

- 4) That Final Reading and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a Restrictive Covenant to secure a BuiltGreen™ Gold (or equivalent) energy efficiency standard.
- Referral form submitted by the Gordon Head Residents' Association dated December 7, 2012 providing comments;
 - Letter of support dated October 9, 2012 signed by five residents; and
 - Two letters from residents received March 10, 2014.

APPLICANT:

A. Bajwa, Torquay Drive, stated:

- The proposed two-family dwelling is consistent with the Official Community Plan; no variances are requested.
- Most neighbours are in favour of the development.
- The footprint of the proposed dwellings is approximately 20% greater than the existing building's footprint.
- The applicant is committed to a BuiltGreen™ Gold energy efficiency standard of construction.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- The type of heating system is still under consideration.
- Relocating or replacing the window overlooking the neighbours' back patio will be discussed with his architect.
- Fencing will be installed once construction is complete.
- Stormwater will be managed on the property.

PUBLIC INPUT:

P. Brown, Majestic Drive, stated:

- This proposed development is a huge change to the neighbourhood.
- The driveway for proposed Lot A is located too close to the intersection of Majestic Drive and Kenmore Road; a better option would be to use the existing driveway off Kenmore Road for both proposed dwellings.
- There is concern that the trees being removed will not be replaced; the window overlooking a residents' backyard patio is a privacy concern.
- The proposed development will increase the traffic in the neighbourhood; infill is not appropriate at this location.
- A proper sidewalk on Majestic Drive would be appreciated.

A. Moran, Majestic Drive, stated:

- There is a high volume of traffic at the intersection of Majestic Drive and Kenmore Road; a shared driveway from Kenmore Road would be a safer option than having the driveway from Lot A exit onto Majestic Drive.
- Properties in the area experience flooding; stormwater management is an issue and needs to be addressed.
- The resident questions who was included for consultation in regards to this project.

M. Jennings, Kenmore Road, presented a list of neighbours who support the development and stated:

- The proposed development will be a refreshing upgrade to the neighbourhood.
- The plans need to be clarified with respect to the height and width of the proposed dwellings; without the proper scale of the dwellings, it is difficult to see shadowing effects on adjacent properties.

- There is concern that the Gordon Head Residents' Association did not provide consultation with neighbours.
- Because of the slope of the site, there may be increased flow of stormwater to the neighbours' property.
- The number of duplexes being built in the neighbourhood is a concern.
- Kenmore Road and Majestic Drive have a high volume of traffic including frequent public transit; visibility is limited from the proposed driveway on Lot A due to on-street parking along Majestic Drive, hydro poles and the proposed hedges; a "No Parking" zone might be considered for safety reasons.
- The plans do not include visitor parking.
- The water collection basin at the corner of Majestic Drive and Kenmore Road must be maintained.

M. Brown, Cloverdale Avenue, stated:

- Concerns include the lack of consultation with neighbours, the site plan not including accurate dimensions, the driveway being too close to the intersection of Kenmore Road and Majestic Drive, and the number of trees being removed from the property.
- Any new development should include improvements that benefit the neighbourhood; this application does not do so.
- A skylight could be considered to replace the window overlooking the neighbours' property to ensure privacy; more consultation with neighbours needs to take place.
- Saanich could consider signage to notify neighbours of the date, time and location of public meetings.

P. Ghinis, Saanich Road, stated:

- The application proposes an appropriate use of the site and the dwellings will fit within the character of the neighbourhood.

D. Gunn, on behalf of the Gordon Head Residents' Association, stated:

- The proposed dwellings fit within the character of the neighbourhood; stormwater management on this property is an issue.
- Proposed Lot A should include a vehicle turning area within the property.
- Improvements to the intersection of Majestic Drive and Kenmore Road will result from this development.
- Consultation could have been improved upon; the applicant did attend a Community Association meeting to discuss the proposal.

J. Brown, Majestic Drive, stated:

- The Community Association did no consultation with immediate neighbours.

APPLICANTS' RESPONSE:

- Fencing will be installed after construction of the proposed dwellings is complete.
- A single family dwelling would have the same shadowing effect as the proposed two family structures.
- Secondary suites are not proposed.
- Parking for two vehicles is available on each property; Lot A originally had a vehicle turning area but this was replaced with the raingardens.
- Heat pumps will be considered.
- There are sidewalks on the north side of Majestic Drive.

- There is a commitment to a BuiltGreen™ Gold energy efficiency standard of construction.
- It is not possible to construct a shared driveway from Kenmore Road.
- Consultation took place with immediate neighbours.

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

- Trees that are diseased or are within the construction and servicing areas will be removed.
- There is no limit on the number of duplexes permitted; the Official Community Plan and Local Area Plans consider duplexes in the context of neighbourhood character and traffic safety.
- Two parking stalls per dwelling are required; traditionally visitor parking takes place on the driveway of the property or on public streets.
- A shared driveway from Kenmore Road could be considered if access over one strata lot to the other is secured; in this case, that would mean redesign of the properties.
- Secondary suites are not permitted within duplexes.

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

- Majestic Drive is a collector road; municipal standards call for a single sidewalk on collector roads and there is a continuous sidewalk on Majestic Drive from Kenmore Road to Ash Road.
- Raingardens act to attenuate the flow of stormwater; when the raingardens are saturated, the water would be held in storage on the site.
- The additional sidewalk on Kenmore Road would consist of concrete curb and gutter.
- The raingardens could be relocated to allow for a vehicle turning area on Lot A.
- The concerns regarding safety issues at the intersection at Kenmore Road and Majestic Drive have been noted.

There were no further submissions for the proposed rezoning on Kenmore Road. Acting Mayor Wergeland closed the public hearing.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That the public hearing regarding the proposed rezoning at 1602 Kenmore Road be adjourned to allow the applicant to further address the concerns raised.”

Councillor Derman stated:

- Consideration should be given to heat pump systems, relocation or replacement of the window overlooking the neighbours’ property and the relocation of the raingardens to allow for a vehicle turning area on Lot A.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Consideration should be given to relocation of the raingardens to accommodate a vehicle turning area on Lot A.
- The hedge and fencing should be incorporated in the plans.

Councillor Wade stated:

- This application has merit but there are concerns that need to be addressed.
- Further community consultation needs to take place.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- The proposed driveway on Majestic Drive is close to the intersection and could be dangerous; additional sidewalk on Majestic Drive should be considered.
- Neighbours state that they have not been consulted; the applicant should meet with neighbours to discuss their concerns.
- This application has merit.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- This application warrants further consideration but clarification of the drawings is needed.
- The applicant might consider meeting with neighbours and addressing concerns.
- Finishing off the existing sidewalk on Majestic Drive should be considered.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The applicant should consider options for changes to design elements; it would be beneficial to have input from the community.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Public consultation is important.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

BYLAWS

6840-20
Sewer Service
Area

SANITARY SEWER BYLAW AMENDMENT – INCLUSION OF 4559 CORDOVA BAY ROAD (A PORTION) IN THE SEWER SERVICE AREA

Final Reading of the “Sanitary Sewer Bylaw, 2006, Amendment Bylaw, 2014, No. 9262”. To give Final Reading to include a portion of 4559 Cordova Bay Road in the Sewer Service Area.

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That Bylaw No. 9262 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”

CARRIED

RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

5370-30
Annual Quote
07/14

ANNUAL QUOTE 07/14 – DUCTILE IRON AND PLASTIC PIPE

Report of the Director of Finance dated March 3, 2014 recommending Council award Annual Quote 07/14 for ductile iron and plastic pipe to EMCO Corp Waterworks in the amount of \$373,728.50 (based on estimated quantities and excluding taxes).

MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Gerrard: “That Annual Quote 07/14 for ductile iron and plastic pipe be awarded to EMCO Corp Waterworks in the amount of \$373,728.50 (based on estimated quantities and excluding taxes).”

CARRIED

1300-20
UBCM

UNION OF BC MUNICIPALITIES 2014 MEMBERSHIP DUES

Invoice from the Union of BC Municipalities requesting payment of annual membership dues in the amount of \$18,499.76.

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wade: “That Council authorize the payment of the 2014 annual membership dues in the amount of \$18,499.76 to the Union of BC Municipalities.”

CARRIED

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

1030-30
Water Utility Leak
Adjustment

WATER UTILITY LEAK ADJUSTMENT POLICY

Recommendation of the February 6, 2014 Finance, Audit and Personnel Standing Committee that Council approve the Water Utility Leak Adjustment Policy as amended.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That Council approve the Water Utility Leak Adjustment Policy, as amended.”

Councillor Brownoff thanked staff for preparing the amendment.

CARRIED

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

.....
ACTING MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK

THE FOLLOWING WAS REPORTED FROM THE “IN CAMERA” COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 27, 2014

2710-40
Torquay Drive

4111 TORQUAY DRIVE – PROPOSED ACQUISITION

“That Council approve the acquisition of Lot 1, Section 53, Victoria District, Plan 18423 (4111 Torquay Drive) in the amount of \$620,000 for addition to Lambrick Park, subject to the terms negotiated.”

THE FOLLOWING WAS REPORTED FROM THE “IN CAMERA” COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 7, 2011

2710-40
Carey Road

PANAMA FLATS – PROPERTY ACQUISITION

Xref: 1600-30
Panama Flats

“That Council:

- a) **Approve the purchase of 4112 Carey Road from Island Berry Company Ltd. For \$2,400,000 by exchanging the municipal properties generally described in this report as Cherry Road and Carey Road, according to the general terms and conditions outlined under Section C, Financial Arrangements of the Report of the Administrator dated February 7, 2011;**
- b) **Provide the cash portion of the transaction from sub-regional parks development costs charges, 2010 general fund operating surplus, accumulated sewer surplus, and land sales reserve; and**
- c) **Provide transfer expenses from the land sales reserve.”**

DISTRICT OF SAANICH
MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2014 AT 8:46 PM

Present:

Chair: Councillor Brice
Council: Acting Mayor Wergeland and Councillors Brownoff, Derman, Gerrard, Murdock, Sanders, and Wade
Staff: Colin Doyle, Acting Chief Administrative Officer; Sharon Hvozdanski, Director of Planning; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

2870-30
Burnside Road
West

1245 BURNSIDE ROAD WEST – PROPOSED REZONING AND DESIGNATION OF THE EXISTING DWELLING AS A MUNICIPAL HERITAGE SITE – KSD HOLDINGS LTD – KOMAL DODD

Report of the Director of Planning dated February 25, 2014 recommending Council approve the rezoning from RS-18 to RS-8, Development Variance Permit DVP00330, and exempt proposed Lots 2 and 3 from the statutory requirement to provide a minimum 10% perimeter road frontage under Section 944(2) of the *Local Government Act* for a proposed three lot residential subdivision, and that Council designate the exterior of the dwelling at 1245 Burnside Road West as a municipal heritage site; and that prior to final reading a covenant be registered to require that the design and construction of new dwellings on proposed Lots 1 and 2 conform to a minimum BuiltGreen™ Gold or equivalent energy efficiency standard, and that the exterior design, exterior building materials, size and siting of the new dwellings is consistent with the conceptual housing styles presented to Council.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Planning stated that properties to the west of this property that are in the Township of View Royal are zoned for residential.

The applicant, K. Dodd, KSD Holdings Ltd., presented:

- This application is to rezone the property to create two additional lots; the current owners of the existing dwelling on the property have applied to have the residence designated as a municipal heritage structure.
- As part of this application, the existing 1.6 meter walkway would be widened to 3 meters to provide better access to the public.
- The applicant has committed to a natural state covenant to protect the Garry oak ecosystem at the rear of the property; the owners wish to review the natural state covenant area to include a garden area.
- There are 27 protected trees on the property; four protected trees will be removed for construction purposes.
- The design of the proposed new dwellings will be complementary to the design of the heritage dwelling; there is a commitment to a BuiltGreen™ Gold standard of energy efficiency and to a stormwater management plan.
- Consultation with neighbours took place and no objections were noted for this proposed development; the Residents Association of Strawberry Vale, Marigold and Glanford support the application.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- The type of heating system will be determined before the Public Hearing; the applicant will consider incorporating future solar capabilities into the design.
- The Arborist has recommended which trees should be removed; the trees to be removed are in close proximity to the servicing and construction areas.
- Colour drawings will be provided to show the design and how the proposed new dwellings are complementary to the heritage building; plans will also be provided to show the building footprints, driveway access, trees and possible blasting areas.
- The owners of the existing dwelling have applied for heritage designation.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Engineering stated he would review the site plans and report back as to the locations of the trees that are being removed and why removal is being recommended.

PUBLIC INPUT:

D. Duprey, Burnside Road West, stated:

- The Monterey Cypress in the area have been problematic in the past and several have already been removed.
- The neighbouring property in the Township of View Royal has been turned into a fenced park; pedestrians access the park through neighbours' land.
- Widening the pathway may mean more access through private property by pedestrians.

E. Bratulic, Burnside Road West, stated:

- The proposed new driveway will be adjacent to their property; they would request that a chain-link fence be installed by the applicant to maintain privacy.
- The Monterey Cypress on the property line should be removed; it overhangs their dwelling and is a safety issue during wind storms.

B. Shuya, President of the Saanich Heritage Foundation (SHF), stated:

- The SHF is pleased to see another heritage home in this neighbourhood; this application is supportable.
- It is recommended that the SHF review the drawings of the proposed two new dwellings to ensure that the design is in keeping with the character of the heritage home.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- The Monterey Cypress, which is on the property line, will be removed as recommended by the Parks Department.
- Detailed colour drawings will be presented to the SHF and at the Public Hearing.
- There are a significant number of Garry oak trees on the west side of the property which resulted in the driveway being situated on the east side of the property.
- Discussion with the neighbour will take place to examine fencing options.

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

- The intent of widening the walkway was to make it more comfortable and safe for pedestrians; the chain-link fence will run along the property line of the subject property.
- Given the concerns raised regarding the trespass over private property to gain access to the park, an information report to Council will be provided.

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That a Public Hearing be called to further consider the rezoning application on Lot A, Section 16, Victoria District, Plan 22406 (1245 Burnside Road West)."

CARRIED

1110-30

Tree Preservation
Bylaw

TREE PRESERVATION BYLAW – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Report of the Director of Parks and Recreation dated February 25, 2014 recommending Council endorse the proposed changes to Tree Preservation Bylaw, 1997, No. 7632 as outlined, and direct staff to prepare an amended bylaw for Council consideration at a future meeting.

D. Henderson, Director of Parks and Recreation, R. Roer, Senior Parks Manager, and C. Manton, Urban Forestry, Horticulture and Natural Areas Manager, presented:

- Policy direction for the review of the bylaw came from the Sustainable Saanich Official Community Plan, Local Area Plans, Saanich Strategic Plan, Urban Forest Strategy (UFS) and Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan.
- Benefits of urban forests include stormwater management, carbon sequestration and clean air and reinforcing environmental integrity.
- Economic benefits of having sufficient tree canopy include extending the life of infrastructure and increasing property values.
- Consultation included discussions with Saanich Advisory Committees, Community Associations, Saanich Community Association Network (SCAN), the public, the development community and professionals such as engineers, arborists, and landscape architects.

- Open Houses were held, discussion boards were available on the website, and the public was encouraged to fill out surveys.
- According to the survey results, it is important to all stakeholders that native tree species are protected; it is also suggested that the Grand Fir and Big Leaf Maple tree species are added to the protected species list and that tree replacement takes place when protected trees are removed.
- Key components of the bylaw amendments include: protection of younger trees with an increased focus on native species, elimination of tree pruning permit requirements in most circumstances, clarification of language regarding the removal of dead, dying and diseased trees or those conflicting with infrastructure and the municipality providing free replacement trees in those circumstances, added flexibility related to the Interface Fire Development Permit Area and in agriculture zoned lands outside of the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR), clarification of definitions of building envelope and building footprint and the language for protected tree removal and the replacement requirements relating to development, and development of a replacement tree credit system.
- There will be no increase in staff required to administer the amended bylaw and to provide an education and outreach program; current resources dedicated to tree pruning permits will be re-allocated.

In response to questions from Council, the Urban Forestry, Horticulture and Natural Areas Manager stated:

- Removal of one tree per acre per calendar year means that if a resident owns more than one acre, trees can be removed from the same acre as long as the number of trees does not exceed the allowable number.
- Requirements for the Interface Fire Development Permit Area will be developed by the Fire Department and industry professionals.
- A permit, at no cost to the applicant, is required to remove a protected tree from agricultural land.
- On average, approximately 450 tree pruning permits are issued each year; staff who currently administer these permits will be re-allocated to tree removal and tree replacement requirements.
- Pruning permits will only be required for Significant Trees or in development-related cases.
- The Comprehensive Tree Planting Program will include a tool to assist residents in selecting the right tree for the right property.
- The bylaw will include information on the appropriate size of trees in relation to their impact on infrastructure such as foundations and perimeter drainage systems.
- The protected root zone is clarified in the bylaw amendment; discussions will continue with the tree-care community.
- Education and outreach material will be developed to ensure that residents understand the changes to the bylaw.
- Best practices, as recommended by the International Society of Arborists and the American National Standards Institute for Pruning Trees, will be included in the bylaw.
- The Oregon Ash could be considered for inclusion in the protected species list.
- The details of the Tree Replacement Credit System are still being discussed.
- 2:1 tree replacement for protected trees outside of the building envelope is consistent with the requirements of the Urban Forest Strategy.

PUBLIC INPUT:

R. Love, Cottonwood Close, stated:

- It is essential that the urban forest is maintained.
- There is concern about government interference in a homeowners' enjoyment of their property; this amendment should be further changed to allow a homeowner to remove a protected tree on their property provided that a minimum of two replacement trees of the same species are planted.
- Such replacement trees should be declared as protected trees to prevent abuse of the system; this change would enable homeowners to manage their own property and serves as a disincentive to remove trees en masse.

C. Friedinger, Seaview Road, stated:

- Fruit trees provide food security; the municipality has systemically neglected fruit trees.
- Garry oak trees need to be pruned regularly to ensure health; the resident is not prepared to pay for tree pruning permits.

A. Solbakken, Hector Road, read a letter on behalf of D. Metcalf, Hector Road, stated:

- The goal of maintaining the forest canopy is laudable; however the tree bylaw is not.
- More aggressive planting of trees could take place on boulevards, parks, school yards and at public buildings; this approach would engage residents, not threaten them with fines.
- Property owners who maintain trees on their property should be compensated for maintenance; it is requested that the amendment is tabled and alternatives considered.

J. Kalina, Oakmount Road, stated:

- Over 72 trees have been removed in this neighbourhood; only two replacement trees have been planted, both of which have died.
- The reasons given for the tree removals are insignificant and not justifiable.
- Ivy removal must be a part of the amended Bylaw to help protect trees.

P. Diggle, Old West Saanich Road, stated:

- There is concern with the content and implications of the proposed amendments; removal of invasive species should be a priority.
- There is no rationale as to why Saanich should dictate detailed regulations for private land; the consultative process leaves much to be desired.
- Food security requires more gardens and greenhouses which means fewer trees as a result; given climate change, solar panels and windows are becoming attractive options but that requires clear exposure to low winter sun angles which may mean removal of trees.

C. Edge, Executive Director of the Victoria Home Builders Association (VHBA), stated:

- VHBA does not support the proposed amendment to the bylaw, in particular the 2:1 tree replacement; the public survey underlines public support for a homeowner's right to build a home without added development costs.
- VHBA maintains the most equitable way to pay for a public benefit such as tree canopy, enjoyed by all, is through property taxes.
- Fairness is not evident in the proposed amendment; new development will incur additional costs while agricultural land will not.

H. Wolf, Kincaid Street, stated:

- Recommended boulevard trees are listed in the appendix of the Subdivision Bylaw and include 50 species of exotics and 8 native trees; there are no ecological grounds for the selection of protected trees included in the bylaw.
- Adding fruit trees to the list of recommended boulevard trees should be considered; food security and sustainability is important.

G. Carmichael, Elk Lake Drive, stated:

- The Tree Bylaw is necessary to stop abuses; 40% loss of canopy in the last ten years is disturbing and that number is accelerating.
- Staff are to be applauded for their hard work; the amendment is supportable.

D. Gunn, Tremblay Drive, stated:

- The goals and intent of the amendment are supportable; staff are to be thanked for their work in managing the urban forest and replacing trees.
- The amendment constricts homeowners' ability to manage their landscaping and protect property values; a strict application of infrastructure damage could result in costly remediations for homeowners.
- Further consideration should be given to the amendment before approving; Saanich has been successful in increasing the planting of trees on boulevards thanks to the efforts of volunteers.
- Incentives to encourage homeowners to plant trees on private property should be considered.

H. Charania, on behalf of the North Quadra Land Use Protection Association, stated:

- The Community Association supports and welcomes the amendment.
- The amendment defines the building envelope based on the building footprint and includes the dwelling, accessory buildings and the site services area.

L. Husted, Cyril Owen Road, stated:

- Trees are valued; the direction of the amendment is supportable and it is suggested that even more could be done to protect trees.
- The amendment strengthens tree protection; education is important for residents to understand the amendment and the value of trees.

R. Sargent, Amroth Place, stated:

- He is opposed to the bylaw; the bylaw infringes on private property rights.
- Having a protected tree on private property means that homeowners are paying property taxes on an area of property that is unusable.
- The fines for tree removal need to be clarified.

Motion:

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gerrard:
"That the meeting continue past 11:00 pm."**

CARRIED

In response to questions from Council, the Urban Forestry, Horticulture and Natural Areas Manager stated:

- There are only 300 hectares of public land left that can be used for tree planting; to make up for canopy loss, there is a need to plant on private property.

Councillor Wade stated:

- A matrix clarifying the species of trees that can be removed would be helpful; more guidance regarding the tree credit program is required.
- The 2:1 replacement is a concern; residents may be willing to plant trees on their own properties and this option should be explored.

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That Council request that Staff consider the comments from this meeting and report back providing additional clarity on the bylaw."

Councillor Derman stated:

- He does not support the motion; clarity can be provided when the bylaw is being prepared.
- The municipality uses regulatory tools to deal with concerns on private property through the Zoning, Unsightly Premise and Noise Bylaws; Council represents the values of the community at large.
- Staff have done a good job explaining the benefits of the urban forest and economic benefits; it is reasonable to expect new homeowners bear the costs through development.
- There is a need to educate the community regarding the amendment.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Reports show that trees increase property values; tree canopies assist with managing stormwater, increasing soil stability, decreasing water run off and preventing damage to watersheds.
- More information is required to explain the tree credit system; the removal of tree pruning permits, the addition of the tree replacement system and clarification of the building envelope in the bylaw is appreciated.
- There may be an opportunity to discuss adding other species of trees to the protected list.
- Saanich has to lead by example and the bylaw amendment begins the process to protect our trees; maintenance and monitoring also needs to take place to ensure protection of trees.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The bylaw amendment is supportable; opportunities for education and awareness for residents needs to be addressed.
- Trees provide natural beauty, have an economic benefit and offer a better quality of life; there is significant tree loss because of development and measures need to be taken to preserve the tree canopy.
- Staff are to be commended on the well thought-out engagement process; staff needs to continue to raise awareness regarding the amendment.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She does not support the motion; this amendment is long overdue.
- A tremendous amount of work went into the amendment; the rate of tree removal needs to decrease.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- The recommendation outlined in the staff report is supportable.
- We are losing our tree canopy at an alarming rate; trees are a benefit environmentally, socially and financially.
- The amendment is seen to be individually punitive rather than collectively an asset to save trees; clarification of the building envelope is important for the development community.
- This is an opportunity to consider climate change and halt canopy-loss.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He appreciates the time and effort that staff have put into the amendment; opportunities to plant more trees on municipal land should be explored.
- Residents should be encouraged to plant trees on their own property.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Staff have done an excellent job; there is an obligation to help our public understand the bylaw amendment.

The Motion was then Put and DEFEATED

Motion: **MOVED by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That Council endorse the proposed changes to Tree Preservation Bylaw, 1997, No. 7632, as outlined, and direct staff to prepare an amended bylaw for Council consideration at a future meeting."**

CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Murdock, the meeting adjourned at 11:35 pm.

.....
 CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....
 MUNICIPAL CLERK