

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING  
FOR THE PURPOSES OF A **PUBLIC HEARING**  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2004 AT 7:30 P.M.**

Present:

**Chair:** Mayor Leonard  
**Council:** Councillors Brownoff, Cubberley, Derman, Gillespie, Ngai, Pickup, Wade, and Wergeland (8:20pm).  
**Staff:** D. Halldorson, Development Manager; T. Olsen, Planner I; M. Trottier, Deputy Municipal Clerk; and C. Bonnick, Senior Committee Clerk.

---

No. 49  
Wilkinson Road  
Bylaw 8530

"ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2004, NO. 8530"

**PROPOSED 4 LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ON WILKINSON ROAD**

To rezone Lot A, Section 16, Victoria District, Plan 45788 (**3852 WILKINSON ROAD**) from zone A-1 (rural - minimum lot size 2 ha) to zone RS-10 (single family dwelling - minimum lot size 780m<sup>2</sup>) for a proposed four lot residential subdivision. **A DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT** applicable to the above lands will also be considered to reduce the width of proposed Lot 4 from 20m to 17.5m.

The Notice of Public Hearing; the report of the Director of Planning Services dated December 22, 2003, recommending approval and one letter in opposition signed by four residents of Wilkinson Road; were introduced.

**APPLICANT:**

Mr. K. Prentice, Earth-Tech, 4430 Chatterton Way, representing the applicant, stated:

- S The application is to rezone the subject property to RS-10 for the purpose of creating four lots which will range in size from 685<sup>2</sup> metres to 896<sup>2</sup> metres with one common access on the south side of the property.
- S The access road originally proposed between Lots 2 and 3 contained a sensitive nature habitat area and had to be relocated to preserve the area.
- S The existing driveway will be retained.
- S There was concern expressed that the proposed road would damage the large Garry Oak tree on the neighbouring property; an arborist has now confirmed that the tree will not be harmed by the road construction.
- S The Parks department has suggested that some plants be transplanted to the covenant area.
- S They have received positive feedback from the President of the Strawberry Vale Ratepayer's Association with respect to the development proposal.
- S They have met with several of the surrounding residents and feel they have adequately addressed their concerns.
- S "No Parking" signage will be posted in the turnaround area at the top of proposed Lot 1.
- S Two guest parking spaces will be constructed in each residential driveway.

- S There will be no overhead street lighting; all lighting will come from the residences.
- S At the request of adjacent neighbours, extensive hedging will be planted to screen their views from the development.
- S Saanich bylaws require that a pre-blast survey be completed.
- S The applicant is prepared to offer a covenant to restrict the dwellings to a maximum of two storeys with one storey not exceeding 1800 square feet and a total square footage 2600 square feet.
- S The applicant is prepared to enter into the covenants specified in the Director of Planning Services' report.
- S There are two high concentration tree areas which lie within building envelopes; these will be transplanted; tree replacement will be done at a 2:1 ratio for the site.
- S The amount of blasting required will depend upon the layout of the houses but all blasting will be done in accordance with Saanich bylaws.

Councillor Derman stated:

- S He questioned whether the applicant would be willing to extend the natural state covenant for the front of proposed Lots 2 and 3 to include Lots 1 and 4 in order to preserve the existing streetscape.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Ms. I. Block, President, Strawberry Vale Ratepayer's Association, stated:

- S The subject property is very steep, uneven and difficult to develop; the developer has created a design which works well with the site.
- S The applicant has made every effort to fulfill all requirements and has maintained contact with the Association throughout the process.
- S The Association believes that the applicant has accommodated the concerns of the neighbours.

Mr. and Mrs. Page, 3861 Mildred Street, stated:

- S They are concerned that the shared driveway at the end of the roadway will be used as a parking lot and that there is not sufficient room for large trucks to turn around.
- S As the low point lies on their property, they are concerned that stormwater will pool on their property.
- S They questioned how the "no parking" area will be enforced in the turnaround.
- S They are concerned that the headlights and noise from vehicle traffic will affect the enjoyment of their home.
- S Extensive blasting will need to occur on the site and they are concerned about the damage which may result

Ms. C. Merry, 3865 Mildred Street, stated:

- S She would like the hedging material which will be planted along her neighbour's properties to be extended along her property to minimize the amount of noise heard from the development.
- S She is very concerned about the damage from blasting as her house sits atop the large rock.

Mr. T. Kirby, 3846 Wilkinson Road, stated:

- S The proposed trees will be planted only to the back of his home but nothing will be planted along the side of the house; he would like the applicant to extend the trees to the Garry Oak tree which lies between the two properties to preserve his privacy and provide a noise barrier.
- S He had requested that the Garry Oak Tree Preservation Society be consulted with respect to tree removal.
- S He queried whether the 2:1 tree replacement would be done on the subject property or elsewhere in Saanich.
- S He has a number of retaining walls and is concerned that the blasting will damage them and the foundation of his home; he queried who will be responsible for damages.
- S He questioned whether any branches would be removed from the large Garry Oak tree in order to accommodate large trucks.

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:**

Mr. J. Hartshorne, 998 Perez Drive, stated:

- S He would be willing to extend the natural state covenants in front of Lots 1 and 4 as long as it does not enter into the building envelope area.
- S He agrees that the streetscape should be maintained in its current state.
- S In order to provide adequate views of approaching traffic, a portion of the rock face will be sheered off.
- S Trees will not grow on the north property line as it is solid rock.
- S They have produced a design concept that will leave as much of the rock in place as possible.
- S He would be willing to extend the cedar hedge east to the Garry Oak tree; there are no windows on any of the buildings on this elevation in order to provide additional privacy to the existing homes.
- S All of the trees required for the 2:1 tree replacement cannot be accommodated on this property.
- S Less than half of the trees on the site will be removed.
- S They are required to address the runoff issues through stormwater management requirements.
- S With respect to blasting, a pre-blast survey is required and they will carry liability insurance.
- S They have selected the proposed layout in order to minimize the amount of rock that would need to be blasted; the blasting will be dealt with as conveniently and appropriately as possible with notification being provided to neighbouring residents.
- S The lots may be developed separately but the road will be constructed all at one time.
- S He does not believe that garbage trucks will enter onto the access road; smaller trucks will likely be used.
- S If legally permitted to do so, they would covenant the "no parking" area in the turnaround.
- S The road surface will likely be constructed of asphalt.
- S With respect to stormwater management, the plan has not yet been engineered but will meet municipal requirements.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, stated:

- S He queried whether the road in the turnaround area directly abuts the garage on proposed Lot 4 as it appears in the plan.

In response to questions, the Development Manager stated:

- S Stormwater management will be in compliance with the Wilkinson Valley Action Plan and will go into pipes to connect to the Wilkinson Valley creek; retention ponds will not be utilized.
- S Saanich's blasting bylaw requires the applicant to obtain the permit, carry acceptable liability insurance, blast within prescribed hours and conduct a pre-blast survey.
- S Complaints are usually addressed expeditiously by the applicant.

In response to questions from Council, the Planner I stated:

- S The hammerhead road surface in front of the garage on proposed Lot 4 is a driveway to provide an alternative to constructing four driveways which would impact the streetscape; both turn-around areas will require shared access agreements.

**Moved by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie:  
"That the application to rezone to RS-10 be approved"**

Councillor Derman stated:

- S This is extremely difficult site and the applicant has presented a design which works well with the site.
- S He is pleased that the applicant has agreed to extend the natural state covenant area to include Lots 1 and 4.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

No. 50  
Wilkinson Road  
Bylaw No. 8530

"ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2004, NO. 8530"  
Second and Third Readings.

**Moved by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Derman:  
"That Bylaw No. 8530 be read a second time."**

**CARRIED**

**Moved by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Derman:  
"That Bylaw No. 8530 be now passed."**

**CARRIED**

**Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie:  
"That it be recommended that Council approve and issue  
Development Permit No. DVP2003-00025 on Lot A, Section 16, Victoria  
District, Plan 45788 (3852 WILKINSON ROAD)."**

**CARRIED**

No. 51  
Wilkinson Road  
Bylaw 8531

"ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2004, NO. 8531"

**PROPOSED REZONING FOR A 66 LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION AND 3.19 ACRES OF PARK ON WILKINSON ROAD**

To rezone Lots 1 and 2, Section 16, Victoria District, Plan 11442 and Lot 5, Section 5, Lake District, Plan 411 (**3977/3981/4025 WILKINSON ROAD**) from zone A-1 (rural - minimum lot size 2 ha) to zones RS-10 (single family dwelling - minimum lot size 780m<sup>2</sup>), RS-8 (single family dwelling - minimum lot size 665m<sup>2</sup>), RS-6 (single family dwelling - minimum lot size 560m<sup>2</sup>) and P-4 (recreation and open space) for a proposed 66 lot residential subdivision and 3.19 acres of parkland.

The Notice of Public Hearing, the report of the Director of Planning Services dated December 23, 2003 recommending approval; the report of the Municipal Solicitor dated February 2, 2004, recommending Council decline the offer to assume responsibility for the private covenant proposed for the Peers Creek development; the report of the Parks Manager dated February 9, 2004 providing additional information with respect to the provision of parkland and one letter in opposition; were introduced.

**APPLICANT:**

Mr. W. Hopkins, Merdyn Development Group, stated:

- S There were concerns noted at the Committee of the Whole meeting that the street would be lined with double car garages; some of the homes have been designed with single-car garages and some with the appearance of a detached garage at the rear of the dwelling to address these concerns.
- S He is currently considering alternatives for impervious surface materials for the driveways as some of the designs have incorporated long driveways.
- S All of the lots and homes within the development lie outside of the floodplain.
- S It is proposed that there will be an 8.5 metre meandering setback from the curb that will follow the roadway.
- S The arborist has completed the on-site review and the areas to be covenanted are in draft form.
- S The trees on the right-of-way cannot be addressed at this time as the road location has not yet been determined by Engineering staff.
- S They intend to construct 26 to 28 parking stalls within cul-de-sac areas and pullouts while maintaining a 6 metre roadway; they have reviewed several similar developments and this type of parking system appears to work well.

- S Only 6 to 8 additional parking spaces could be accommodated by widening the road.
- S A “no parking” bylaw has not been required in the Gordon Point development which has the same type of parking as proposed for Peers Creek.
- S He would be willing to have Council adopt a “no parking” bylaw for specific areas within the development if necessary.
- S They are currently investigating a new porous material for the sidewalk and he would be happy to comply with Council’s decision with respect to material and location.
- S He agrees that the municipality should not assume responsibility for the private covenants.
- S He has estimated the expense of equipment for a “tot lot” at approximately \$20,000 including installation and is prepared to make a contribution of one half of this cost.
- S He is willing to personally undertake the responsibility of the covenants for the development.

Councillor Derman stated:

- S The responsibility for Broadmead covenants has been passed on to an agency which appears to have been successful.
- S He queried whether the applicant would vet applications for permits before they came to Saanich.

Councillor Cubberley stated:

- S Sidewalks are necessary for safety and the ones within this development would likely be part of a safe route to school; for this reason they should be separated from the roadway.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- S An owner could not make an application to Saanich without the approval of the developers.
- S The setback from the front lot line will vary as the road meanders; the Planning department is currently processing the application for variances; no one house can be closer than 1.5 metres.
- S He is currently considering two options for sidewalk surface but would prefer a design and material which would not require maintenance or landscaping.
- S The ponds and riparian areas will be extensively planted.
- S The multi-use trails will be constructed 2 metres wide.
- S He would prefer to construct a sidewalk along the side of the road; he believes that the landscaped strips between roadways and separated sidewalks are often neglected.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Mr. G. Potter, Broadmead Area Resident’s Association, stated:

- S The Association has a separate society to enforce covenants as they have found enforcement to be a significant task.
- S In most cases, the developers move on and no one is left to enforce the covenants.
- S There is currently little assistance received by Saanich as they do not determine whether a private covenant exists before a permit is issued;

it would be helpful if Saanich would not issue permits without approval from the Broadmead Covenant Society.

Ms. S. Gray, 3808 Heritage Lane, stated:

- S She is not opposed to the development but is concerned that it will bring an increase in the already heavy traffic on Burnside Road West.
- S She has had a serious accident on Burnside Road and the speeding traffic worsens each year; she queried whether Council is planning to address these issues.
- S She hopes that the blasting times will be published in the Saanich News or that notification will be distributed to the surrounding area.

Ms. I. Block, President, Strawberry Vale Ratepayer's Association, stated:

- S The association feels the developer has set a standard of excellence which should be used as a template for development of the neighbouring properties.
- S Aspects of this development which are particularly noteworthy are the separation of the road from the stream resulting in a protected haven for wildlife; the avoidance of the 200 year floodplain and setting aside over three acres of parkland.
- S The association is not opposed to the meandering setback as they feel it will lend character to the development.

Mr. T. Kirby, 3846 Wilkinson Road, stated:

- S He is not opposed to the development but is concerned that as this and other properties are developed along Wilkinson Road traffic will increase; he queried if funding was being set aside for a pedestrian and/or cyclist facility in the area.

Mr. R. Kuhn, 4169 Hatfield Road, stated:

- S As part of this development, he would like a pedestrian pathway constructed along the undeveloped side of Hatfield Road.
- S A pedestrian crosswalk is necessary at the corner of Wilkinson Road, Helmcken Road and Santa Rosa Avenue as this is a very dangerous area where many children cross the road to get to school.

Mr. C. Hughes, 3984 Wilkinson Road, stated:

- S He is a member of the Safe-Routes-To-School committee at Strawberry Vale School and agrees that the sidewalks should be separated from the roadway for reasons of safety.
- S With respect to the sidewalk, he would prefer that it be constructed of gravel or wood chips.
- S He queried that if a playground is to be constructed within the development, would arrangements be made for garbage pickup.
- S With respect to the intersection at Wilkinson and Helmcken Roads, he feels there will be a lot of additional traffic with this new development and consideration should be given to safety when the roads are realigned.

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:**

Mr. W. Hopkins stated:

- S He does not anticipate that any blasting will occur during development.
- S A sidewalk will be constructed on Wilkinson Road; it will also be

slightly widened with a curb and gutter installed on the development side of the road.

- S The issue of a pedestrian corridor on Hatfield Road was discussed with staff during the early planning phases and it was felt that pedestrians would cut through the park trail and the sidewalk on Hatfield Road would be unnecessary.
- S The new intersection at Helen Road would be a controlled intersection and they have requested that a crosswalk be included.
- S He would prefer not to provide detailed engineering drawings with respect to the sidewalk when he returns to Council for the front yard variances as this would delay the application.

In response to questions from Council, the Development Coordinator stated:

- S The crosswalk at Wilkinson and Helmcken Roads will be fully signalled.
- S Staff would accept the applicant's offer to provide a sidewalk but cannot include it as a servicing requirement.
- S Funding is currently secured to construct the sidewalk along Wilkinson Road half way up to Burnside Road West; it is not known when the other funding will become available.
- S He would be willing to take the issue of private covenant responsibility to the Development Process Review Committee.

In response to questions from Council, the Planner I stated:

- S The variance for the front-yard setbacks will come back to Council for approval.

**Moved by Councillor Cubberley and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie:  
"That:**

- 1. The application to rezone from A-1 to RS-10, RS-8, RS-6 and P-4 be approved;**
- 2. Final reading of the zoning bylaw be postponed until a Development Cost Charge bylaw is adopted for the Wilkinson Valley;**
- 3. Prior to final reading, the applicant provide a cost estimate and cash donation for an emergency preparedness kiosk and suggestions on adaptable features that can be included in the developers design covenant; and**
- 4. The following issues be referred to the Approving Officer for consideration during the subdivision approval process:**
  - a) A stormwater management plan that includes development of the stormwater management ponds in the new parkland;**
  - b) A natural landscaping plan for the new parkland, the boulevard, and enhancement of the watercourse including riparian plantings;**
  - c) A tree retention and mitigation plan prepared by a registered arborist; and**
  - d) Samples for the design, colour and exterior finishes of new housing which should be controlled by a Section 219 covenant or the applicant's covenant should be amended so no changes**

**to the developer's covenants can be permitted without the written authorization of the Approving Officer."**

Councillor Cubberley stated:

- S He is pleased to see the improvements the applicant has made to satisfy the concerns raised at the Committee of the Whole meeting.
- S He appreciates the level of detail the applicant has provided and his willingness to introduce a pedestrian environment within the development.
- S The applicant has worked well with the community to address their concerns and presented some innovative ideas which may help Council look more creatively at future developments.
- S Traffic on Burnside Road West is increasing and the issue should be addressed.
- S The pedestrian environment along Burnside Road West is currently inadequate and steps should be taken to make the road less appealing to speeding traffic.

Councillor Gillespie stated:

- S This development has been part of a ten year action plan process and it will fit well with the neighbouring development.

Councillor Derman stated:

- S A great deal of attention to detail has been given to this project.
- S Six metre wide roads will assist in traffic calming but parking pullouts are necessary.
- S An adequate pedestrian environment must also be provided.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- S This will be a very attractive development and he looks forward to its completion.
- S He agrees that sidewalks are necessary within this development but he is concerned that long-term maintenance may become an issue if a material other than asphalt is used.
- S It is important that a sidewalk along Wilkinson Road be constructed to allow pedestrian traffic to safely get to Burnside Road West.

Councillor Pickup stated:

- S As Chair of the Environmental Advisory Committee she would like to compliment the developer for incorporating so many of the stewardship principles into his development.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- S She thanked the developer for his contribution toward a "tot lot".
- S She agrees that a pedestrian environment should be incorporated into the development given the number of families that will move into this new neighbourhood.
- S She congratulated the developer for devising a creative solution to resolve the issue of double garage doors lining the streets of the development.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

No. 52  
Wilkinson Road  
Bylaw No. 8531

“OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN, 1993, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2004, No. 8531“  
Second and Third Readings

**Moved by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Derman:**  
“That Bylaw No. 8531 be read a second time.”

**CARRIED**

**Moved by Councillor Cubberley and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie:**  
“That Bylaw No. 8531 be now passed.”

**CARRIED**

Resolutions

### **RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION**

No. 53  
Cancellation of  
Meeting  
ADM90

### **CANCELLATION OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2004 COUNCIL/COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETINGS**

Memorandum from the Municipal Clerk dated February 4, 2004 requesting that the decision to cancel the regular February 9, 2004 Council and Committee of the Whole meetings be ratified.

**Moved by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Pickup:**  
“That the rules under section 6(b)(iv) of Council Procedure Bylaw No. 8305 be temporarily suspended and the decision to cancel the regular February 9, 2004 Council and Committee of the Whole meeting be ratified.”

**CARRIED**

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Gillespie the meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:20 p.m.

No. 54  
ADM115 - AVICC  
BC Social  
Assistance Rules

### **ASSOCIATION OF VANCOUVER ISLAND COASTAL COMMUNITIES - PROPOSED RESOLUTION - B.C. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE RULES**

**MOVED by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:**  
“That Council forward the following resolution to the AVICC 2004 Annual General Meeting:

***WHEREAS unprecedented new provincial laws that limit the time people classified as employable can collect Income Assistance to two of every five years and reduce benefits to families with children by \$100-\$200 per month come into affect on April 1, 2004;***

***AND WHEREAS The people who will be most impacted are among the poorest and most vulnerable in our society, and are already struggling to deal with the impacts of cuts to other provincial and federal programs and services;***

***AND WHEREAS time limits for Income Assistance conflict with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms assurance to equality and life, liberty and security of the person, and are inconsistent with provincial and federal obligations to fulfill the right to an adequate standard of living, including food, clothing and shelter as provided in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to which Canada is a signatory;***

***AND WHEREAS time limits effectively download provincial responsibility for people in need onto the communities within the AVICC;***

***THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the AVICC urge the B.C. government to rescind the laws imposing Income Assistance time limits and reducing benefits;***

***AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the AVICC urge the UBCM to also call on the B.C. government to rescind these regressive and punitive Income Assistance rules on behalf of all the communities in B.C.”***

**CARRIED**

No. 55  
ADM115 - AVICC  
Provincial Funding  
of Health  
Facilities

**ASSOCIATION OF VANCOUVER ISLAND COASTAL COMMUNITIES -  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION - PROVINCIAL FUNDING OF HEALTH  
FACILITIES**

**MOVED by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:  
“That Council forward the following resolution to the AVICC 2004  
Annual General Meeting:**

***WHEREAS health facility capital funding levels have decreased significantly over the past two years;***

***AND WHEREAS deferred maintenance results in both more costly repairs down the line and buildings and their operating systems wearing out faster;***

***AND WHEREAS insufficient investments in building and modifications to reflect changing uses and new technology can compromise resident care and healing, perpetuate poor conditions for staff and staffing efficiencies and limit the number of and speed at which residents can be treated;***

***AND WHEREAS eventually the cost and benefits to renovate older health facilities to current standards exceeds the cost and benefits of replacement;***

***THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that AVICC strongly urge the province of B.C. to invest in health capital at more appropriate levels to maintain, upgrade and replace publically funded health facilities;***

***AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the AVICC urge the***

*province of B.C. to reinstate its 60% share of major capital projects and offsetting operating cost increases to the Vancouver island Health Authority.”*

CARRIED

No. 56  
ADM115 - AVICC  
Bill 75 Significant  
Projects Stream-  
lining Act

**ASSOCIATION OF VANCOUVER ISLAND COASTAL COMMUNITIES -  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION - BILL 75 SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS  
STREAMLINING ACT**

**MOVED by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:  
“That Council forward the following resolution to the AVICC 2004  
Annual General Meeting:**

*WHEREAS Bill 75 provides the provincial government with sweeping powers to override Local Government bylaws, plans, policies and powers;*

*AND WHEREAS Bill 75 allows the province to override Local Government jurisdiction not only for provincial projects, but also for private or mixed public/private projects if the province considers these to be in the broader provincial interest;*

*AND WHEREAS the autocratic powers granted to the province under Bill 75 have the potential to seriously undermine the current structure for ensuring cohesive Regional/Municipal land use planning and the important public safety protection that Local Government involvement brings to project development;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the AVICC urge the UBCM to establish a legal fund to assist local governments initiating legal challenges to Bill 75.”*

CARRIED

No. 57  
ADM115 - AVICC  
Heritage

**ASSOCIATION OF VANCOUVER ISLAND COASTAL COMMUNITIES -  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION - HERITAGE**

**MOVED by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:  
“That Council forward the following resolution to the AVICC 2004  
Annual General Meeting:**

*WHEREAS Heritage in our communities includes not just old buildings, but also artifacts and architecture, historic sites and land, historic and prehistoric resources, archival and interpretive materials and activities that reflect our roots;*

*AND WHEREAS the current B.C. government has relinquished responsibility for heritage sites and buildings of the province through a policy of privatization of services;*

*AND WHEREAS the current B.C. government is divesting itself of responsibility for stewardship of a public trust, eliminating*

*funding to programs such as the Heritage Trust, and jeopardizing future heritage policy and investment through ministry downsizing of the Provincial Heritage Branch;*

***THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the AVICC urge the BC government to maintain stewardship of heritage resources by investing the appropriate funding levels required to preserve, protect and enhance our heritage resources throughout British Columbia and on Vancouver Island.***

**CARRIED**

No. 58  
ADM115\_ AVICC  
 Exemption from  
 Provincial Sales  
 Tax

**ASSOCIATION OF VANCOUVER ISLAND COASTAL COMMUNITIES - PROPOSED RESOLUTION - EXEMPTION FROM PROVINCIAL SALES TAX**

**MOVED by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: "That Council forward the following resolution to the AVICC 2004 Annual General Meeting:**

***WHEREAS the Government of Canada has provided needed additional revenues to municipal governments by exempting them from paying any portion of the Goods and Services Tax***

***THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of the Province of British Columbia supplement this federal initiative by exempting municipal governments in the province from paying any portion of the Provincial Sales Tax;***

***AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such an exemption should be regarded as additional revenue for municipal governments and should not result in any reduction of grants in lieu or any other monies presently directed from the provincial government to municipal governments, nor should such exemption be seen as an opportunity to download additional responsibilities to municipal governments without providing sufficient funding to compensate for such additional responsibilities.***

**CARRIED**

In Camera Motion

**MOVED by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Ngai: "That the following Council meeting be closed to the public as the subject matter being discussed relates to the proposed disposition of land and/or improvements."**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Gillespie, the meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

.....  
 MAYOR

I hereby certify that these minutes are correct.

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK