

**Town of Drumheller
COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES**

August 21, 2017 at 4:30 PM
Council Chamber, Town Hall
224 Centre Street, Drumheller, AB, T0J 0Y4



PRESENT:

MAYOR:
Terry Yemen

COUNCIL:

Jay Garbutt
Tara McMillan
Patrick Kolafa
Sharel Shoff

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER/ENGINEER:

Ray Romanetz

DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES

Barb Miller

DIRECTOR OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES:

Darryl Drohomerski

DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES:

Paul Salvatore

DIRECTOR OF PROTECTIVE SERVICES:

Greg Peters

RECORDING SECRETARY:

Linda Handy

ABSENT: Councillor Lisa Hansen-Zacharuk
Councillor Tom Zariski

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Terry Yemen called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM.

Mayor Yemen advised that he has spoken with a number of individuals in the local tourist industry and they are experiencing a busy season.

Mayor Yemen advised that he attended the Physicians' Action Plan Attraction and Retention Meeting today which focuses on bringing more medical professionals to Drumheller.

2.0 MAYOR'S OPENING REMARK

3.0 PUBLIC HEARING

3.1 Mayor Terry Yemen called the Public Hearing to order at 4:35 PM.

Mayor Terry Yemen stated that the purpose of the public hearing is to consider Bylaw 07.17 being a bylaw to amend Plan 3867HU Lot 11 within the SW 1/4 Sec. 28-28-19 W4M in the Rosedale District from UT – Urban Transitional District to R-CH – Residential Cottage Housing District

Mayor Terry Yemen called the Public Hearing to order at 4:35 PM.

Mayor T. Yemen asked Cynthia Cvik – CEO, Palliser Regional Municipal Services (PRMS) to provide her planning report. C. Cvik advised that Bylaw 07.17 received first reading on June 12, 2017. Her report is summarized as follows:

“The application proposes to introduce 57 cottage sites onto the upper section of the property, which will be developed as a gated community. The proposal also includes the construction of RV parking for resident’s vehicles and a meeting space / social building for the residents on the lower half of the site in a later phase of development. The application indicates that all sites will be developed with permanent cottage housing under a long term lease agreement. No subdivision is proposed.

After first reading of the bylaw, written notice of the proposal was sent to referral agencies including Transportation, the Health Department and the Town of Drumheller Administration. A total of twelve (12) referral agencies were circulated the application. As is required under Section 692(4)(c) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA), adjacent owners were also provided a copy of the application. Section 692 (7) of the MGA defines “adjacent” as land that is contiguous to the parcel of land that is being redesigned, or would be contiguous if not for a highway, road, river or stream. In this location twenty (20) parcels are considered adjacent by this definition. Fifty eight (58) letters were sent out in the neighbourhood on June 19, 2017. An additional forty five (45) letters were sent out to residents in the neighborhood on June 23 at the request of Town Administration, for a total of 103 residential referral letters. Newspaper advertising for the Public Hearing was completed in accordance with Section 606(2) of the MGA.

Seven (7) letters of opposition from local residents were received at the time this report was written. Alberta Health Services provided comments on July 19, 2017. The Health Department has indicated that all of the proposed sites must be hooked up to the municipal water and wastewater treatment systems. Telus, Canada Post and Alberta Transportation responded that they have no concerns with the proposal as presented.

The MPC reviewed the application on June 29, 2017. At that meeting, the following motion was made: “Cottage Structures that will carry 22 year leases are intended for but not limited to, clients who are looking to spend perhaps six (6) months of the year here (snowbirds). Extension of the water system would be a requirement and the requirement for foundations will have to be a condition of Drumheller’s Servicing Agreement. The MPC requested the size of lots, and architectural controls.”

Statutory and Non-Statutory Documents were considered:

Municipal Development Plan (MDP) identifies the subject property as residential. The proposed zoning and redevelopment of this site is in keeping with the identified future land use identified in the MDP. The MDP, as the long range or visionary document for the community, advocates that a variety of housing types be provided in the community and as well, acknowledges that the needs and desires of an aging population may have an impact on the character of the build. The MDP specifically supports reduced minimum floor areas for housing and a wide variety of lot sizes throughout the community.

Land Use Bylaw Amendment – the current zoning of the subject property is UT – Urban Transitional District. The purpose of the district is to identify lands on the perimeter of the built up area that can accommodate uses that will not inhibit more intensive development when planned for in an appropriate manner. The zoning proposed by the applicant is the R-CH – Residential Cottage Housing District, which is a more intensive form of development that will be required to have full urban potable water and wastewater services, to accommodate the permanent dwellings.

The housing sizes proposed in the concept plan range from a low of 55.75 m² (600 sq. ft.), with a proposed maximum cottage size of 120.7 m² (1300 sq. ft.). It should be noted that in accordance with the Land Use Bylaw, the minimum area for each “pad or lot” must be 186 m² (2000 sq. ft.), but can transition up to larger “lots”. In accordance with the R-CH, the minimum floor area for each of the individual structures must be a minimum of 29.74 m² (320 sq. ft.).”

C. Cvik reviewed the purpose and intent of the R-CH District. She explained that a cottage dwelling cluster is a discretionary use. She further explained that the cottage dwelling cluster means a group of cottage dwellings that are located on the same parcel of land, developed according to an approved concept plan and must be characterized by special requirements as outlined in Section 28(f) of the LUB.

C. Cvik provided an overview of the Sagebrush Resorts Draft Concept Plan:

“The site is currently naturally “divided” into an upper and lower plateau. The contour map indicated that the site elevation changes approximately 15 metres (almost 50 ft.), from the high point on the south, to the lower level on the north. A large portion of the elevation change occurs in the middle of the site. It is the intent for all of the housing to be developed on the upper portion to take advantage of the views and the lower portion of the site to remain largely undeveloped and house the recreational amenities. Parking will be provided for visitors and storage of the RV’s owned by residents will be accommodated. The Plan identifies several “green” initiatives which will be incorporated into the development of both the overall site, as well as individual housing plans, which includes grey water usage for irrigation, high energy efficiency standards, solar panels, etc. The concept plan introduces design controls for the architectural appearance of the structures on site. The individual houses are intended to have high pitched roofs, dormers and aesthetically interesting facades.”

In conclusion, C. Cvik stated that the previous development proposal reviewed by Council in 2016 was not approved based on the numerous concerns expressed from adjacent residents. She further stated that the draft Sagebrush Concept Plan meets the general intent of the MDP and addresses some of the goals identified in the Municipal Sustainability Plan relative to energy consumption; "green" building standards; protection of the landscape/watershed; range of housing choices/affordability; and recycling of water and waste materials. C. Cvik stated that it is recommended that Council support Bylaw 07.17. She further stated that Council also has options: 1) That Council give bylaw 07.17 as presented, second reading; or 2) That Council request that changes be made to the Sagebrush Concept Plan and for the proposal to be brought back for consideration at a new Public Hearing; or 3) That Council defeat Bylaw 07.17, citing reasons.

Mayor Yemen asked the Secretary of the Public Hearing if any written submissions were received by the Town. Secretary L. Handy stated that seven (7) letters were received in opposition and one (1) letter was received in support of the proposal. A summary of the concerns / comments was read into the record.

Mayor Yemen asked for those who wished to speak in favor of the proposal.

Norah Hamilton illustrated the Sagebrush Resort Concept Plan through a PowerPoint presentation. She advised that she and her husband, Bob have resided in Drumheller for thirty-one (31) years and have established an excellent reputation in cabinetry, renovations and rebuild industry, citing Heartwood Manor as one of their rebuild projects. She explained that the proposed cottages will be built by contractors. She provided a variety of pictures showing the upper and lower levels, the tree line barrier to the north which will be left in place and continue to grow in density, the fifty-seven (57) proposed lots, two parking lots, community building, pathways, green space as well as photos of sample cottages (range in size and style). She advised that cottages will be architecturally controlled to ensure cottage-like in nature; cottages will be constructed by stick built contractors. She further advised that a community board will be established. With regards to concerns raised on state of the property, N. Hamilton explained that the property is mowed two to three times per year and the community has been allowed to use the property. In conclusion, N. Hamilton stated that she feels this type of development will attract new talents to the valley who wish to live more environment friendly and who wish to have a reduction of living expenses as they are not required to pay for the lot itself. She further stated that although intended for retirees, a healthy community has a mix of people of different ages.

Bob Hamilton advised that RH Hamiltons & Associates is not a big developer from the City, but a local developer who wants to set up a win-win for the community with the proposal before Council this evening. He further advised that he feels the new proposal satisfies a lot of concerns that were expressed in the last hearing. He explained that the cottages will be built on permanent foundations and will be aesthetically pleasing. He explained that they will try to avoid as much inconvenience in the construction phase as possible by looking at packages that are ready to assemble on site and / or ready to move-in structures with several different options and models

with artistic appeal. He further explained that the lifestyle will appeal to someone green minded and community minded. He explained that his love of gardening will be evident in the green space with ponds and waterfalls in the lower bench. In conclusion, B. Hamilton stated that the proposal will yield a tax increase to the community funds.

Mayor Yemen asked for those persons who wished to speak in opposition.

Heather Gallagher stated that she disagreed with a public hearing being held on a Monday in the middle of the afternoon in the middle of summer. She expressed concerns with the development being a trailer park - like the hoodoo campground; development on the upper land will encroach on privacy as the lots will directly overlook her property; would like assurance that the road will be used on Mabbott Road as opposed to 1st Avenue which is graveled, water and sewer needs to be paid for by the developer; the number of fifty eight (58) new homes is excessive; the size of the cottages at 300 sq. ft. versus the requirement under other zoning for residential at 1000 sq. ft. In conclusion, H. Gallagher stated that she does appreciate the garbage pickup on the property. She further stated that she would like assurances that it would be cottages rather than RV trailers.

Colleen McDonald stated that she would prefer a development that includes a modest amount of housing. Her concerns with the proposal includes increased traffic (already deal with tourist traffic to / from the Swinging Bridge); developer pay for sewer and water and concerns dealing with loss of privacy. In conclusion, she asked Council to reconsider holding public hearings in the summer months and asked how many times they would have to deal with these types of proposals for Rosedale.

Gwen Morse stated that her concerns are increased traffic and she does not want a new road in her backyard.

Vern Pasco stated that his concerns deal with the development turning into a trailer park (already indicated that there will be RV parking on the north side); will the intended development for "snowbirds" change to allow anyone as they can't discriminate against age; don't expect them to be developing gardens and green space and other activities; what are the health risks for using grey water recycling, gone over the campground / trailer park before and not sure how many more times it will be dealt with as Rosedale residents do not want it, and loss of his own privacy and peace.

Ron Pedersen stated that fifty eight (58) more properties in the area is a significant increase in density with only road to the development. This will result in larger traffic flows which is already busy because of tourist traffic. He further explained that the buffer of trees that suggests will provide privacy is not accurate; the cottages will loom over existing properties, for example Aerial Crescent will have ten (10) of these cottages in their backyard with a setback as little as four (4) feet.

Mikaela Chambers stated that she lives on Aerial Crescent and as a mother, has concerns with increased traffic and doesn't feel the current infrastructure can support an

influx in traffic. She questioned whether there would be open excavations, whether homes will be brought in year after year, is it a family development, are campfires permitted, is there potential for vandalism with residents not living there in the winter months, and if cottage owners would be able to rent their home in the winter (new concept of Airbnb). She further stated that although the developers have listened to concerns from the previous proposal, she feels that she is being chased from her home and that resale values of existing homes in the area will decrease.

Questions from Council:

Councillor J. Garbutt asked Nora and Bob Hamilton to respond to the concerns expressed from those who spoke in opposition. N. Hamilton stated that she foresees a community area with a fire pit and that it would be possible to offer a service to check on homes when the residents are away. She further explained that she would encourage a mix of ages including young families but primarily their target market is seniors. With regards to loss of privacy, increase in traffic and noise, B. Hamilton stated there will be no RV's coming and going as previously proposed. He explained that those living in the permanent cottages will be people living there with a normal routine. He further explained that he intends to build a road around the perimeter of the development so that access and egress is off of Mabbott Drive, avoiding Aerial Crescent and 1st Avenue. He further explained that the lower bench will be developed into a park area with the higher density of population in the upper bench. Vehicular traffic will have a full vision at the top of the hill and with reduced speeds along the road (35 km), any safety concerns should be addressed. With regards to the worse-case scenario that the lots are not leased, B. Hamilton advised that the area would not be used for an RV park or campground. R. Romanetz advised that any development must be reviewed and ruled on based on the merits of an application by the Municipal Planning Commission. He stated that the MPC must take into account any concerns from residents as well.

Councillor S. Shoff asked the applicants why they have not considered residential homes and secondly, how will the privacy issue be addressed. B. Hamilton stated that in consultation with builders, there is no market for traditional residential housing, and locally, another housing development does not make sense. He further stated that builders have studied the market and found that seniors want to downsize; the cottages will be smaller in size and appeal to the seniors market. With regards to the privacy issue, B. Hamilton stated that he stood at the top of the upper bench and as it is flush with the tree level, one can only see rooftops and yard space. He further explained that the roadway on the upper bench will be designed to serve as a privacy barrier to the residents.

Councillor T. McMillan asked who maintains the roadway. B. Hamilton stated that road maintenance and snow removal as well as residential security will be looked after and cared for by a group of employees. She further asked if the lease holder has an option to sublease. N. Hamilton stated that any homeowner would not have restrictions. She further stated that she does not foresee leaseholders to sublease or rent under an Airbnb scenario however she would ask the market if this is something that needs to be considered. Councillor T. McMillan disagreed, stating that Airbnb is being more popular and must be addressed as it is happening in our valley.

Councillor P. Kolafa asked if each leaseholder would have separate utility accounts and secondly how would you ensure building standards are met? N. Hamilton stated that there will be separate utilities and there will be architectural controls with a bond in place if they do not build to the required specifications.

Mayor Yemen asked for rebuttals.

B. Hamilton stated that although concerns regarding RV's have been expressed, the development would have designated parking area for RV storage for the leaseholders; he reiterated that it is not an RV park. He reiterated that the cottages will have a permanent foundation; they are not trailers. He further explained that the foundation will be slab on grade / screw piles to minimize the excavation. He stated that any inconvenience will be kept to a minimum during the utilities and road installations.

Heather Gallagher asked if the Town has an Airb&b bylaw and if not, how would the Town control the Airbnb? R. Romanetz stated that the Town does not have an Airbnb bylaw. She further questioned whether each cottage owner will require a separate development permit? R. Romanetz advised that each cottage owner will require a separate development permit from the Town. She further asked for assurance that the road access will be from Mabbott Road. She stated that the trees do not provide privacy from the upper bench. She further questioned if the property is rezoned what assurances are in place that a new property owner would not build a campground? R. Romanetz stated that any development must go through the Municipal Planning Commission.

Dale Morse stated that in a conversation with N. Hamilton, she guaranteed privacy and he stated that the trees do not provide privacy. He further stated that the road is not a buffer zone.

Vern Pasco stated that a pile driven foundation will create noise. He further stated that he heard at the hearing that it is not only for "snowbirds" but open to people of all ages and wondered if this type of development would attract transients. He stated that the privacy fence was not addressed as well as other issues of concern not addressed.

Mayor Yemen closed the Public Hearing at 5:50 PM.

Mayor Yemen recessed the meeting at 5:50 PM.
Mayor Yemen reconvened the meeting at 5:55 PM.

4.0 ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MO2017.103 McMillan, Shoff moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Carried unanimously.

5.0 MINUTES

5.1. ADOPTION OF REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

5.1.1 Regular Council Meeting Minutes of July 24, 2017

MO2017.104 Kolafa, Garbutt moved to adopt the Regular Council Meeting Minutes of July 24, 2017 as presented. Carried unanimously.

5.2. MINUTES OF MEETING PRESENTED FOR INFORMATION

5.3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

6.0 DELEGATIONS

7.0 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RECOMMENDATIONS

8.0 REQUEST FOR DECISION REPORTS

8.1 CAO

8.1.1 Bylaw 04.17 being a bylaw to incur indebtedness by the issuance of debenture(s) in the amount of \$497,400 for the purpose of flood mitigation in Central Drumheller through berm enhancement and construction – second and third readings

R. Romanetz advised that Bylaw 04.17 received first reading on June 12th, 2017. Since that time, the Town has received one comment from the public requesting that an article be published relating to the costing of the project. No further comments have been received from the public relating to the bylaw. He explained next steps: Council could proceed to second and third reading of the bylaw which would allow the dollars to be in place for the project to proceed; Council could debate the bylaw once passed to determine if borrowing or reserves would be the appropriate funding source; if reserves is the preferred option, the bylaw would sit on the books and stale-date itself within two years. He further advised that Administration would not move forward with borrowing until Council has had an opportunity to debate funding and provide direction.

MO2017.105 Shoff, Kolafa moved for second reading of Bylaw 04.17.

Councillor J. Garbutt asked the length of the debenture? B. Miller advised that the debenture is for thirty (30) years as the expected life of the asset is fifty (50+) years at 3.17% current rate. In comparison to the investment return on reserves, B. Miller stated that long term investment is earning 2.61% for five years; Town reserves are held in GIC's with a significant amount of dollars in longer term investments (earning about 3%); of \$11M reserves \$6M are held in GIC's (more than half). Councillor J. Garbutt stated that at 3%, a thirty (30) year debenture would have in excess of \$0.5M worth of interest charges over its term and in the current environment, not possible to exceed that amount on an investment return on a GIC. He stated he was not in favour of passing the bylaw because the interest expenses outweigh what Town would make in an investment. He further asked which restricted reserves balance would the dollars be

drawn from and what would be the remaining balance. B. Miller stated that information is not available at this time as the Town has multi-reserve accounts and some of the dollars are committed at this time. R. Romanetz advised that Administration is working on a capital financing strategy and although initially intended for this meeting, it will be presented in two weeks. He explained that a financial plan has been mapped out that finds the balance between borrowing and reserves. He further explained that the document is meant to be a guideline and not cast in stone. He recommended that Council review the document in two weeks and make a decision at that time on whether mitigation funding should be borrowing or reserves. Councillor J. Garbutt asked if there was a bylaw in place that prevents the Town from being in excess of \$10M in outstanding debt? R. Romanetz stated that this is not the case and the Town is well below the debt limit set by the Province. He explained that there is a policy that states that the Town shall not exceed 60% of the limits established by the Province and the Town is currently running at 28% of debt limit. He stated that the draft financial plan proposes that over the next ten (10) years, dollars spent on reserves and amortization along with borrowing, will be at the same level at the end of ten (10) years.

Councillor J. Garbutt stated that he is not informed to make a decision; needs to know if the funds are available from reserves and the balance remaining. R. Romanetz advised that Council could give second and third reading as passing of the bylaw does not authorize Administration to move forward to borrow the monies. He reiterated that the capital financing plan would be available in two weeks. He further reiterated that the Town would be in a proactive position to access flood mitigation dollars when the project is approved and the outstanding issue with the Province (dyke ownership) is resolved.

Vote on Motion:

2 - In favour – Shoff, Yemen

3 - Opposed – Garbutt, McMillan, Kolafa

Defeated.

8.1.2 Bylaw 05.17 being a bylaw to incur indebtedness by the issuance of debenture in the amount of \$516,000 for the purpose of flood mitigation in East Midland and Newcastle, through berm enhancement and construction – second and third readings

R. Romanetz advised that Bylaw 05.17 received first reading on June 12, 2017.

MO2017.106 McMillan, Shoff moved to table Bylaw 05.17. Carried unanimously.

8.1.3 Draft Purchasing Policy

R. Romanetz advised that the draft purchasing policy has been forwarded to the Chamber's Advocacy Committee for comment. Their comments will be presented to Council at the Regular Council Meeting of September 5, 2017. He further advised that in response to a comment from one Councillor regarding clarity on non discrimination, definitions are within the New West Partnership Agreement and there is no need to include these definitions in the Town's policy. He stated that the draft policy is

available for Council's and the public's review and any questions or comments should be directed to him prior to September 5th.

8.2. DIRECTOR OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

8.2.1 Aquaplex Project Update

D. Drohomerski advised that the total Aquaplex project is 45% - 50% complete with the mechanical and pumping work 90% complete; the men's shower / change room is 100% complete. He further noted that there have been delays with the removal of old concrete that was not expected, and will most likely impact the schedule. He stated that work on the women's shower room is being review to determine if there is budget availability or whether this work will be completed next year. He further stated that the project is well within Council's approved budget however the project could be a few weeks behind schedule. He invited Council on a walk-through tour to see the progress to date.

8.3. DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES

8.3.1 RFD – Advance Vote – 2017 Local Authority Elections

B. Miller stated Section 73 of the Local Authorities Elections Act (LAEA) allows for the Returning Officer to hold advance voting polls, provided that Council has passed a resolution authorizing the Returning Officer to do so. She recommended that Council pass a motion to allow for advance voting which provides greater access to the voting process for all eligible residents.

MO2017.107 Shoff, Kolafa moved to authorize the Returning Officer to provide for the holding of an advance vote for the 2017 municipal election on Thursday, October 5th from 4:00 PM – 8:00 PM and Saturday, October 14th from 10:00 AM – 2:00 PM. Carried unanimously.

8.4. DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

8.4.1 Downtown Revitalization Update

P. Salvatore advised that he will be joined by J. Fielding – Economic Development Officer / Communication Officer and D. Drohomerski – Director of Infrastructure in the update.

J. Fielding presented the results of the public engagement on the Downtown Revitalization Strategy working with Urban Systems. The summary from the online questionnaire and the boards that were placed at the BCF (60 responders in total) is as follows:

- The creation of a downtown plaza and enhanced maintenance of existing features were identified as top revitalization priorities, followed by additional soft landscaping and street furniture.
- Shade, an outdoor performance area and seating were identified as key elements of a downtown park or plaza.
- Over 80% of respondents currently attend organized outdoor markets. Ideas to enhance the outdoor market experience include improved signage and advertising, improved maintenance of the streetscape and more pedestrian-friendly features.

- Events/programming and entry signage were identified as the primary opportunities to improve branding of the Town, followed by the use of a logo/theming, banners/wayfinding signage and street furniture.
- The Town will host a public engagement session on August 29th at 6:00 PM at the former Lowleft building.

Councillor P. Kolafa asked if the streets will have their original names. P. Salvatore explained that the green street signs will continue to exist with the addition of the secondary sign. Councillor P. Kolafa stated that those streets named with local flavor should not have a secondary name. P. Salvatore stated that the total voting number was 3148 in response to the street naming. Councilor J. Garbutt asked if there was duplication in the voting process. P. Salvatore stated there was only one opportunity to vote with the same IP address. Councillor J. Garbutt asked what the Economic Development Advisory Committee is doing about the overwhelming negative comments on the street naming? P. Salvatore explained that the wayfinding signs had a similar type reaction and since that time, the negative comments have subsided. Councillor J. Garbutt requested the Economic Development Advisory Committee to re-enforce the message that the signage design is to enhance the tourism experience.

D. Drohomerski provided an overview on the proposed changes to Drumheller's decorative lights. He explained that the current forty six (46) decorative lights need to be replaced due to their age, deficiencies, unavailability of replacement parts and high energy consumption. He explained that the proposed new LED lights will be a brighter light at less energy consumption (similar to lighting at the BCF) with the ability for new lighting to be focused away from building. He further stated that there will be high intensity lighting at the downtown intersection. He explained that the change out will begin next spring and completed before mid –June (3 month project). He further noted that there will be a demonstration of the lights at the public engagement session on August 29th. The Town intends to send out a communiqué and work with the property owners.

Councillor J. Garbutt asked the cost of the new lighting. D. Drohomerski stated that the cost per fixture is \$2500 and noted that Council has approved a budget of \$50,000 per year for replacement for a three year program (\$130,000). He further stated that ATCO's is subsidizing the cost of the lights plus installing the conduit and cabling.

8.5 DIRECTOR OF PROTECTIVE SERVICES

9.0 PRESENTATION OF QUARTERLY REPORTS BY ADMINISTRATION

10.0 PUBLIC HEARING DECISIONS

10.1 Bylaw 07.17 – second and third readings

MO2017.108 McMillan, Shoff moved second reading of Bylaw 07.17.

1 – In favour - Yemen

4 – Opposed – McMillan, Shoff, Kolafa, Garbutt

Defeated.

11.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

12.0 NOTICE OF MOTION

13.0 COUNCILLOR REPORTS

14.0 IN CAMERA MATTERS

There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 6:55 PM.

Chief Administrative Officer

Mayor