensuring they are posted and made available as widely as possible. And of course our committee secretary, Penny Masse in Legislative Services continues to be prime resource for us.

The committee will continue to hold regular monthly meetings until the end of September. These meetings occur on the last Wednesday of each month (June 28, July 26, Aug 30, Sept 27) in the Kirby Room, Saanich Police Station, at 760 Vernon Avenue, and are open to the public. Schedules, agendas, and minutes are published on the Saanich website. Speakers and guest submitters are scheduled and the public are invited to attend as observers.
Thank you for this opportunity to provide a brief update on our work to date. The GRCAC is committed to making this governance review a success and providing positive and meaningful input that benefits Council and the municipality.
Respectfully submitted,

John Schmuck  
Chair, Saanich Governance Review Citizens Advisory Committee
The District of Saanich

Report

To: Mayor and Council
From: Ken Watson, Director of Legislative Services
Date: 06/14/2017
Subject: Annual Report Presented to the Public

RECOMMENDATION

That Council make the 2016 Annual Report available for public inspection and direct staff to schedule the Annual Meeting for input on the Report as part of the Regular Council meeting on July 17th, 2017.

PURPOSE

To provide the completed 2016 Annual Report to Council, make it available to the public, and schedule a meeting to consider public input and submissions regarding the Report.

DISCUSSION

Staff are pleased to present to Council and the public the 2016 Annual Report for consideration.

The Community Charter requires that before June 30th each year Council prepare an Annual Report and make it available for public inspection. The Charter also requires that, at least 14 days after the report is released, Council conduct an “Annual Meeting” to consider the Report and receive submissions and questions from the public regarding the Report.

All information required by the Charter is provided in the Report including the 2016 Audited Financial Statements which were received and approved by Council on June 13, 2017.

The 2016 Annual Report provides information to the public on all the services and initiatives undertaken by Saanich in one readable and informative document. Staff in all departments are involved in preparation of this document, but special acknowledgment should be given to Debbie Harris and Julie Wren in the Legislative Services department whose efforts and skills provide the high quality of the document produced.

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS

The Annual Report is an important component of Saanich's Strategic Planning process providing for annual measurement of progress on Strategic Initiatives and achievement of the Sustainable Saanich vision.
ALTERNATIVES

1. That Council receive the 2016 Annual report, make it available to the public and direct staff to schedule the Annual Meeting for input on the Report as part of the Regular Council meeting on July 17th, 2017

2. That Council provide alternate direction to Staff.

Prepared by

Ken Watson
Director of Legislative Services

ADMINISTRATOR’S COMMENTS:

I endorse the recommendation from the Director of Legislative Services.

Paul Thorkeisson
Chief Administrative Officer
The Corporation of the District of Saanich

Report

To: Mayor and Council
From: Sharon Hvozdanski, Director of Planning
Date: June 13, 2017
Subject: Development Permit Amendment Application
File: DPA00907 • 3333 Glasgow Avenue

RECOMMENDATION
That Council approve Development Permit Amendment DPA00907.

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to seek direction from Council on the subject application. The subject application is for an amendment to the existing Development Permit at 3333 Glasgow Avenue (1000 Inverness Road) to allow for a side yard setback variance from the southerly edge of the Phase Two building to the proposed new property line. The applicant is John Newton of Inverness & Glasgow Properties Ltd.

DISCUSSION

Background
At the meeting of June 15, 2015, Council gave final reading to rezone the subject properties to a new RA-9 (Apartment) Zone, and approved Development Permit DPR00561, in order to construct two four-storey, multi-family residential buildings, with underground parking in two phases, containing 43 and 48 units respectively.

Proposed Amendment
Construction has been underway at the site for some time, and Phase One was recently completed with an Occupancy Permit being issued on March 28, 2017.

Construction of Phase Two, comprising the consolidated northernmost four lots on Glasgow Avenue is now set to begin. Originally the two buildings were intended to be part of the same strata. However, the applicant has determined that it would be better for the two Phases to be in two separate stratas. While this does not affect the form and character of the proposed development, it does result in a required setback variance that needs Council approval.
The proposed change from one strata to two is, in effect, a type of subdivision, where each of the buildings would now be situated on its own lot. The allowable density under the RA-9 (Apartment) Zone would not be exceeded, but the presence of a lot line between the two buildings, unanticipated during the review of the original proposal, would now require a variance for side yard setback from the southerly edge of the Phase Two building to the new property line. The RA-9 Zone requires that buildings shall be sited not less than 4.0 m from an interior side lot line. The new property line between the two stratas would be located 2.43 m from the Phase Two building, requiring a variance of 1.57 m.

The distance from the new property line to the Phase One building is approximately 7.46 m which is in excess of the 4.0 m minimum and therefore no variance is required for that building. The location of the proposed property line is determined by the location of the physical boundary between Phase One and Phase Two in the underground parkade.

Other implications of the change to two stratas are that each lot must be serviced separately, and that an easement must be registered over the underground parkade to enable the residents of Phase Two to pass through the Phase One portion to enter and exit the parkade. As per the Zoning Bylaw, underground structures can be located anywhere within a lot and therefore the parkade structure below the buildings would not require a variance for setback.
It is important to note that this is essentially a housekeeping issue — the proposed Phase Two building is in no way different than the one previously approved by Council, save the presence of the new property line between the two buildings, which results in the legal need for a setback variance to be approved. For this reason, the proposed Development Permit Amendment is supportable.

![Figure 2: Site Plan showing Requested Variance](from plans by VDA Architecture Limited)

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. That Council approve the recommendation as outlined in the staff report.
   
   The implications of this alternative are outlined within the body of this report.

2. That Council reject the recommendation as outlined in the staff report.
   
   Should Council decide to reject the recommendations contained in this report, the implications are that the requested variance sideyard setback would not be granted, the property line could not be located in the proposed location, and the development would not be able to be comprised of two separate stratas.

3. That Council provide alternate direction to Staff.
   
   Should Council provide alternate direction to staff, the implications are that staff would work with the applicant to address comments from Council. The applicant would undertake any necessary revisions to the plans, and would resubmit their proposal, for review by staff and ultimately consideration by Council. This alternative would result in a delay in Council’s decision regarding the rezoning application.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATION**

The proposal has no immediate implications related to the District of Saanich Financial Plan.
STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLICATIONS

The proposal has no immediate implications related to the District of Saanich 2015-2018 Strategic Plan.

CONCLUSION

Two four-storey, multi-family residential buildings, with underground parking on the subject property were approved by Council in 2015. While always conceived of being completed in two phases within one strata, the applicant has now indicated that they would prefer each phase to be its own separate strata entity, necessitating the splitting of the larger lot into two. The introduction of a property line between the two buildings would require an interior sideyard setback variance for the Phase Two building.

As the introduction of the new property line in no way changes the form and character or site design of the previously approved development, and the required Development Permit Amendment is simply a legal housekeeping issue, the proposed variance can be supported.

Prepared by
Chuck Bell
Planner

Reviewed by
Jarrel Malanowskch
Manager of Current Planning

Approved by
Sharon Hvozdanski
Director of Planning

cc: Paul Thorkelsson, Administrator
    Graham Barbou, Manager of Inspection Services

ADMINISTRATOR’S COMMENTS:
I endorse the recommendation from the Director of Planning.

Paul Thorkelsson, Administrator
DISTRICT OF SAANICH

AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

To: Inverness & Glasgow Properties Ltd., Inc. No. BC1037147
  160 – 4396 West Saanich Road
  Victoria BC V8Z 3E9

(herein called “the Owner”)

1. This Amended Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws
   of the Municipality applicable thereto, except as specifically varied by this Permit.

2. This Amended Development Permit applies to the lands known and described as:

   Lot 2 Section 63 Victoria District Plan EPP70198
   3333 Glasgow Avenue

   (herein called “the lands”)

3. This Amended Development Permit further regulates the development of the lands as
   follows:

   (a) By varying the provisions of the Zoning Bylaw 2003, Section 735.6 (a) (ii) to permit
       the apartment building for Phase 2 to be constructed with an interior side yard
       setback on the south side of 2.43 (4.0 m required).

   (b) By supplementing the provisions of the Zoning Bylaw 2003, to require the buildings
       and lands to be constructed and developed in accordance with the plans prepared
       by VDA Architecture Limited received April 27, 2017, copies of which are attached to
       and form part of this permit.

4. The Owner shall substantially start the development within 24 months from the date of
   issuance of the Permit, in default of which the Municipality may at its option upon 10 days
   prior written notice to the Owner terminate this Permit and the Permit shall be null and void
   and of no further force or effect.

5. The lands shall be developed strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and
   provisions of this Permit and shall comply with all Municipal bylaws except for those
   provisions specifically varied herein. Minor variations which do not affect the overall
   building and landscape design and appearance may be permitted by the Director of
   Planning or in her absence, the Manager of Current Planning.

6. The terms and conditions contained in this Permit shall enure to the benefit of an be
   binding upon the Owner, their executors, heirs and administrators, successors and
   assigns as the case may be or their successors in title to the land.
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7. This Permit is not a Building Permit.

AUTHORIZING RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL ON THE

______________ DAY OF ____________ 20 ________

ISSUED THIS ____________ DAY OF ____________ 20 __________

_________________________________________

Municipal Clerk
The Corporation of the District of Saanich

Report

To: Mayor and Council
From: Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering
Date: 3/16/2017
Subject: 931 Beckwith Avenue – Application for Inclusion in Sewer Service Area

RECOMMENDATION

That Council approve the application to include 931 Beckwith Avenue (Lot 3, Section 65, Plan VIP59979, Victoria District) into the Sewer Service Area.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the application to have the property at 931 Beckwith Avenue included into the Sewer Service Area.

DISCUSSION

The property at 931 Beckwith Avenue is located outside the Sewer Service Area (SSA), but inside the Urban Containment Boundary. The owner is requesting inclusion of the property into the SSA, concurrently with a six lot subdivision application.

The current RS 8 zoning for the property supports the proposed six lot subdivision and there is a gravity sewer system on Jagat Place with sufficient capacity to serve the potential lots, upon subdivision approval.

It should be noted that the owner has submitted a separate application to rezone and subdivide 980, 990 and 1000 Beckwith Avenue to create a total of 14 RS-8 zoned parcels. This proposal also requires an extension of the Urban Containment Boundary and inclusion into the SSA. These requests would be discussed in a separate report to Council. Should Council support extension of the SSA around 931 Beckwith Avenue, because the parcel is already zoned RS-8, approval of the subdivision would be under the purview of the Approving Officer.
The District of Saanich Official Community Plan (OCP) states:

Policy 4.2.10.12 Consider extensions to the Sewer Service Area within the Urban Containment Boundary, based on health concerns, land-use policies, and cost effectiveness to the Municipality.

The applicant will be responsible for all costs associated with the extension of the SSA and additional sewer usage fees will be collected as per the Sanitary Sewer Bylaw No. 8792. Therefore the policy stated in the OCP supports the extension, due to cost effectiveness to the Municipality.

ALTERNATIVES

1. That Council approves the applicant's request to include the property of 931 Beckwith Avenue into the Sewer Service Area.

2. That Council denies the applicant's request to include the property of 931 Beckwith Avenue into the Sewer Service Area.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The extension of the Sewer Service Area to include the property at 931 Beckwith Avenue will result in additional sewer usage fees collected as per the Sanitary Sewer Bylaw No.8792. The property owner will be responsible for all costs associated with the extension of the sewer system.

CONCLUSIONS

The owner of the property located at 931 Beckwith Avenue has applied for a six lot subdivision supported under the current RS-8 zoning. Inclusion of the property into the Sewer Service Area is a requirement of the subdivision application and the owner is requesting approval for the inclusion. The property is located outside the SSA but inside of the Urban Containment Boundary. The application to include the property inside the SSA meets the policy outlined in the OCP.

Prepared by

Sean Elliott
Engineering Tech V

Approved by

Harley Machlelse
Director of Engineering
ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS:

I endorse the recommendation from the Director of Engineering.

Paul Thorkelsson, Administrator

cc: Sharon Hvozdanski, Director of Planning
    Liz Gudavicious, Subdivision Coordinator
    Lesley Hatch, Manager of Underground Services
The Corporation of the District of Saanich

Report

To: Mayor and Council
From: Sharon Hvozdanski, Director of Planning
Date: June 16, 2017
Subject: Application to paint a mural on the retaining wall at the north entry to the Seaton Street tunnel
File: 2200-35

RECOMMENDATION

That Council authorize the installation of a mural on the retaining wall at the north entry to the Seaton Street tunnel, based on the conceptual illustration (see figure 7) and the artistic process as outlined in this report.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek direction from Council on the subject proposal. The applicant is the District of Saanich, represented by Constable Lisa Bruschetta of the Saanich Police Department.

DISCUSSION

Background
The north entrance to Seaton Street tunnel has been a graffiti hot spot for years (see figures 1-4). The location has incurred many hours of Public Works staff time to remove the graffiti. In certain circumstances, graffiti can create an unwelcoming atmosphere and give the appearance of neglect. Graffiti can also make the area feel unsafe for some residents and tunnel users. Public Works staff remove graffiti from the high target areas, such as Seaton Street tunnel, on a regular basis to avoid other types of vandalism that often occurs in areas that are not maintained.

The Saanich Police Community Bike Squad uses the tunnel as one of their routes through the community. They have recognized that the blank wall leading into the tunnel is not only an easy target for graffiti, but also an opportunity to make a positive change in the community.

Constable Lisa Bruschetta of Saanich’s Community Bike Squad has developed a relationship with youth and staff at the Native Friendship Centre that is in close proximity to the tunnel. During her visits at the Native Friendship centre, Constable Bruschetta has recognised the artistic talent of the youth that participate in programs at the centre. An example of their work can be seen in a mural that they created inside the centre (see figure 5).
Constable Bruschetta has connected with staff and an artist mentor at the Native Friendship Centre and is proposing to install a mural at the north entry to the Seaton Street tunnel to deter graffiti and to showcase the youth artists' talent.

Constable Bruschetta applied for and received funding from the 2017 Civil Forfeiture Office Grants Program for their Crime Remediation and Crime Prevention Grant Funding Program. The funding application was submitted in order to hire a youth mentor to lead First Nations youth in designing and painting a mural at Seaton Street tunnel.

Council approval of a mural in a public area as required based on Saanich's Comprehensive Arts Policy and Unsightly Premises Bylaw.

Figure 1: Location of Seaton Street Tunnel and Proposed Mural
Figure 2: Air Photo Seaton Street Tunnel.

Figures 3 & 4: North Entry to Seaton Street Tunnel
Proposal

The artist Jesse Campbell would act as a mentor and lead a small group of First Nations, Inuit, and Metis youth artists in the development and installation of the mural. Jesse is a Metis painter and has been involved in the creation of over 10 murals in greater Victoria including: Phases 2 and 3 of the Ogden Point Unity Wall in James Bay. The Rock Bay Murals Project on Government Street and Pembroke Street, the Helmcken Alley mural at 510 Fort Street, and the Coming Home mural in Sooke.

Jesse explains that: “Each youth selected to take part has a unique identity and cultural history. It is my hope that through this process these youth will take this opportunity to tell their story through art and gain the experience and confidence necessary to continue their careers as emerging artists.”

Jesse would plan to work with the youth over a few weeks to finalize the conceptual drawing for the artwork. The youth would work with Jesse to create a mural that includes elements of their culture, and stories that they have gathered from their elders (see figures 6 and 7).
Figure 6: Photos of the youth artists' sketches
Figure 7: Conceptual Image of Proposed Mural

**Consultation**

The project was discussed at the May 25, 2017 Arts, Culture & Heritage Advisory Committee meeting where they passed the following motion in support of the proposal:

"That the Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory Committee fully supports the proposed Seaton Splash Mural Project, and recommends approval of the project when it is presented to Council."

The immediate neighbours have been contacted by the Saanich Police Community Bike Squad and have indicated they are in support of the proposed mural at the site.

Mount View Colquitz Community Association and Gorge Tillicum Community Association have been contacted and also fully support the installation of a mural at Seaton Street tunnel.

Public Works and Parks support the proposal as it would improve the appearance of the wall and help to reduce the amount of tagging that occurs at the site.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. That Council authorize the installation of a mural on the retaining wall at the north entry to the Seaton Street tunnel, based on the conceptual illustration (see figure 7) and the artistic process as outlined in this report. (Recommended).

The implications of this alternative are outlined within the body of this report.

2. That Council reject the recommendation as outlined in the staff report.

Should Council decide to reject the recommendation outlined in this report, the implications are that the proposed mural would not proceed, graffiti on the retaining wall would remain an ongoing issue, and a valuable community building opportunity would be missed.

3. The Council provide alternate direction to staff.

Should Council provide alternate direction, staff would endeavour to work with the applicant to address the noted issues/concerns. The implications of this alternative is that the installation of the proposed mural would be delayed, or that it would potentially not proceed.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

If approved, the project would be funded by the 2017 Crime Remediation and Crime Prevention Grant Funding Program from the Civil Forfeiture Office.
Public Works staff do a weekly review of the site and currently expend resources removing graffiti from the retaining wall at the entry of the tunnel. Staff anticipate that graffiti would be less of an issue if the mural is painted on the wall. Either way, Public Works staff would continue to attend to the site to ensure any graffiti is removed.

If the proposal is approved, Public Works and Parks staff would clean the wall prior to the artists’ work being installed and apply anti-graffiti sealant after the mural is complete. The anti-graffiti sealant has been used successfully on other murals in Saanich. Associated costs of the above-noted work would be accommodated within existing budgets.

In some cases, Saanich has installed a plaque identifying the art and artist for public art installations within the community. Some of the plaques have also included background information on the artwork as well. The organizers and participants in this project have indicated that a plaque explaining the work and the artists would be welcome. The cost of a plaque would be approximately $550 to $800 and would be accommodated within the Planning Department’s existing budget.

STRAategic IMPLICATIONS

There are no implications to the District of Saanich 2015-2018 Strategic Plan. Any staff time required in relation to this proposal could be accommodated within existing work plans.

PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

Policy

The following Saanich Policies are the most applicable to the subject proposal:

Official Community Plan (2008)

5.2.3 (2) “Work with other municipalities, school districts, Chambers of Commerce, Tourism Victoria, and other agencies to plan and coordinate arts initiatives.”

5.2.3 (4) “Support the continued implementation of the Comprehensive Arts Policy.”

5.2.3 (7) “Continue to promote the use of parks, civic buildings and public spaces for public art, performances, festivals and exhibitions.”

Unsightly Premises Bylaw No. 8417 (2003)

1. “In this bylaw, GRAFFITI means any drawing, printing, picture, writing or mark or combination thereof but does not include … a mural for which a permit has been issued by the Council, or a mural approved by the Project Jury in accordance with the Saanich Comprehensive Arts Policy, January 2002.”

6. “Notwithstanding anything contained in this bylaw or the “Sign Bylaw, 2000, No 8101” or any successor bylaw or bylaws, the Council may, upon the application in writing of an owner of land, authorize the issuance of a permit to paint a mural on a wall, fence or other place or thing on a parcel of land.”
Comprehensive Arts Policy (2002)

Pt. 2 Sec. 7  “Public art is worthy of support and should be part of many civic works projects, as well as part of larger private development proposals.

Definition of Public Art for the District of Saanich:
- Artwork that is intended for installation and integration in indoor and outdoor public areas;
- Artwork that is created by local and other artists for a specific site and for the public to experience at no direct cost; and
- Artwork that is intended to be integrated into and interactive with the surrounding environment.”

Section 7.2  “Ensure that any civic public art project will be chosen through an equitable process and that projects are of sufficient value to merit selection.”

Policy Analysis
The creation of a mural to enhance the public realm and build community is clearly supported by both the Official Community Plan and Saanich’s Comprehensive Arts Policy. The subject proposal is also in keeping with other community murals that have been approved by Council, such as: the Garry oak ecosystem mural at Rogers Elementary school; and the First Nations mural at Craigflower Elementary school.

CONCLUSION

The Seaton Street tunnel is a location that is subject to a high incidence of graffiti and tagging. Graffiti is regularly removed by the Public Works Department in an effort to deter further vandalism. Many people use this tunnel to commute to work, the recreation centre, schools, the Native Friendship Centre and shopping. In order to deter further vandalism, engage in community building, and help to make the space feel safer, Constable Lisa Bruschetta of the Saanich Police Department, and staff from the Native Friendship Centre are proposing that a mural be painted on the retaining wall of the north entry to the tunnel. The proposed installation is for a mural to be painted by First Nations, Inuit and Metis youth and would be led by artist and mentor, Jesse Campbell.

The Official Community Plan and Comprehensive Arts Policy support such a community based initiative, and the proposed mural would be in keeping with projects recently approved by Council. The proposal enjoys support from the surrounding neighbourhood and Community Associations; the Arts, Culture & Heritage Advisory Committee; Saanich Police; and both Public Works and Parks staff.

The project would be funded by the Civil Forfeiture Office Grants Program. Any associated costs outlined in this report such as preparing the wall for the mural, or installing an information plaque similar to other public art projects in Saanich, could be accommodated within existing Departmental work plans and budgets.

For the above-noted reasons, staff support the installation of the subject mural as outlined in this report.
Prepared by

Jane Evans
Planner

Reviewed by

Cameron Scott
Manager of Community Planning

Approved by

Sharon Hvozdanski
Director of Planning

cc: Paul Thorkelsson, Administrator
    Graham Barbour, Manager of Inspections Services

ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS:

I endorse the recommendation from the Director of Planning.

Paul Thorkelsson, Administrator