

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
FOR THE PURPOSES OF A **PUBLIC HEARING**
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2005 AT 7:33 P.M.

Present:

Chair: Mayor Leonard
Council: Councillors Brownoff, Gillespie, Derman, Ngai (8:30), Pickup, Wade and Wergeland
Staff: S. Hvozanski, Planner I; V. Bishop, Manager of Development and Municipal Facilities; and MaryAnn Greco, Senior Committee Clerk

No. 294
Bylaw No. 8696
Rambler Rd

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8696”

PROPOSED 2 LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ON RAMBLER ROAD/LOCHSIDE DRIVE

To rezone Lot 3, Section 31, Lake District, Plan 6440 (**5178 RAMBLER ROAD/LOCHSIDE DRIVE**) from zone RS-18 (single family dwelling – minimum lot size 2 ha) to zone RS-6 (single family dwelling – minimum lot size 560 m²) for a proposed two lot residential subdivision.

The Notice of Public Hearing; report from the Director of Planning dated July 8, 2005 recommending rezoning approval; an arborist report submitted by the applicant; and 1 letter of no objection from the Cordova Bay Residents Association, were introduced.

APPLICANT:

Mr. D. Fetterley, 5178 Rambler Road, stated:

- He will undertake the arborist’s recommendations outlined in the letter from Talbot Mackenzie & Associates dated July 29, 2005.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Nil.

APPLICANT’S RESPONSE:

Nil.

Motion:

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That the application to rezone to RS-6 be approved.”

CARRIED

No. 295
Bylaw No. 8696
Rambler Rd

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2004, NO. 8696”
Second, Third and Final Readings.

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That Bylaw No. 8696 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That Bylaw No. 8696 be now passed.”

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That Bylaw No. 8696 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”

CARRIED

No. 296
Bylaw No. 8697
Lochside Dr

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8697”

PROPOSED 2 LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ON LOCHSIDE DRIVE/BECKTON ROAD

To rezone Lot 1, Section 31, Lake District, Plan 7879 (**5178 LOCHSIDE DRIVE/BECKTON ROAD**) from zone RS-18 (single family dwelling – minimum lot size 2 ha) to zone RS-12 (single family dwelling – minimum lot size 930 m²) for a proposed two lot residential subdivision.

The Notice of Public Hearing; report of the Director of Planning Services dated July 8, 2002 recommending rezoning approval; 2 letters in opposition; and 1 letter of no objection from the Cordova Bay Residents Association were introduced.

APPLICANT:

Mr. V. Wescott, 1005 Kentwood Place, stated:

- With respect to the concerns expressed by the neighbour at 5172 Lochside Drive, the owner was not aware of the setbacks and that the trees bordering the property will be retained and protected.
- He has attempted to have a meeting with the Cordova Bay Community Association but has not been successful.
- Any limitation on dwelling size should be considered by the Approving Officer at the subdivision review process.
- He does not feel it would be appropriate for him to commit to a dwelling size given that he is acting as an executor for the estate and will not be developing the two lots; the intent is to rezone and sell.
- The existing dwelling will be removed prior to subdivision approval.
- The future buyer will have to go through the subdivision review process and negotiate a dwelling size with the Approving Officer at that time.

In response to a question from Council, the Planner I, stated:

- The Approving Officer can request a covenant to limit the size of the house during the subdivision review process.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Ms. S. Bridges, Vice President, Cordova Bay Community Association, spoke in support and stated:

- She has attempted to contact the applicant to discuss an acceptable house size but did not receive a response.
- The Association has no objections to the application provided that a restrictive covenant be registered to limit the house size to 372 m² (4,000 ft²) excluding the garage.
- It is important that the house size is consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Mr. H. Brauss, 5172 Lochside Drive, spoke in support and stated:

- Some of his concerns have been addressed by the applicant.
- The group of trees adjacent to the interior side lot line (#485-489) should be retained as they are a natural division between the two properties and provide privacy; these trees should be protected by a covenant.

- He supports a limitation on the dwelling size; a smaller home would be in context with the existing homes in the neighbourhood and retain more trees.

Mr. F. DeBoever, 5175 Beckton Road, spoke in support and stated:

- The trees that border the south side of the subject property should be retained and protected to provide future privacy between his home and the new dwellings.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:

Mr. Wescott stated:

- He understands that the Approving Officer will be requesting a covenant to limit the future dwelling size.
- All the trees on the south side of the building envelopes of proposed Lots A and B will be retained and protected through a covenant as identified in the surveyors plan.

In response to a question from Council, the Planner I stated:

- The trees offered by the applicant for retention will be protected through a covenant by the Approving Officer at the subdivision review stage; this is in addition to the trees identified in the Planner's report for protection.

Councillor Wade stated:

- An executor is bound by law to do the best they can for the estate and maximize the value of the estate; the applicant will not personally benefit from this proposal.
- The community is not opposed to the subdivision but want a covenant to restrict the dwelling size and protect the trees in order to provide a buffer zone.
- She believes the desire for containing the dwelling size is to decrease the opportunity for secondary suites.
- The dwelling size should be within the community context rather than a specified number.

Motion: MOVED by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That

- 1. The application to rezone to RS-12 be approved; and,**
- 2. The Approving Officer consider a restrictive covenant to protect the trees outlined in the report of the Director of Planning dated July 8, 2005 and the trees located within the southern portion of the subject parcel, a restriction on the location of driveway accesses and a limitation on the size of the proposed new dwellings as part of the subdivision review process."**

Councillor Derman stated:

- He is disappointed that the applicant did not meet with the community association.

- The Approving Officer should consider requesting covenants that would protect the trees, restrict the location of the driveway access and limit the dwelling size at the subdivision review stage.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- In some cases the applicant is requested to provide house plans and in others they are not; there needs to be a standard so that the community has an understanding of what is proposed for their neighbourhood.
- A restrictive covenant should be provided to protect the trees, restrict the location of driveway access and limit the dwelling size.

Councillor Gillespie stated:

- He is comfortable that the Approving Officer will request a covenant to limit the dwelling size and protect the trees outlined in the Planner's report as well as those offered for retention by the applicant.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He does not believe it is fair that the proposed new lots will have a restriction on the dwelling size whereas the existing lots in the neighbourhood have no restriction and can build a home to 6,000 square feet.
- If large dwelling sizes are being considered in the future, then he believes the style of the home is important and should be taken into serious consideration and a restrictive covenant will help protect everyone.

Councillor Pickup stated:

- Retaining the trees will increase the value of the properties.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

No. 297
Bylaw No. 8697
Lochside Dr

"ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2004, NO. 8697"
Second, Third and Final Readings.

Moved by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8697 be read a second time."

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8697 be now passed."

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Wade and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8697 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto."

CARRIED

No. 298
Bylaw No. 8701
PLD60

“OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW, 1993, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8701“

PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF PROPERTY ON WILKINSON ROAD IN THE WEST SAANICH ROAD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA

The intent of this proposed bylaw is to amend Appendix “N” - Development Permit Areas, Justifications and Guidelines of the Official Community Plan to include Lot S Pt. 1 and Lot 2, Section 9, Lake District, Plan 4789 (**4583 AND 4591 WILKINSON ROAD**) in the West Saanich Road Development Permit Area.

Bylaw No. 8702
Wilkinson Road

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8702”

PROPOSED 17 UNIT TOWNHOUSE COMPLEX ON WILKINSON ROAD

To rezone Lot S Pt. 1 and Lot 2, Section 9, Lake District, Plan 4789 (**4583 AND 4591 WILKINSON ROAD**) from zone A-1 (rural) to zone RT-3 (attached housing) for a proposed 17 unit townhouse complex. **A DEVELOPMENT PERMIT** applicable to the above lands will be considered to require the buildings and lands to be constructed and developed in accordance with the plans submitted. Council will also consider a restrictive covenant to protect the portion of the site identified as a “natural retention area”.

The Notice of Public Hearing; report of the Director of Planning Services dated July 8, 2005 recommending that the rezoning and development permit be approved, the West Saanich Road Development Permit Area be amended and a natural state covenant be applied to the portion of the site identified as a “natural retention area”; report from the Advisory Design Panel recommending design approval; 1 letter in opposition; and 1 letter in support from the Royal Oak Community Association were introduced.

Councillor Ngai entered the meeting.

APPLICANT:

Mr. E. Barker, Eric Barker Architect Ltd., stated:

- They have had many discussions with the Royal Oak Community Association and their input has been incorporated into the design of the project.
- The site has a 25 foot grade difference.
- The units facing onto Wilkinson Road appear as single family homes from the street with smaller upper floors and larger main floors.
- The entrance has been positioned as far from Wilkinson Road as possible.
- Approximately 16 feet of the frontage on Wilkinson Road will be dedicated for road widening.
- A split rail fence will be constructed along West Saanich Road to retain the rural feel.
- A lush landscaped streetscape will be introduced along West Saanich Road to create a transition to the rural country side.

- The School Board has agreed in principle to carry on with protecting the natural retention area on their property.
- Approximately 50% of the site will be open space with 27% site coverage.
- There are seven different unit types to attract a variety of different buyers.
- Each single family house will have a different colour and treatment but with an arts and crafts character

Mr. R. Lloyd, Civil Engineer, stated:

- The storm water management proposed for this site has the capacity to store all the water from a ten year storm.
- The water from the units will be captured and directed into rain garden structures.
- The rain gardens will treat as well as slow down the water; it is a combination of detention and retention in one structure.
- This method will reduce the amount of water going into the Colquitz River system and the amount of drainage works to be done on Wilkinson Road.
- The surface of the rain garden is not intended to retain water; it holds it temporarily during or after a rain storm but within four hours it is gone so there will not be a source for West Nile Virus.

Mr. B. Forth, Landscape Architect, stated:

- The landscape treatment has been slightly revised from the plans presented at the Committee of the Whole meeting.
- The sidewalk has been taken off the curb line by approximately 4 feet, a grass boulevard has been added, the fence has been moved closer to the buildings and the sidewalk has been meandered around the trees.
- Some of the trees are situated inbound and outbound of the sidewalk creating an arcade of trees for pedestrians to walk under.
- There will be a special paved crossing at the entrances to signal the movement from pedestrian to vehicular traffic.
- The driveways will have visitor parking stalls which will be paved with permeable pavers.
- There will be a band of permeable paving along one side of the roadway that can be used for pedestrians.
- He has augmented the existing landscaping with an array of trees to create shade, accent and colour for the different units.
- Some of the trees in the open space areas will be protected by a covenant.
- The backyards will be a combination of landscape beds and lawn; the lawn serves the purpose of allowing the water to flow into the rain gardens which are situated along the perimeter of the property.
- The stand of Garry oaks has been augmented with native trees to create a natural Garry oak ecosystem; the ground is currently grass but will be changed to a meadow-type landscape which will be covenanted.
- The existing vegetation will be retained where it has significance and value; any evasive exotic vegetation will be replaced with native plants.
- Aqua pavers will be used along the edge of the road and the individual driveways.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Ms. K. Whitworth, President of the Royal Oak Community Association, spoke in support and stated:

- Approximately 30 copies of the Planner's report and 100 flyers were distributed; the Association was in attendance at both public open houses and many of the concerns have been addressed.
- The Association is concerned about the setback variance requested for the north boundary but the neighbours have not expressed the same concern.
- The applicant should consider providing bus passes for the future residents as well as membership in the Victoria Car Share Co-Op program.
- The Association is pleased with the infrastructure and safety improvements that will be provided.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, spoke in support and stated:

- He is pleased with the storm water management proposed for this site.
- Given that the street improvements have been revised to move the sidewalk inland and a grass strip introduced, there may be an opportunity for cut outs and rain gardens on the side of the road.

Mr. I. Block, President of the Strawberry Vale Residents Association, spoke in support and stated:

- She is not against the proposal but she is concerned about the traffic increase onto Wilkinson Road and the intersection of Interurban Road and Hastings Street.
- In the interest of traffic safety and pedestrian safety, there should be a dedicated left turn light on Wilkinson Road onto Interurban Road and there should be a moratorium on any future developments that puts traffic onto the intersection of Wilkinson Road/Interurban Road and Hastings Street.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:

Nil.

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Derman: "That the application to rezone to RT-3 be approved."

Councillor Pickup stated:

- The applicant and his team should be complimented for a superb development in terms of the thought that has gone into the design, tree preservation and storm water management.
- She appreciates the time the applicant has taken to consult with the public and community association.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The applicant and his team have designed a commendable project.
- Perhaps the applicant can consider augmenting their storm water treatment to capture some of the road water in cut outs and rain gardens in the grass strip along Wilkinson Road.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The applicant and staff should consider introducing cut outs and rain gardens on the grassed strip to treat some of the water coming off of Wilkinson Road.
- In terms of the intersection of Wilkinson Road, Interurban Road and Hastings Street, there are some developments planned for the area in the future that will trigger some improvements to this intersection.
- She is pleased with the different mixes of housing as it makes the subdivision interesting while still maintaining a rural-feel; she is also pleased with the meandering sidewalk proposed for Wilkinson Road.
- A connection should be created from this site to Royal Oak Middle School so that children living in this development do not have to go onto Wilkinson Road.
- She appreciates the time that the applicant has taken to work with the community association.

Councillor Gillespie stated:

- He is pleased with the design of the project and the storm water management proposed for the site.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He is pleased with the work that the applicant and community association has put into this project.

Councillor Wade stated:

- As chair of the Administrative Traffic Committee, she understands the residents' frustration with the traffic congestion at the intersection of Wilkinson Road, Interurban Road and Hastings Street.
- This is an admirable development.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

No. 299
Bylaw No. 8701
PLD60

“OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW, 1993, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8701” Second and Third Readings.

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That Bylaw No. 8701 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That Bylaw No. 8701 be now passed.”

CARRIED

No. 300
Bylaw No. 8702
Wilkinson Rd

"ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8702"
Second and Third Readings.

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8702 be read a second time."

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8702 be now passed."

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That it be recommended that Council approve and issue Development Permit No. DPR2004-00019 on Lot S Pt. 1 and Lot 2, Section 9, Lake District, Plan 4789 (4583 and 4591 Wilkinson Road)."

CARRIED

No. 301
Bylaw No. 8699
PLD60

“OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW, 1993, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8699”

INCLUSION OF REGIONAL CONTEXT STATEMENT IN THE SAANICH GENERAL PLAN

In 2002, Saanich Council supported the Capital Regional District’s Regional Growth Strategy and committed to the preparation of a Regional Context Statement. The intent of this proposed bylaw is to amend the Saanich General Plan to include the Regional Context Statement which is a benchmark document and work plan. The statement also identifies any inconsistencies that exist between the Regional Growth Strategy and Saanich’s Official Community Plan and how these inconsistencies will be addressed.

The Notice of Public Hearing; report of the Director of Planning dated June 16, 2005 recommending that the Regional Context Statement be endorsed and forwarded to the Capital regional District Board for approval and adoption; the Saanich General Plan be amended to include the Regional Context Statement and the new policies related to the implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy; supplementary report of the Director of Planning dated July 28, 2005 recommending the additional background information be included in the Regional Context Statement as outlined; and 1 letter in support from the Saanich Community Association Network, were introduced.

APPLICANT:

The Corporation of the District of Saanich.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Ms. V. Sanders, Chair of the Saanich Community Association Network (SCAN), 3363 Richmond Road, spoke in support and stated:

- She would like to compliment the Planning Department for all their work in explaining the Regional Context Statement to SCAN.
- In terms of Action 1.1 (2) she believes that 2008 would be too long to wait to do a review of what constitutes a major or minor amendment to the Urban Containment and Sewer Enterprise Boundaries; it should be done sooner.

Ms. J. Gaylord, Gordon Head Residents Association, spoke in support and stated:

- She appreciates the presentation made by the Planning Department to SCAN and is in general agreement with the information presented.
- She is disappointed with Action 1.1 (2); the review of what constitutes a major or minor amendment does not need to form part of the focused review of the Official Community Plan, it could be resolved sooner than that.
- There are many development applications coming forward soon so there needs to be some guidelines or criteria in place to evaluate them.
- Perhaps there should be a moratorium on development applications until the definition of major or minor amendments to the Urban Containment and Sewer Enterprise Boundaries are determined.

Ms. I. Block, President of the Strawberry Vale Community Association, spoke in support and stated:

- There should be a definition of what constitutes a major or minor amendment to the Urban Containment and Sewer Enterprise Boundaries.
- One of the methods that can be used to determine if it is major or minor is by putting a number on the amount of applications that will be considered or how many movements can be made to the boundary.

Ms. S. Bridges, Vice President of the Cordova Bay Association, spoke in support and stated:

- There needs to be a definition of what constitutes a major or minor amendment to the Urban Containment and Sewer Enterprise Boundaries prior to 2008.
- Perhaps 10% of the property could be considered for expansion.

Ms. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, spoke in support and stated:

- There needs to be a definition of what constitutes a major or minor amendment to the Urban Containment and Sewer Enterprise Boundaries; 2008 is far too long to wait for a review of this.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:

Mayor Leonard stated:

- Perhaps Action 1.1 (2) could be revised to delete the words "As part of this review" and replaced with "Prior to this review"; consideration will be given to what constitutes major and minor amendments to the Urban Containment Boundary.
- This will provide direction to the new Council to undertake a review of a definition prior to the focused review of the Official Community Plan.

Councillor Pickup stated:

- She believes that in order for Council to be serious about strengthening policies to ensure long term protection, policies 12 and 19 should be amended to delete the words "Where appropriate" and the words "This could" should be replaced with "This should".
- Currently these policies do not reflect an acceptance or support for long term protection of the Capital Green Lands or the concept of buffering from activities in adjacent urban areas.
- The CRD had watered down some of the policies in the Regional Growth Strategy surrounding the idea of an urban containment and buffering to meet some concerns from the City of Colwood and the City of Langford.

Moved by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: "That,

- 1. The Regional Context Statement (as detailed in Attachment 2) be endorsed and forwarded to the Capital Regional District Board for approval and adoption;**
- 2. The Saanich General Plan be amended to include the Regional Context Statement; and,**

3. The Saanich General Plan be amended to include the new policies related to the implementation of the Regional Growth Strategy as detailed in Attachment 1.”

Councillor Gillespie stated:

- In terms of the local food production, there needs to be an agricultural water rate for farmers, it is essential to their survival.
- In terms of watershed planning and approach and non catchment watersheds in the region, he hopes there will be some advancement made in the controlling of these waters in the main area.

Councillor Ngai stated:

- She supports the existing wording in the policies as it provides flexibility particularly in terms of costs.
- The words “Where appropriate” still provides an opportunity for input as well as professional and staff advice.
- Amending the wording will make this guiding document too rigid.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

No. 302
Bylaw No. 8699
PLD60

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2005, NO. 8699”
Second, Third and Final Readings.

Moved by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: “That Bylaw No. 8699 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Wade: “That Bylaw No. 8699 be amended to include the additional background information outlined in the report of the Director of Planning dated July 28, 2005.”

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Gillespie and Seconded by Councillor Wade: “That Bylaw No. 8699 be amended to revise Action 1.1 (2) to read: ‘Saanich will undertake a focused review of its Official Community Plan by the end of 2008. Prior to this review, consideration will be given to what constitutes major and minor amendments to the Urban Containment Boundary.’”

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Bylaw No. 8699 be amended as follows:

- 1. To revise Policy 12 on page 17 of the General Plan to read: ‘Saanich will establish and/or strengthen policies within Official Community Plans that ensure the long-term protection of Renewable Resource Lands depicted on Map 3 and 4 in the CRD Regional Growth Strategy. This should include policies aimed at buffering Capital Green Lands from activities in adjacent urban areas.’; and,**
- 2. To revise Policy 19 on page 27 of the General Plan to read: ‘Saanich will establish and/or strengthen policies within Official Community Plans, that ensure the long-term protection of Capital Green Lands depicted on Map 3 and 4 in the CRD of the Regional Growth Strategy. This should include policies aimed at buffering Capital Green Lands from activities in adjacent urban areas.’”**

Councillor Pickup stated:

- Amending policies 12 and 19 shows a commitment to the community and the region towards strengthening the long term protection of Capital Green Lands and providing buffers for those lands adjacent to urban areas; this is a commitment already made through Saanich’s Urban Containment Boundary and is good stewardship of land.

Councillor Derman stated:

- He does not believe that removing the words “Where appropriate” makes the policies too prescriptive to any particular development or initiative; it simply establishes a strong general direction that is consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Deleting the words "Where appropriate" strengthens the policies but still provides some flexibility.

Councillor Wade stated:

- At the previous Special Committee of the Whole meeting, she did not support amending the policies because she wanted to capture those areas where it was not possible or where it would otherwise hamper previous actions.
- However, she now believes that the intent behind the proposed wording change is not that it will mean digging up what already exists but to look towards a future where a better job will be done.

Councillor Ngai stated:

- Deleting the words "Where appropriate" and replacing "This could" with "This should" makes the policies too prescriptive.
- When this type of wording was deleting from policies in the past, it has not worked and resulted in a lot of taxpayers' money being spent.

CARRIED

with Councillor Ngai voting against.

Moved by Councillor Pickup and Seconded by Councillor Gillespie: "That Bylaw No. 8699 as amended be now passed."

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Pickup: "That Bylaw No. 8699 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto."

CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Brownoff the meeting adjourned at 9:10

.....
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK