CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF COURTENAY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

July 6, 2015 City Hall Council Chambers 4:00 p.m. DATE: PLACE:

TIME:

1.00	ADOPTION OF MINUTES
	1. Adopt June 15, 2015 Regular Council and June 29 Committee of the Whole meeting minutes
2.00	INTRODUCTION OF LATE ITEMS
3.00	DELEGATIONS
	1. C.V. Cycling Coalition re: Willemar Cycling Lanes
4.00	STAFF REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS
Pg #	(a) CAO and Legislative Services
	(b) Community Services
1	1. Reductions in Irrigation on Municipal Land
	(c) Development Services
	(d) Engineering and Operations
5	2. Willemar Avenue Cycling Infrastructure Options
	(e) Financial Services
5.00	EXTERNAL REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR INFORMATION
23	1. UBCM Endorsed Resolution
25	2. Village of Cumberland re: EDC Service Withdrawal
6.00	INTERNAL REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE FOR INFORMATION
31	1. Staff Memo re: 2 nd Street North Sidewalk
33	2. April 22 and May 27, 2015 Heritage Advisory Commission Minutes
7.00	REPORTS/UPDATES FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS INCLUDING REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

8.00 **RESOLUTIONS OF COUNCIL**

1. In Camera Meeting

That notice is hereby given that a Special In-Camera meeting closed to the public will be held July 6, 2015 at the conclusion of the Regular Council meeting pursuant to the following sub-sections of the *Community Charter*:

- 90 (1) (g) litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality.

9.00 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- **10.00** NOTICE OF MOTION
- 11.00 NEW BUSINESS
- 12.00 BYLAWS

40

For Final Adoption

 "Officer's Designation and Establishment of Powers, Duties, and Responsibilities Bylaw No. 2823, 2015". (To update the Officer's Designation Bylaw)

13.00 ADJOURNMENT



THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF COURTENAY

STAFF REPORT

To:CouncilFrom:Chief Administrative OfficerSubject:Reductions in irrigation on Municipal land

File No.:6030-02Date:July 6, 2015

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to advise Council on the options and implications of reducing the water usage in Municipal irrigation systems.

CAO RECOMMENDATIONS:

That based on July 6, 2015 staff report "Reductions in irrigation on Municipal land", Council approve Option 1 as follows:

- 1: Shut off irrigation for grass areas including:
 - i. boulevards,
 - ii. park grass (except premier fields),
 - iii. grass at facilities including City Hall, Firehall, Recreation facilities

Respectfully submitted,

David Allen, BES, CLGEM, SCLGM Chief Administrative Officer

BACKGROUND:

The summer of 2015 is unseasonably hot and dry. Stage 2 and 3 water restrictions are being initiated far sooner than in typical years and may extend longer than usual. The City operations are exempt from these restrictions so that infrastructure and safety can be maintained. This report details some options council may consider in reducing water consumption on public sites.

DISCUSSION:

Past practice in reducing water consumption on municipal land has varied. In general, the City has continued to irrigate parks, sports fields, boulevards, facility landscapes and flowerbeds through watering restrictions. The premier fields in Courtenay are sand-based. These are designed to shed winter rains, and require regular watering in summer or the turf will die within days. For this reason, the City has exercised it's exemption for sand based sports fields in order to avoid expensive reconstruction costs due to the loss of large amounts of sensitive turf. Replacing each field would cost tens of thousands of dollars, and render the playing fields unusable for a significant period of time. Also, sports fields need to be kept in safe condition for sporting events, utilizing water to soften the ground.

For other parks and boulevards, there was a value placed on common spaces for the public to recreate on green grass. In the past staff would reduce the amount of water on sites, but maintain enough water to keep trees and turf roots alive.

The mile of flowers, downtown floral baskets, and facility landscapes are all watered by a combination of in-ground irrigation as well as the water wagon, driven by staff.

The majority of the City's irrigation systems are controlled by a central computer that is highly programmable. This central controller is connected to a weather station, reducing consumption when it rains. The system includes flow-sensing technology that will let our staff know when there may be a leaking or damaged sprinkler head. However, it cannot sense when a sprinkler head has been vandalized to point the wrong way. City staff repair these as they are discovered, or when notified by the public.

To date several actions have been taken by City staff to reduce water consumption on City land. These include:

- Reduction in the hours of operation for the Lewis Rotary water park 10am to 5pm;
- Use of "Gator Bags" for watering vulnerable street trees;
- Conversion of spray heads to drip irrigation (ongoing replacement program);
- Reduced water to the margins of sports fields;
- Installation of drought resistant plants, xeriscaping, and reduction of bed areas; and
- Reduction is the water times allocated to each zone.

In 2015, there have been high levels of concern expressed by the public regarding the exemption of public spaces. Most criticism is directed at water that sprays onto hard surfaces, or vandalized systems that can cause water loss. Vandalism is generally quickly repaired. However, many of our public irrigation systems would require reconstruction to reflect higher standards for water conservation. This would result in capital costs.

Staff recommend a reduction of the amount of water used on City land.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The financial implications will depend on the extent to which Council decides to conserve water. With no irrigation and hot weather, some sod, shrubs, trees and flowers may need to be replaced. As grass is weakened by a lack of water, more hardy weeds will be more present in the turf areas. The "Gator Bag" program may be more widely used requiring the purchase of more bags.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS:

Mowing staff will be reallocated to hand watering duties as time permits.

ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:

Water application is a necessary maintenance activity to support the healthy development of Civic landscapes. This reduction will stunt the development of these assets. As assets die, capital funds may be necessary to rebuild landscape assets.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AND REGIONAL ISSUES:

A reduction in water consumption supports the CVRD water conservation strategies.

Manager of Parks

CITIZEN/PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:

Staff would inform the public based on the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation: http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/imported/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf



Randy Wiwchar Director of Community Services



THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF COURTENAY

STAFF REPORT

То:	Council	File No.: 5400-20-71793
From:	Chief Administrative Officer	Date: July 6, 2015

Subject: Willemar Avenue (17th to 26th St) Road Reconstruction Project – Cycling Infrastructure Options

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to present Council with the options for cycling infrastructure along Willemar Avenue (17th to 26th Street) as requested at the February 4, 2015 regular Council meeting:

" Moved by Frisch and seconded by Lennox that staff investigate and report back on the options and implications on different levels of service for the installation of bike lanes on Willemar and Piercy Avenues."

CAO RECOMMENDATIONS:

That based on the July 6, 2015 staff report entitled "*Willemar Avenue Road Reconstruction Project – Cycling Infrastructure Options,*" Council approve Option 1 (shared vehicle-bike lanes) and direct staff to proceed with detailed engineering design based on the shared bike lane cross section.

Respectfully submitted,

David Allen, BES, CLGEM, SCLGM Chief Administrative Officer

BACKGROUND:

In the spring of 2014, the City engaged engineering consultants to support the detailed design and construction of 7 road reconstruction and underground utility replacement projects. These projects have been listed in the capital budget for several years and were prioritized for delivery beginning in 2014. Over the summer/fall of 2014 background investigations, pipe condition assessments and concept designs were undertaken for each project. The project designs were informed by:

- The City of Courtenay Official Community Plan (Transportation Policies 5.3.1 and 5.3.9),
- Neighbourhood Local Area Plans (where applicable),
- The current engineering design standards based on the road classification, and
- The 2010 Comox Valley Cycling Network Plan.

By the end of 2014, the preliminary engineering designs were sufficiently advanced to bring forward for public engagement. In January of 2015, staff invited the public to attend a Public Information Session at the Natives Sons Hall to see the preliminary road designs for each street project, discuss the upcoming construction anticipated for 2015 and to respond to any questions from the public at large. It was well attended with more than 150 registering on the sign-in sheet.

During the February 2, 2015 regular Council meeting and General Capital Budget discussions, staff was directed to report back on options and implications for different levels of service for cycling infrastructure

on Willemar and Piercy Avenues beyond the proposed shared bike lane identified in the preliminary design. Subsequently, on March 2, 2015, staff provided a memorandum to Council advising that effort would be concentrated on Willemar Avenue as an indicative example of the options for both roads. Road cross sections and associated cost estimates have been developed for Willemar Avenue for the purpose of the discussion below.

DISCUSSION:

Willemar Avenue consists of one through travel lane and a parking lane in each direction, with an overall asphalt width of approximately 14.5 metres. There is no curb and gutter and the sidewalks are located adjacent to the parking lanes. Hydro poles are located within the parking lane on the northerly side of Willemar Avenue. Willemar Avenue is identified as an "Existing Bicycle Route" in the Comox Valley Cycling Network Plan (2010). The plan specifies Bicycle Lanes and Bicycle Routes separately. Therefore, it was interpreted that Bicycle Routes identified lower traffic routes for a shared roadway in the form of a normal vehicle travel lane, a widened curb lane or smooth paved shoulder without pavement markings. Willemar Avenue operates this way today.

For this design project staff also took into consideration the HASTe (Hub for Active School Travel) program implemented by School District 71 which identifies Willemar Avenue as a "Preferred Family Bike Route" rather than a "Best Route" to École Puntledge Park Elementary School. As such, the installation of cycling infrastructure was not listed in the School Travel Planning Stakeholder Group Priority Requests supplied to the City at the completion of the Active Travel assessment by the School District.

At Council's request, staff engaged Dillon Consulting to design alternative cross-sections and associated cost estimates for five cycling infrastructure options on Willemar Avenue. The proposed road cross sections have been prepared and are attached for reference. The cost estimates have been expressed as a cost per kilometre in order to be able to compare the costs of the different options.

The five options investigated are as follows and can be viewed in the attached figures:

Option 1: Shared Vehicle-Bike Lanes, Parking Both Sides

This option represents the initial proposed design for the Willemar Avenue reconstruction project. In referring to the design criteria indicated in the "Background" section above, Willemar is not identified as a either an "Existing..." or "Proposed Bike Lane" roadway on the Comox Valley Cycling Network Plan (2010) but rather an "Existing Bike Route". For this design project, staff also took into consideration School District 71 HASTe (Hub for Active School Travel) program which identifies Willemar Avenue as a "Preferred Family Bike Route" to École Puntledge Park Elementary School. However, action items related to this plan did not identify the need to provide dedicated bike lanes to support Willemar Avenue as the determined "best routes" for travelling to/from the school. Therefore, the proposed roadway cross section includes shared vehicle and bike lanes along with the provision for parking on both sides of the road, concrete curb and gutter, grassed boulevards, and 1.5 metre sidewalks at the property line.

This option has an asphalt width of 12.6 metres, less than the existing road width of 14.5 metres. The City's current road standard for a collector roadway is 12.0m. As this section does not include cycling infrastructure, the design was modified to included shared bike lanes in order to maintain its status as an "Existing Bicycle Route" as defined by the Comox Valley Cycling Network Plan (2010) and the current demonstrated use. There is no change in the existing level of service (driving, parking, cycling, and pedestrians) for this design option.

Option 2: Dedicated Bike Lanes, Parking Both Sides

This option includes vehicle travel lanes, dedicated painted bike lanes, provision for parking on both sides of the road, concrete curb and gutter, grassed boulevard, and 1.5 metre sidewalks at the property line. Option 2 has an asphalt width of 15.2 metres, an increase from the existing road width of 14.5 metres. This option also has Hydro poles located within the parking lanes. Option 1 was designed to eliminate this utility hazard in the roadway.

This option increases the level of service the City is providing on the roadway through the addition of dedicated bike lanes and increased asphalt width. The City will incur additional annual maintenance cost to repair/re-paint the longitudinal lines of the lanes (approximately \$1.00/metre) as well as any thermoplastic paint for decals (\$125/each every 5 years). When compared to the life cycle costs of Option 1, the increase in asphalt area is approximately 2430 square metres on Willemar Avenue. The City will incur increased maintenance costs for street sweeping, snow clearing and initial repairs for potholes and crack sealing and the ultimate cost to replace in about 25 – 30 years should Option 2 be selected.

Functional levels of service for driving, parking and pedestrian infrastructure are maintained at the existing level with single travel lane in each direction, parking and sidewalks available on both sides of the road.

Option 3: Dedicated Bike Lanes, Parking One Side

This option includes vehicle travel lanes, dedicated bike lanes, a single parking lane, concrete curb and gutter, grassed boulevards, and 1.5 metre sidewalks at the property line.

Option 3 has an asphalt width of 12.7 metres, a decrease from the existing road width of 14.5 metres.

This option proposes an increased level of service on the roadway through the addition of dedicated bike lanes but decreases the level of service through the reduction of the parking lane on one side of the road. When compared to Option 1, the City will incur additional annual maintenance cost to repair/re-paint the longlines of the lanes (approximately \$1.00/metre) as well as any thermoplastic paint for decals (\$125/each every 5 years). The asphalt area is not significantly changed from Option 1, therefore there will be a minimal difference in maintenance costs for street sweeping, snow clearing and initial repairs for potholes and crack sealing and the ultimate cost to replace in about 25 – 30 years when compared to Option 1.

Should Council favour this option, staff recommend completing a parking survey to better understand the use of this service prior to completion of the detailed engineering design. Staff would also propose to invite the affected residents to another Public Information Session to discuss the impact of this option and Council's direction.

Option 4: Bikeway, Parking One Side

This option includes vehicle travel lanes, a single parking lane and a separated 3.0 metre wide bikeway. The bikeway would be separated from the vehicle travel lane by a curb. This option also includes concrete curb and gutter, grassed boulevards, and 1.5 metre sidewalks on both sides of the road at property line.

Option 4 has asphalt with of 12.9 metres a decrease from the existing road width of 14.5m. This option reduces the parking lanes from both sides of the road to only the northerly side of the road and is a level of service reduction for parking.

Similar to Options 2 and 3, Option 4 is an increased level of service for cycling infrastructure with a dedicated bikeway on the southerly side of the road. There will be increased maintenance costs to offer this service similar to Options 2 and 3.

Option 4 will require upgrades to the existing intersections in order to safely accommodate the bikeway crossing of traffic. With the bikeway located on one side of the road, left and right turning movements at intersections will have to be planned such that there is a safe way for these turning movements to be performed. Dedicated traffic signals for the bikeway, or bike boxes, may have to be installed. The costs of these improvements are not known and have not been included in the cost estimates completed for this Council Report.

Bikeways are typically used under the following conditions (National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) – Urban Bikeway Design Guidelines):

- Streets on which bike lanes would cause many bicyclists to feel stressed because of factors such as multiple lanes, high traffic volumes, high speed traffic, high demand for parking and high parking turnover
- Streets for which conflicts at intersections can effectively be mitigated using parking lane setbacks, bicycle markings through the intersection, and other signalized intersection treatments
- Along streets with high bicycle volumes
- Along streets with high motor vehicle volumes and/or speeds
- On streets with few conflicts such as driveways or cross-streets

Willemar Avenue does not meet these criteria. There are a high frequency of driveway and bikeway crossings along this route which could lead to conflicts and the potential for accidents. This route is not recommended for this treatment option.

Option 5: Multi-Use Pathway (MUP), Parking One Side

This option includes vehicle travel lanes, a single parking lane and a separated 3.0 metre multi-use pathway on the southerly side of the road, concrete curb and gutter, and a grassed boulevard and sidewalk on the northerly side of the road. The multi-use pathway would be separated from the vehicle travel lane by concrete curb and gutter.

Option 5 has an asphalt width of 9.7 metres, a reduction from the existing road width of 14.5m. This option reduces the parking lanes from both sides of the road to only the northerly side of the road and is a level of service reduction for parking. This option also reduces the dedicated sidewalk from both sides of the road to only the northerly side of the road. The dedicated sidewalk from the southerly side of the road has been included in the multi-use pathway located on the southerly side of the road.

Similar to Options 2, 3, and 4, Option 5 is an increased level of service for cycling infrastructure with a multi-use pathway located on the southerly side of the road. There will be increased maintenance costs to offer this service similar to Options 2, 3, and 4.

Option 5 will likely require upgrades to the existing intersections in order to safely accommodate the multi-use pathway traffic. With the multi-use pathway located on one side of the road, left and right turning movements at intersections will have to be planned such that there is a safe way for these turning movements to be performed. Vehicles will be turning across the multi-use pathway and

cyclists will have to turn across the travelled lanes of the road. The costs of any improvements are not known and have not been included in the cost estimates completed for this Council Report.

MUP's are typically located outside roadway corridors for several factors including the enjoyment of the walking or cycling away from traffic. MUP's located adjacent to the roadway experience issues such as (according to American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) – Guide for Bicycle Facilities) :

- Bikes travelling against traffic flow and resulting in conflicts at crossings
- Confusions at the ends of the MUP and travelling against the rules of the road
- Signage is posted against traffic
- Use of the roadway despite the provision of the MUP as it's faster, more convenient, and often better maintained
- Vehicle blocked pathways

Given the potential for confusion and opportunities for conflicts, or blocked MUP access on Willemar Avenue, this route is not recommended for this treatment option.

There are many pros and cons for each option. Staff have summarized some of these in the table below:

Table 1 – Cycling Infrastructure Options Comparison

	Pros	Cons
Option 1: Shared Vehicle & Bike Lanes	 Allows for all forms of transportation without affecting existing level of service for users. Life cycle cost savings achieved through reduced road width; less maintenance and replacement costs No relocation of Hydro poles required Separated boulevards provided to a maintainable width (i.e. approximately 1.5 – 2.0m) 	Existing Hydro pole locations conflict with proposed sidewalk
Option 2: Dedicated Bike Lanes	 Maintains driving, parking and pedestrian levels of service. Increases level of service for cyclists through a dedicated bike lane 	 Existing Hydro pole locations conflict with proposed sidewalk Hydro poles located in parking lane on north side Very narrow boulevard provisions (difficult to maintain) Increased asphalt width Additional maintenance and replacement costs
Option 3: Dedicated Bike Lanes, One Parking Lane	 Maintains driving and pedestrian levels of service. Increases level of service for cyclists through a dedicated bike lane Separated boulevards provided to a maintainable width (i.e. approximately 	 Reduction in level of service due to parking reduction Existing Hydro pole locations conflict with proposed sidewalk

\\Vesta\Public\Corporate Reports\Communication Procedures\Active Communications\SME SR 2015-07-06 Willemar Ave Bike Lane
Options.docx

	1.5 – 2.0m)	
Option 4: Bikeway, One Parking Lane	 Separation of vehicle and bike traffic Separated boulevards provided to a maintainable width (i.e. approximately 1.5 – 2.0m) 	 High frequency of driveway/bikeway crossings may result in bikeway being blocked by vehicles and traffic flow interrupted High frequency of driveway/bikeway crossings may result in conflicts between vehicles and cyclists Intersection improvements will be required (e.g. dedicated cycle traffic signals, bike boxes for left turns) to facilitate traffic movement Reduction in level of service for parking (only on one side of the road)
Option 5: Multi-Use Pathway, One Parking Lane	 All modes of transportation accommodated Separated boulevards provided to a maintainable width (i.e. approximately 1.5 – 2.0m) 	 High frequency of driveway/MUP crossings may result in multi-use pathway being blocked and traffic flow interrupted High frequency of driveway/bikeway crossings may result in conflicts between vehicles and cyclists Reduction in level of service due to parking reduction (only on one side) Intersection improvements will be required (e.g. dedicated cycle traffic signals, bike boxes for left turns) to facilitate traffic movement

Staff have met with members of the Comox Valley Cycling Coalition to discuss Willemar Avenue cycling infrastructure options and the existing use of Piercy Avenue for cycling. Throughout these discussions, the Coalition has identified that a new cycling map is being developed and they indicated support for dedicated bicycle lanes on Willemar. The Coalition and staff agree that Piercy Avenue should be reviewed further to understand its potential for network connectivity in an overall cycling plan and that the City's upcoming Road Transportation Network Plan (2005) update project provides more time and broader discussion on the merits of Piercy Avenue as a cycling route. For this reason, staff have not brought forward a specific recommendation for Piercy Avenue cycling infrastructure options.

Staff recommend that Willemar Avenue detailed design be completed as per the preliminary design information provided which meets existing City policy. Should Council support dedicated bike lanes on Willemar Avenue, staff's alternate recommended course of action is to proceed with a parking study and public engagement to support furthering the design of Option 3 (dedicated bike lanes and single parking lane).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Staff have developed cost estimates for all of the options and provided them on a cost per kilometre of road reconstruction as a comparison in the table below:

Table 2	– Class	C Cost	Estimates
---------	---------	--------	-----------

Option No.	Description	Estimated Cost per kilometre
1	Shared Vehicle - Bike Lanes	\$ 1,920,000
2	Dedicated Bike Lanes, Parking Both Sides	\$ 2,350,000
3	Dedicated Bike Lanes, Single Parking Lane	\$ 1,925,000
4	Bikeway, Single Parking	\$ 1,840,000 + intersection improvements
5	MUP, Single Parking Lane	\$ 1,930,000 + intersection improvements

Should council decide on an option other than design Option 1, redesign of the project will need to occur and an additional public information session is recommended. This will result in an additional cost of \$15,000. In addition, the investigation into the modified cross sections included in this Council Report incurred a cost of \$9,400 to the project for Dillon Consulting to develop the cross sections, concept plans and associated estimates.

Staff will have to review the remaining budget available to ensure that the designs can be completed based on the option selected by Council.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS:

The Engineering staff work plan includes time to complete the detailed design of the Willemar Avenue road reconstruction project. This exercise is over and above the original work plan efforts for the project and took approximately 40 hours of staff time to work with the consultants on the option concept development, review the information and provide comments, and prepare the staff report.

ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:

The inclusion of dedicated cycling infrastructure on any City street where cycling infrastructure does not currently exist is an increased level of service and is considered an "upgrade" under the umbrella of asset management. Increasing a level of service includes additional capital cost to implement the service and increased annual maintenance cost to operate. Road improvements are funded by the General Capital Fund and maintained by the General Operating Fund of the annual budget sourced from taxation.

STRATEGIC PLAN REFERENCE:

None.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REFERENCE:

Section 5.3 – Transportation, Policies

- 5.3.1 Collector Roadways
 - distribute and collect traffic within neighbourhood and connect to arterial
 - limited direct access

\\Vesta\Public\Corporate Reports\Communication Procedures\Active Communications\SME SR 2015-07-06 Willemar Ave Bike Lane Options.docx

- truck routes
- 20 metre right-of-way width
- sidewalks on both sides
- 5.3.9 The City will require sidewalks to be constructed a minimum of 1.5 metres from the back of curb with street trees planted in the boulevard along all arterial and collector roads outlined on the Road Network Plan.

REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY REFERENCE:

Section 4

GOAL 4: TRANSPORTATION

Develop an accessible, efficient and affordable multi-modal transportation network that connects Core Settlement Areas and designated Town Centres, and links the Comox Valley to neighbouring communities and regions.

Objective 4-B: Improve bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to increase the use of active transportation options.

4B-6 Ensure bicycling amenities and infrastructure are included in all public developments and larger-scale private developments (e.g., bike racks, signage, shower facilities, bicycle lockers or secure bike storage, etc.).

Section 7

GOAL 7: PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Support a high quality of life through the protection and enhancement of community health, safety and well-being.

Objective 7-A: Increase the number of pedestrians and cyclists in the Comox Valley.

7A-1 Support the creation and coordination of local government bicycle and pedestrian plans with local-level strategies to improve active transportation connections to, through and between designated Town Centres located within Core Settlement Areas.

7A-2 Ensure bicycling amenities and infrastructure are included in all public developments and larger-scale private developments

7A-6 Ensure that all new public institutions are accessible via active transportation routes (e.g. bike/greenway network) and public transit.

CITIZEN/PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:

Staff held a public information session as part of the design for the seven road improvement projects in January 2015. Subsequent to Council's request to provide options for Willemar Avenue, staff discussed the

cross section options identified in this report with the Comox Valley Cycling Coalition as part of the ongoing project engagement.

As such, staff has informed the public as part of the design of the seven road improvement projects and will involve the Comox Valley Cycling Coalition on future projects based on the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation:

http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/imported/IAP2%20Spectrum_vertical.pdf



Should Council decide to modify the proposed road cross sectional design for Willemar or Piercy Avenues, staff will inform the public of these changes.

OPTIONS:

- Option 1: That Council direct staff to complete the design of Willemar Avenue using the shared vehiclebike lane cross section depicted in drawing Option 1 (*Recommended*).
- Option 2: That Council direct staff to complete the design of Willemar Avenue using cross section Option 3 (dedicated bike lane, single parking lane) subject to the completion of a parking survey and public information session with the affected residents (*Alternate Recommendation*).
- Option 3: That Council direct staff to complete the design of Willemar Avenue based on a different cross section option of their choice (specify option 2, 4, 5, or other)

Prepared by:

ORIGNAL SIGNED BY

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

Craig Perry, P.Eng. Manager of Engineering Lesley Hatch, P.Eng. Director of Engineering and Public Works

\\Vesta\Public\Corporate Reports\Communication Procedures\Active Communications\SME SR 2015-07-06 Willemar Ave Bike Lane Options.docx







*COST DOES NOT INCLUDE SANITARY, STORM OR WATER UPGRADES *ASSUMES THAT THE ROAD PROFILE REMAINS UNCHANGED *COST DOES NOT INCLUDE OVERHEAD ELECTRICAL

*COST DOES NOT INCLUDE SANITARY, STORM OR WATER UPGRADES *ASSUMES THAT THE ROAD PROFILE REMAINS UNCHANGED *COST DOES NOT INCLUDE OVERHEAD ELECTRICAL

	1:50	1 2m
BY	COURTENAY ROAD RECONSTRUCTION WILLEMAR AVENUE	PROJECT NO. 149559
		SHEET NO.
	PROPOSED ROAD SECTIONS	1 5







*COST DOES NOT INCLUDE SANITARY, STORM OR WATER UPGRADES *ASSUMES THAT THE ROAD PROFILE REMAINS UNCHANGED *COST DOES NOT INCLUDE OVERHEAD ELECTRICAL

*COST DOES NOT INCLUDE SANITARY, STORM OR WATER UPGRADES *ASSUMES THAT THE ROAD PROFILE REMAINS UNCHANGED *COST DOES NOT INCLUDE OVERHEAD ELECTRICAL

	1:50	1 2m
BY	COURTENAY ROAD RECONSTRUCTION WILLEMAR AVENUE	PROJECT NO. 149559
		SHEET NO.
	PROPOSED ROAD SECTIONS	4 6









														•	
	1760	1780	1798	1820	1836	18	868	1882		1920	1936	1944	1950	1966	
							1:50r								
8			(8		<u>}</u>	2.00 4.20m)				⊗		
							4.30m	SHARED LANE						WILLEMAR AVENUE	
							2.00 1.80-2.30	m PARKING Om BOULEVARD							
							× 1450r	n SIDEWALK							
				ALIGNMENT WHEN NEC 1.50m WIDT	EWALK OR SHIFT SIDEWALK TAROUND HYDRO POLES ESSARY TO MAINTAIN TH (TYP.)										
	1757	1775	1785		1805		1855		1905		1925	193	35	1955	
			I												
	2150	2160	2180	2220	0	2240	2250	2	260	2300	2	316	2350	2380	
	⊗ ⊗		×			×	1.50m SIDEWALK 1.80-2.30m BOULEVA 2.00m PARKING	RD	×				×		
LEMAR A	VENUE						4.30m SHARED LAN	E					WILLEMAR	AVENUE	
							4.30m SHARED LAN 2.00m PARKING	E							
	<u></u>		//////////////////////////////////////	<u></u>			1.80-2.30m BOULEVA	RD	<u> </u>					<mark>`</mark>	
2155		2205	2209	2215	2231	2253	2259	2279		2309	2327	2341	2367	2375	
									 						







	1760	1780	1798	1820	1836	1868		1882	1920		1936	1944	195	50 190	6
					N REQUIRED										
							1.50m SIDEV	NAĽK WEVARD							
Q	>		\otimes		8		2.50m PARk	KING Ø					6	3	
							1.50m BIKE I 3.60m DRIVEN							WILLEMAR AVENUE	
							3.60m DRIVEN							WILLERING	
							1.50m BIKE I	LANE							
							2.50m PARk 0.50-1.00m BOU	KING JLEVARD							
			/// <u>8</u> /////////////////////////////////	✓/////₩		///////////////////////////	1.50m SIDEV	NAĽK		<u> </u>			<u> </u>		
	F			WIDEN SIDEWALK	OR SHIFT SIDEWALK										
				ALIGNMENT AROU WHEN NECESSAR	ND HYDRO POLES Y TO MAINTAIN										
				1.50m WIDTH (TYP.))										
	1757	1775	1785		1805	1855		190	05		1925	193	35	1955	
	2150	2160	2180	2220	2240		2250	2260	2300		23	16	2350	2380	
	×		$\bigotimes^{(1)}$			0!50-1.00	n SIDEWALK M BOULEVARD		×				×		
						2.50 1.50n	m PARKING n BIKE LANE								
LEMAR	VENUE					3.60m	DRIVEN LANE						WILLEN	IAR AVENUE	
						3.60m	DRIVEN LANE								
						1.50n 2.50	n BIKE LANE m PARKING								
	<u></u>		<mark></mark>			0.50-1.00 1.50n	MBOULEVARD	///////////////////////////////////////	8					<mark>%</mark>	
0455		2205	2220	22	231 2253		2259	2279	2309		2327	2341	2	367 2375	
∠105			2209	2210											
			I			I	I				I				I

50 Meters

1:250





	1760	1780	1798	1820	1836	1868	
(<i>N</i>			×	×		

			WIDEN SIDEWALK OR SHIFT SIDEWALK ALIGNMENT AROUND HYDRO POLES WHEN NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN 1.50m WIDTH (TYP.)	
1757	1775	1785	1805	1855

2150	2160	2180	2220	2240	
					1.50m/SIDE

	1760	1780	1798	1820	1836	1868	1.50m SIDEWALK 1.70-2.20m BOULEVARD	192	0	1936	1944	1950	1966	
							2.50m PARKING 1.50m BIKE LANE 3.60m DRIVEN LANE					WIL	LEMAR AVENUE	
							3.60m DRIVEN LANE 1.50m BIKE LANE 1.70-2.20m BOULEVARD							
				WIDEN SIDEWALK C	OR SHIFT SIDEWALK		1.50m SIDE WALK		<u> </u>					
	1757	1775	1785	WHEN NECESSARY 1.50m WIDTH (TYP.)	TO MAINTAIN 1805	1855		1905		1925	1935		1955	
	2150	2160	2180	2220	2240		2250	2260 2300		2316		2350	2380	
	8		8			 ✓ 1.50m SIDI ✓ 1.70-2.20m BC 2.50m PAI 	EWALK DULEVARD RKING	<i>⊗</i>				8		
MAR AV	ENUE					1.50m BIKI 3.60m DRIVI	E LANE EN LANE					WILLEMAR AVENU	JE	
				<u>×</u>		1.50m BIKI 1.70-2.20m BC	E LANE OULEVARD	<u>×</u>					8	
155		2205	2209	2215 223	31 2253	2259	2279	2309		2327	2341	2367	2375	

2155	2205	2209	2215	2231	2253	2259





		(
	1760	1780	1798	1820	1836	1868	
Ć	8			\otimes	\)	2

			WIDEN SIDEWALK OR SHIFT SIDEWALK ALIGNMENT AROUND HYDRO POLES WHEN NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN 1.50m WIDTH (TYP.)	
1757	1775	1785	1805	1855

2150	2160	2180	2220	2240	

	1760	1780	1798		1820	1	836	1868		1882		1920	1936	1944	1950	1966	
									1.50m.S	SIDEWALK							
\otimes					<u>×</u>		<u>⊗</u>		2:00-2:50m 2.50m	PARKING)				×		
									3.60m DF	RIVEN LANE						WILLEMAR AVENUE	
									3.60m DF	RIVEN LANE							
									3.00m	BIKEWAY							
			///////////////////////////////////////					///////////////////////////////////////	1.30-1.80m <u>1.50m</u>	BOULEVARD		<u> </u>			<mark>\</mark>		
	1757	1	1775	178	785	N SIDEWALK OR SHIFT S IMENT AROUND HYDRO I NECESSARY TO MAINT WIDTH (TYP.) 1805	SIDEWALK POLES TAIN	1855			1905		1925	193	5	1955	
	2150	2	160	2180	0	2220	2240		2250	2	260	2300	2	316	2350	2380	
								1.50r	m SIDEWALK								
8)			8				8 2.00-2.5	Om BOULEVARD		\bigotimes				<u>⊗</u>		
LEMAR AVE	NUE							2.50 3.60m	DRIVEN LANE						WILLEMAR AV	VENUE	
								3.60m	DRIVEN LANE								
								3.00	m BIKEWAY								
	<u> </u>			<u></u>	<mark>%</mark>			1.30-1.8	Om BOULEVARD		<u></u>	<u> </u>				<u></u>	
2155		2205	22	209	2215	2231	2253		2259	2279		2309	2327	2341	2367	2375	





	1760	1780	1798		1820	1836	6	1868	1882	19	920	193	6 1944	1950	1966	
								<u>1.50r</u>	n SIDEWALK							
\otimes				\otimes			<u>─</u>	2.00-2.50 2.50	Om BOULEVARD)				<u> </u>		
								3.60m	DRIVEN LANE					V	VILLEMAR AVENUE	
								3.60m	DRIVEN LANE							
			//////////////////////////////////////		8			3.00m/MUI 3.00-3.50	LTI-USE PATHWAY Om BOULEVARD							
														<u>&</u>		
	1757		1775	1785		1805		1855		1905		1925	19	35	1955	
	2150	2	160	2180	2	220	2240	2250	2	260 2300)		2316	2350	2380	
	×			×			<u> </u>	1.50m SIDEWALK		//////////////////////////////////////				 ///////////////////////////////		
								2.50m PARKING								
LEMAR AVE	INUE							3.60m DRIVEN LANE						WILLEMAR AVE	INUE	
								3.00m MULTI-USE PATHW	IAY////////////////////////////////////							
	×			⊗	⊗			3.00-3.50m BOULEVARI							<u>×</u>	
												0007	22.44	2267	2275	
2155		2205	22	209	2215	2231	2253	2259	2279	2309		2321	2341	2307	2375	

	1760	1780	1798	3	1820	1	836	1868	1882	1920		1936	1944	1950	1966	
								1.50m	SIDEWALK							
\otimes					<u>×</u>		<u> </u>	2.00-2.50r 2.50m	n BOULEVARD 🔗 N PARKING					<u> </u>		
								3.60m D						V	ILLEMAR AVENUE	
								3:00m/MULT	TI-USE PATHWAY							
			\otimes		\otimes			⊗ 3.00-3.50r	n BOULEVARD		\otimes			×		
	1757		1775		1785	1805		1855		1905		1925	193	5	1955	
	2150	2	2160	21	180	2220	2240	2250	226	60 2300		23	316	2350	2380	
	⊘			(/////////////////////////////////////			<pre></pre>	1.50m SIDEWALK 2.00-2.50m BOULEVARD		×				×		
EMAR AVE	NUF							2.50m PARKING							ŇITE	
								3.60m DRIVEN LANE						VILLEIMARAU		
								3:00m MULTI-USE PATHWA	¥/////////////////////////////////////							
				×				3.00-3.50m BOULEVARD								
2155		2205		2209	2215	2231	2253	2259	2279	2309		2327	2341	2367	2375	

	1760	1780	1798		1820	1836	1	868	1882		1920	193	36 1944	1950	1966	
									1-50m SIDEWALK							
\otimes				\otimes			\otimes	2.0	0-2.50m BOULEVARD	\otimes				×		
								3	2.50m PARKING					W		
								3	60m DRIVEN LANE							
								//////////////////////////////////////	MULTI-USE PATHWAY							
			\otimes		\otimes			<mark>⊗</mark> 3.0	0-3.50m BOULEVARD			<u>⊗</u>		\otimes		
	4757	4 7 7	75			1905		1955		1005		1025	10	35	1955	
	1757	177	5	1785		1005		1000		1000		1020				
	2150	2160	0	2180	222	20	2240	2	250	2260	2300		2316	2350	2380	
								1.50m SIDEWA	<u> </u>							
	8			<u> </u>				2.00-2.50m BOULE 2.50m PARKIN	VARD		⊗					
	/ENUE							3.60m DRIVEN L	ANE					WILLEMAR AVEN	IUE	
								3.60m DRIVEN L	ANE							
	Martin Ma Artin Martin Ma Artin Martin Ma			×	//////////////////////////////////////			3.00m MULTI-USE PA 3.00-3.50m BOULE	THWAY VARD	//////////////////////////////////////					<i>∞</i>	
2155		2205	2209	2	215	2231	2253	2259	2279		2309	2327	2341	2367	2375	

3.60m DRIVEN L/

50 _____Meters

1:250

June 22, 2015

Mayor Larry Jangula City of Courtenay 830 Cliffe Avenue Courtenay, BC V9N 2J7

Dear Mayor Jangula:

Re: 2015 Resolutions

UBCM is in receipt of the attached resolution(s) endorsed by your Council.

The resolution(s) will be presented to the UBCM membership for their consideration at the 2015 UBCM Convention in September.

Please feel free to contact Reiko Tagami, Information & Resolutions Coordinator, if you have any questions about this process.

Tel: 604.270.8226 ext. 115 Email: rtagami@ubcm.ca

Sincerely,

apalin al

Councillor Sav Dhaliwal President

Enclosure

Union of BC Municipalities

TREE PROTECTION BYLAWS IN IDENTIFIED URBAN EXPANSION AREAS

WHEREAS regional districts are prohibited by law from creating tree protection bylaws;

AND WHEREAS unincorporated areas of regional districts include working forests, which are regulated provincially both on public and private land, precluding localregional regulation:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Association of Vancouver Island and Coastal Communities call on the Province to permit regional districts to institute tree protection bylaws in identified urban expansion areas.

Corporation of the Village of Cumberland

2673 Dunsmuir Avenue P.O. Box 340 Cumberland, BC VOR 1S0 Telephone: 250-336-2291 Fax: 250-336-2321 cumberland.ca

June 25, 2015

Bruce Joliffe Chair Comox Valley Regional District 600 Comox Road Courtenay, BC V9N 3P6

Re: Comox Valley Economic Development Commission – Service Withdrawal Meeting

Dear Bruce,

In response to Minister Oakes' letter of May 27, 2015 the Village of Cumberland would like to work with the Comox Valley Regional District to arrange a meeting of the parties of the Comox Valley Economic Development Service to discuss the Village of Cumberland's withdrawal from the service.

The Village of Cumberland would like to see the following parameters for the meeting:

- 1. The Village would like to have the meeting facilitated by an independent facilitator acceptable to the parties;
- 2. The Village would like to limit participation at the meeting to the parties of the Economic Development Service; and,
- 3. As per Section 90 (1) of the Local Government Act the Village of Cumberland would like to have the meeting take place in-camera.

If you have any questions in regards to this information please contact me directly via email at mayor.baird@cumberland.ca or by telephone at 250-336-2291.

Sincerely,

· Spind

Leslie Baird Mayor Village of Cumberland

Encl: May 27, 2015 letter from Minister Oakes re: Comox Valley Economic Development – Village of Cumberland Withdrawal

 cc: Coralee Oakes, Minister of Community, Sport and Cultural Development Mayor and Council, City of Courtenay Mayor and Council, Town of Comox Rod Nichol, Director, Electoral Area B, Comox Valley Regional District Edwin Grieve, Director, Electoral Area C, Comox Valley Regional District Debra Oakman, Chief Administrative Officer, Comox Valley Regional District

Rejan Farley, Director, Intergovernmental Relations and Planning

Page 2 of 2

JUN-1 2015

MAY 2 7 2015

Ref: 157378

Her Worship Mayor Leslie Baird Village of Cumberland 2673 Dunsmuir Avenue PO Box 340 Cumberland, BC VOR 1S0

Dear Mayor Baird:

Thank you for your letter of January 27, 2015, regarding withdrawal from the Comox Valley Economic Development Commission function (economic development service).

I understand that the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) recently completed a service review of the economic development service. I applaud the CVRD and the service participants for being proactive in engaging in a service review. Over time, service arrangements need to be able to respond to the needs of service participants and adjust when local or regional circumstances change. Service reviews provide an opportunity for service participants to review their participation in a service and support continued collaboration between members.

I understand from your letter that the Village of Cumberland continues to be dissatisfied with the existing terms and conditions of participating in this service and would like to initiate a service withdrawal process pursuant to Section 813.08 of the *Local Government Act*. It is unfortunate that, despite the service review process, the Village has decided that continued participation in the economic development service is unsatisfactory.

Regional economic development services are important in enabling local governments to work together to stimulate business and other economic development opportunities for their communities. I understand that the CVRD is in the process of developing proposed amendments to the service in response to the service review recommendations. I would like to see the parties engage in further discussions in consideration of the proposed amendments and the Village's specific concerns, to see if agreement might be reached for the Village to stay in the service.

To this end, as authorized under section 813.09(1)(a.1) of the Act, I am directing the parties to the service review to engage in further negotiations to attempt to come to an agreed upon resolution to the issues, with negotiations to be concluded no later than August 31, 2015.

.../2

Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development Office of the Minister

 Mailing Address:

 PO Box 9056 Stn Prov Govt

 Victoria BC
 V8W 9E2

 Phone:
 250 387-2283

 Fax:
 250 387-4312

Location: Room 124 Parliament Buildings Victoria BC V8V 1X4

www.gov.bc.ca/cscd

Her Worship Mayor Leslie Baird Page 2

If you have any questions about the process, please contact Ms. Rejan Farley, Director, Intergovernmental Relations and Planning, by email at: <u>Rejan Farley@gov.bc.ca</u>, or by telephone at: 250 387-4046.

I do hope that you can come to a resolution acceptable to all participants in the economic development service and work to develop a successful, long-term solution.

Thank you again for your letter.

Sincerely,

Conster Oskes

Coralee Oakes Minister

pc:

Mr. Bruce Jolliffe, Chair, Comox Valley Regional District

His Worship Mayor Paul Ives, Town of Comox

His Worship Mayor Larry Jangula, City of Courtenay

Mr. Sundance Topham, Chief Administrative Officer, Village of Cumberland

Ms. Debra Oakman, Chief Administrative Officer, Comox Valley Regional District

Mr. Rod Nichol, Director, Electoral Area B, Comox Valley Regional District

Mr. Edwin Grieve, Director, Electoral Area C, Comox Valley Regional District

Ms. Meggin Messenger, Executive Director, Intergovernmental Relations and Planning

Ms. Rejan Farley, Director, Intergovernmental Relations and Planning

JUN-1 2015

MAY 2 7 2015

Ref: 157378

Her Worship Mayor Leslie Baird Village of Cumberland 2673 Dunsmuir Avenue PO Box 340 Cumberland, BC VOR 150

Dear Mayor Baird:

Thank you for your letter of January 27, 2015, regarding withdrawal from the Comox Valley Economic Development Commission function (economic development service).

I understand that the Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD) recently completed a service review of the economic development service. I applaud the CVRD and the service participants for being proactive in engaging in a service review. Over time, service arrangements need to be able to respond to the needs of service participants and adjust when local or regional circumstances change. Service reviews provide an opportunity for service participants to review their participation in a service and support continued collaboration between members.

I understand from your letter that the Village of Cumberland continues to be dissatisfied with the existing terms and conditions of participating in this service and would like to initiate a service withdrawal process pursuant to Section 813.08 of the *Local Government Act*. It is unfortunate that, despite the service review process, the Village has decided that continued participation in the economic development service is unsatisfactory.

Regional economic development services are important in enabling local governments to work together to stimulate business and other economic development opportunities for their communities. I understand that the CVRD is in the process of developing proposed amendments to the service in response to the service review recommendations. I would like to see the parties engage in further discussions in consideration of the proposed amendments and the Village's specific concerns, to see if agreement might be reached for the Village to stay in the service.

To this end, as authorized under section 813.09(1)(a.1) of the Act, I am directing the parties to the service review to engage in further negotiations to attempt to come to an agreed upon resolution to the issues, with negotiations to be concluded no later than August 31, 2015.

.../2 .

Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development Office of the Minister

 Mailing Address:

 PO Box 9056 Stn Prov Govt

 Victoria BC V8W 9E2

 Phone:
 250 387-2283

 Fax:
 250 387-4312

Location: Room 124 Parllament Buildings Victoria BC V8V 1X4

www.gov.bc.ca/cscd

Her Worship Mayor Leslie Baird Page 2

If you have any questions about the process, please contact Ms. Rejan Farley, Director, Intergovernmental Relations and Planning, by email at: <u>Rejan.Farley@gov.bc.ca</u>, or by telephone at: 250 387-4046.

I do hope that you can come to a resolution acceptable to all participants in the economic development service and work to develop a successful, long-term solution.

Thank you again for your letter.

Sincerely,

Covale Cakes

Coralee Oakes Minister

pc:

Mr. Bruce Jolliffe, Chair, Comox Valley Regional District His Worship Mayor Paul Ives, Town of Comox

His Worship Mayor Larry Jangula, City of Courtenay

Mr. Sundance Topham, Chief Administrative Officer, Village of Cumberland

Ms. Debra Oakman, Chief Administrative Officer, Comox Valley Regional District

Mr. Rod Nichol, Director, Electoral Area B, Comox Valley Regional District

Mr. Edwin Grieve, Director, Electoral Area C, Comox Valley Regional District

Ms. Meggin Messenger, Executive Director, Intergovernmental Relations and Planning

Ms. Rejan Farley, Director, Intergovernmental Relations and Planning

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF COURTENAY

MEMORANDUM

To:CouncilFile No.: 5600-20-87547From:Chief Administrative OfficerDate: June 25, 2015Subject:2nd Street Road Reconstruction Project – Additional Information North Sidewalk

PURPOSE:

To provide additional information to Council following questions about the Second Street Reconstruction Project plans from the June 1, 2015 Council meeting.

BACKGROUND:

Engineering Division staff has received a public inquiry regarding the plans for 2nd Street, specifically in regards to the proposed removal of the sidewalk on the north side of the street between Cliffe and Duncan Avenues. As outlined in staff's response to the residents (letter dated April 24, 2015), staff were guided by City policy in determining the need to replace the sidewalk as part of the ongoing project. Employing the Official Community Plan (*Section 5.3.1 & 5.3.10*), Old Orchard Local Area Plan and current City specifications for a Local Road, the proposed design for this capital project includes maintaining a sidewalk on one side of the road (south side) for the length of the project.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

At the June 1, 2015 regular Council meeting, Council considered and discussed a letter (dated May 25, 2015) from the same group of residents fronting the existing north sidewalk on 2nd Street between Cliffe and Duncan Avenues as part of "New Business". Many questions were posed and details in support of some of the question were not readily available to provide a complete response to Council, as such, additional information is available below to close out these questions:

Can the sidewalk stay where it is?

The sidewalk cannot remain in place as the road cross section is being adjusted to implement a new curb & gutter and relocating the gutterline further north to accommodate the laning. This element impacts the horizontal and vertical alignment of the existing sidewalk, putting it in conflict with the new road design.

Were there any survey comments relating to the sidewalk removal? What were they?

The following comments relate specifically to 2nd Street survey comments:

- Four people identified themselves as being residents of from 2nd Street (addresses unknown).
- Of the 105 responses, 52% said they use the 2nd Street corridor for walking; 74% for cycling; 56% for car travel (multiple options were selected by each)
- Of the 131 responses, a preference was shown for maintaining parking as 37.4% said "yes" to parking on both sides of the road.

- Of the 130 responses, a preference was shown for the implementation of grassed boulevards as 37.4% said "yes" to the provision of grassed boulevards.
- Of the 130 responses, support was provided for the proposed traffic calming measures as 70% said "yes" to the design elements.

If specific "open" comments relating to this topic are still desired, staff will need to re-review the 150 surveys collected to respond to this request under Council's direction.

Prepared by

& Hatch

Lesley Hatch, P.Eng. Director of Engineering & Public Works

Minutes of a City of Courtenay Heritage Advisory Commission meeting held April 22, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. at the Courtenay and District Museum

Present:	L. Burns D. Griffiths	C. Piercy R. Smith	E. Ferguson, staff J. Fortin
Absent:	H. Squire	L. Grant	J. Hagen
MINUTES	Moved by C	Piercy and se	econded by I. Fortin th

FORFO

Moved by C. Piercy and seconded by J. Fortin that the March 25, 2015 minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

OLD BUSINESS

40 HOUSES

E. Ferguson provided update that letter has been circulated to property owners. Three individuals have contacted the City. One submitted a letter of support. Two people called asking seeking clarification on how it would impact them. No one has opposed. Staff bringing forward to Council for adoption.

Plaque location to be coordinated with Parks & Operational Services Departments. Plaque ordering to be coordinated with Susie Karvalics.

REPORT OF CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

L. Burns reported on Centennial Committee planning.

FUTURE MEMBERSHIP

Advertisement has gone in the newspaper for new membership this month for three new members.

Discussed need to advertise for new membership preferably this spring.

A. Guillo working on this.

DOWNTOWN WALKING TOUR BROCHURE

NEW BUSINESS

MUSEUM CENTENNIAL PROJECT The book "Watershed Moments" being produced by the Museum has been sent for publishing. It is a pictoral history of Courtenay & District containing numerous photos, vignettes, many seen before. It should be available in October.

Museum is looking for more information on wharves.

Museum is printing a copy of Centennial Display Panels for year round display. A public unveiling of the display and reception will be held prior to "Home Coming Week" late in June.

HERITAGE APPRECIATION LETTERS

Three letters to be mailed out by June.

COUNCIL

Commission Delegation to visit Council May 11th with an annual report in connection to strategic direction and report of delegates to annual conference.

A brief report of April 20th Heritage BC webinar was given.

HERITAGE BC

PROJECTS &

PRIORITIES

• 40 Houses Plaque 17th & McPhee Ave

- Interpretive signson Rotary Trail
- Heritage Inventory of Commercial buildings and recently annexed residential properties

Next Meeting: May 27, 2015 at 10 a.m. The meeting adjourned at 11:30 pm.

Chair

34

Minutes of a City of Courtenay Heritage Advisory Commission meeting held May 27, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. at the City of Courtenay

Present:	L. Burns D. Griffiths	C. Piercy R. Smith	H. Squire J. Fortin	L. Grant	J. Hagen
·	2				
Absent:	E. Ferguson, s	staff	•		· · · .

MINUTES

Tabled.

DELEGATION

Rotary members Art Meyers and Rod Hunter, with architect Phillipa Atwood and Engineer Darren Moss presented plans for renovation of the exterior of Courtenay's heritage E & N Train Station. Rotary members emphasized that getting a "Rotary Room" in the 950 sq. ft. repurposed freight area was their motivation to take on the project. Forty minutes of discussion followed on the extent of the proposed work and the relevance of character defining elements in the station's Statement of Significance prepared by the national registry.

Moved by R. Smith and seconded by L. Grant that Deb Griffiths prepare and circulate the Heritage Commission's statement on the proposed Rotary plan today, and that members respond by email to Deb before the end of the day. (Note: Deb received responses all in favor of the proposal, and a copy of the statement is attached to these minutes.

Carried

OLD BUSINESS	
40 HOUSES	Tabled.
REPORT OF CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE	L. Burns reported on the activities planned for the summer.
FUTURE MEMBERSHIP	Tabled.
1085 5 th ST PRESENTATION	Tabled.
REPRINT OF HERITAGE WALKING BROCHURE	Ongoing
CENTENNIAL PANELS	Deb reported that the museum has enlarged panels which will be put or display in the museum on June 27 th at an open house and reception 1-3 pm and will stay on display through the year. Lawrence reported on the commission's panels which are on view at centennial events.
CARDS OF APPRECIATION	To Heritage home owners who enhance their properties. Julie is writing the cards to be sent out.
ANNUAL REPORT	Lawrence reported on the presentation to Council May 11 th

NEW BUSINESS

DISCUSSION OF FUTURE PROJECTS

Tabled.

JULY 1ST PARTICIPATION

Plan to attend Lewis Park with heritage display boards in centennial committee's location.

CORRESPONDENCE

Heritage BC Report

Next Meeting: June 24, 2015 at 10 a.m. The meeting adjourned at 11:55 am.

Chair

City of Courtenay Heritage Commission Motion May 27, 2015: E&N Station

The City of Courtenay Heritage Commission approves Rotary and Island Corridor Foundation's plans for the exterior phase (phase one) for the rehabilitation of the historic Courtenay E&N Station as presented on May 27, 2015. From 1914, the E&N Station served as a vibrant community terminus. Over the past twenty years, the E&N building has gradually deteriorated from age and neglect.

We acknowledge the intentions, labour and over \$40,000 Rotary has contributed to protecting the building's envelope and in presenting plans for the building. The commission also recognizes Rotary's years-long support in development of Courtenay's extensive public walkways and trails along railway grades. This trail and walkway system provides a key contextual component for community use, connectivity and enjoyment of the E&N Station.

It is the commission's intent to support and advise on the plans for the rehabilitation of the E&N Station. This rehabilitation should encourage reengaging public use of the station while improving energy efficiency to complement the anticipated increased activity and to ensure the long-term sustainability of this heritage asset.

Members of the commission recognize that these improvements may require that a lower priority be placed upon specific elements outlined in the statement of significance both in phase one, the exterior portion of the project; and in phase two, the interior portion of the project.

Specifically, the commission sees discussion of these elements by phase:

Phase One: Exterior

• The commission supports replacement of single glazed windows with double glazed wooden replicas.

Phase Two: Interior

In principle, the commission supports the following concepts subject to a separate presentation and approval of plans before commencement of phase two.

- Removal of interior finishes in new Rotary room and lobby (not existing waiting area) to allow insulation of exterior walls, installation of new mechanical and electrical systems and seismic upgrades.
- Existing materials repurposed whenever possible on interior finish
- Retention of all historic signage and replication of signage approved by the commission

Finally, on approval of phase one, the commission asks that any design and construction of the west platform should take into consideration a future extension in keeping with the original footprint as per the attached 1919 image.

CITY OF COURTENAY

BYLAW REFERENCE FORM

BYLAW TITLE

"Officer's Designation and Establishment of Powers, Duties, and Responsibilities Bylaw No. 2823, 2015".

REASON FOR BYLAW

To update the Officer's Designation Bylaw.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR BYLAW

Community Charter, SBC 2003 Chapter 26 Financial Disclosure Act RSBC 1996 Chapter 139

OTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED

None.

STAFF COMMENTS AND/OR REPORTS

Housekeeping update of bylaw to current positions.

OTHER PROCEDURES REQUIRED

June 9, 2015

J. Ward Staff Member

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF COURTENAY

BYLAW NO. 2823

A bylaw to designate and to establish the powers, duties, and responsibilities of Officers for the City of Courtenay

The Municipal Council of the Corporation of the City of Courtenay, in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. <u>CITATION</u>

This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "Officer's Designation and Establishment of Powers, Duties, and Responsibilities Bylaw No. 2823, 2015".

2. OFFICERS

Pursuant to Section 146 of the *Community Charter*, the Officers of the City of Courtenay shall be those persons holding the following positions:

- (a) Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)
- (b) Director of Legislative Services/Deputy CAO
- (c) Director of Financial Services
- (d) Director of Community Services
- (e) Director of Development Services
- (f) Director of Engineering and Public Works

3. <u>POWERS, DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF OFFICERS</u>

3.1 <u>CHIEF ADMINISTRATRIVE OFFICER (CAO)</u>

The Chief Administrative Officer is hereby assigned the chief administrative responsibility for the Municipality and the statutory powers, duties and functions specified in Section 147 of the *Community Charter*, and the powers, duties, and responsibilities established by Council in the Chief Administrative Officer Position Description, including the duties of Deputy Corporate Officer.

3.2 DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES/DEPUTY CAO

The Director of Legislative Services/Deputy CAO is hereby assigned the responsibility of corporate administration for the Municipality including the statutory powers, duties, and functions specified in Section 148 of the *Community Charter (Corporate Officer)*, and the powers, duties, and responsibilities established in the Director of Legislative Services/Deputy CAO Position Description, including the duties of the City Clerk.

3.3 <u>DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL SERVICES</u>

The Director of Financial Services is hereby assigned the responsibility of financial administration for the municipality, which includes the statutory powers, duties, and functions specified in Section 149 of the *Community Charter (Financial Officer)*, and the powers, duties, and responsibilities established in the Director of Financial Services Position Description.

3.4 DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

The Director of Community Services is hereby assigned the powers, duties, and responsibilities established in the Director of Community Services Position Description.

3.5 DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

The Director of Development Services is hereby assigned the powers, duties, and responsibilities established in the Director of Development Services Position Description.

3.6 DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Director of Engineering and Public Works is hereby assigned the powers, duties, and responsibilities established in the Director of Engineering and Public Works Position Description.

4. <u>FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE</u>

All persons employed in the positions identified in section 2 of this bylaw are hereby designated as "municipal employees" for the purposes of the *Financial Disclosure Act*.

5. <u>MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS</u>

"Officer's Designation and Establishment of Powers, Duties, and Responsibilities Bylaw No. 2381, 2004 is hereby repealed.

Read a first time this 15th day of June, 2015

Read a second time this 15th day of June, 2015

Read a third time this 15th day of June, 2015

Finally passed this day of