

1. June 22, 2020 Council Agenda And Correspondence

Documents:

[JUNE 22, 2020 - AGENDA.PDF](#)

[CHILD CARE NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND ACTION PLAN.PDF](#)

[JUNE 22, 2020 CORRESPONDENCE.PDF](#)

[JUNE 22, 2020 - ITEM 12.1.2 5G FULL REPORT.PDF](#)



AGENDA

**City of Salmon Arm
Regular Council Meeting**

**Monday, June 22, 2020
1:30 p.m.**

[Public Session Begins at 2:30 p.m.]
**Council Chamber of City Hall
500 – 2 Avenue NE**

Page #	Item #	Description
	1.	CALL TO ORDER
1 - 2	2.	IN-CAMERA SESSION
	3.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL TERRITORY <i>We acknowledge that we are gathering here on the traditional territory of the Secwepemc people, with whom we share these lands and where we live and work together.</i>
	4.	ADOPTION OF AGENDA
	5.	DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST
3 - 12	6. 1.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES Regular Council Meeting Minutes of June 8, 2020
13 - 18	7. 1.	COMMITTEE REPORTS Development and Planning Services Committee Meeting Minutes of June 15, 2020
19 - 30	2.	Downtown Parking Commission Meeting Minutes of June 16, 2020
	8.	COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT UPDATE
31 - 34	9. 1.	STAFF REPORTS Director of Engineering and Public Works - Municipal Asset Management Grant, Establishing Salmon Arm's Asset Management Program
35 - 100	10. 1.	INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4378 [ZON-1171; 11604895 BC Ltd./ G. Arsenault; 70 & 210 11 Street SE; R1/R4 to R4] - First and Second Readings

- 11. **RECONSIDERATION OF BYLAWS**
 - 101 – 118 1. City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 4393 [OCP4000-42; Edelweiss Properties Inc./Timberline Solutions/Baer, J.; 220 Okanagan Avenue SE; CC to HR] – Second Reading
 - 119 – 122 2. City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4394 [ZON-1175; Edelweiss Properties Inc./Timberline Solutions/Baer, J.; 220 Okanagan Avenue SE; C-2 to R-5] [*See item 11.1 for Staff Report*] – Second Reading

- 12. **CORRESPONDENCE**
 - 123 – 124 1. Informational Correspondence
 - 125 – 128 2. L. Wong, Manager, Downtown Salmon Arm – letter dated June 15, 2020 – Alexander Street

- 13. **NEW BUSINESS**

- 14. **PRESENTATIONS / DELEGATIONS**
 - 129 – 130 1. Terry Smith, SK’atsin Silvatech Ventures LLP, a Neskonlith Indian Band Subsidiary – Update on 2020 Community Resiliency Investment (CRI)

- 15. **COUNCIL STATEMENTS**

- 16. **SALMON ARM SECONDARY YOUTH COUNCIL**

- 17. **NOTICE OF MOTION**

- 18. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND DEFERRED / TABLED ITEMS**
 - 131 – 142 1. A. Morris – email and attachments dated April 20, 2020 – Nuclear Weapons Disaster [*deferred from April 27, 2020 Regular Council Meeting*] and A. Morris – email and attachments dated June 15, 2020 – Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons
 - 143 - 154 2. Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan [*Full Report available on the City of Salmon Arm Website: <https://www.salmonarm.ca/AgendaCenter/Council-Agenda-Packages-5/?#06222020-618>*]

- 19. **OTHER BUSINESS**

- 20. **QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD**

7:00 p.m.

Page #	Item #	Description
	21.	DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST
	22.	HEARINGS
155 - 166	1.	Development Variance Permit Application No. VP-516 [The Canada Trust Company Inc.; CND Framing/Skjerpen, M.; 941 - 8 Avenue NE; Setbacks]
	23.	STATUTORY PUBLIC HEARINGS
	24.	RECONSIDERATION OF BYLAWS
	25.	QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD
167 - 168	26.	ADJOURNMENT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 2.

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor Flynn

Seconded: Councillor Lavery

THAT: pursuant to Section 90(1) of the Community Charter, Council move In-Camera.

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 6.1

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor Lindgren

Seconded: Councillor Wallace Richmond

THAT: the Regular Council Meeting Minutes of June 8, 2020, be adopted as circulated.

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

REGULAR COUNCIL

Minutes of a Regular Meeting of Council of the City of Salmon Arm commenced by electronic means as authorized by Ministerial Order M139, at 1:30 p.m. on Monday, June 8, 2020.

PRESENT:

Mayor A. Harrison
Councillor D. Cannon
Councillor C. Eliason
Councillor K. Flynn
Councillor T. Lavery
Councillor S. Lindgren
Councillor L. Wallace Richmond

Chief Administrative Officer C. Bannister
Director of Corporate Services E. Jackson
Director of Engineering & Public Works R. Niewenhuizen
Director of Development Services K. Pearson
Acting Chief Financial Officer T. Tulak
Recorder C. Simmons

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Harrison called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. IN-CAMERA SESSION

0209-2020

Moved: Councillor Cannon
Seconded: Councillor Eliason
THAT: pursuant to Section 90(1) of the Community Charter, Council move In-Camera.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Council moved In-Camera at 1:30 p.m.
Council returned to Regular Session at 2:30 p.m.
Council recessed until 2:35 p.m.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL TERRITORY

Mayor Harrison read the following statement: "We acknowledge that we are gathering here on the traditional territory of the Secwepemc people, with whom we share these lands and where we live and work together."

4. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Addition under item 12.2 Shuswap Youth Soccer Association - letter dated May 21, 2020 - Request for letter of support.

5. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1. Regular Council Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2020

0210-2020

Moved: Councillor Cannon
Seconded: Councillor Flynn
THAT: the Regular Council Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2020, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Development and Planning Services Committee Meeting Minutes of June 1, 2020

0211-2020

Moved: Councillor Eliason
Seconded: Councillor Lindgren
THAT: the Development and Planning Services Committee Meeting Minutes of June 1, 2020, be received as information.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT UPDATE

1. Board in Brief - May 2020

Received for information.

9. STAFF REPORTS

1. Acting Chief Financial Officer - Salmon Arm Folk Music Society Financial Information - For Information

0212-2020

Moved: Councillor Cannon
Seconded: Councillor Lindgren
THAT: the Salmon Arm Folk Music Societies Financial Information for the 2020 Festival Budget be received as information.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Manager of Permits & Licensing - Temporary Expanded Service Area Authorization

0213-2020

Moved: Councillor Eliason
Seconded: Councillor Wallace Richmond
THAT: structural changes to liquor licenses, be allowed without such changes coming to Council, as outlined as Option 1 of the May 22, 2020 email from the Liquor and Cannabis Regulation Branch (LCRB) attached to the staff report dated May 27, 2020.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **STAFF REPORTS – continued**3. **Director of Development Services – Sidewalk Café/Patio Fees – For Information**

0214-2020

Moved: Councillor Lindgren

Seconded: Mayor Harrison

THAT: Council direct staff to waive the Sidewalk Café application fees and expand the patron areas into boulevards for the 2020 season, subject to application approval by City staff and adequate liability insurance;

AND THAT: Hanoi 36 be refunded the Sidewalk Café application fee for the 2020 season.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

0215-2020

Moved: Councillor Flynn

Seconded Councillor Cannon

THAT: Council direct staff waive the \$150.00 land charge fee for the 2020 season;

AND THAT: Hanoi 36 be refunded the land charge fee for the 2020 season.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY4. **Chief Administrative Officer – Ross Street Underpass Financing & Project Update**

Councillor Flynn left the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

0216-2020

Moved: Councillor Wallace Richmond

Seconded: Councillor Lavery

THAT: the 2020 Budget contained in the 2020 to 2024 Financial Plan be amended to reflect additional funding for the Ross Street Underpass Construction in the amount of \$3,569,912.20 funded from the following:

Grants	\$1,067,912.20
Underpass Reserve Account	525,000.00
Parking – General Parking Lot Reserve Account	1,570,000.00
TCH Intersections Reserve Account	157,000.00
20 Ave/20 St Intersection Realignment Reserve Account	250,000.00
	<u>\$3,569,912.20</u>

AND THAT: the Corporate Strategic Plan/Debt Strategy be amended to move the Downtown Parkade Project out by 5 years (i.e. 2028 vs. 2023).

Councillor Flynn returned to the meeting at 2:57 p.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY5. **Director of Engineering and Public Works – 2020/2021 Annual Transit Operating Agreement**

0217-2020

Moved: Councillor Lavery

Seconded: Councillor Wallace Richmond

THAT: the Mayor and Corporate Officer be authorized to execute the 2020/2021 Annual Operating Agreement and the Transit Service Agreement between the City of Salmon Arm and BC Transit.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. STAFF REPORTS – continued

6. Acting Chief Financial Officer – 2021/2022 RCMP Funding (2021 Budget)

0218-2020

Moved: Councillor Flynn

Seconded: Councillor Wallace Richmond

THAT: the City of Salmon Arm approve in principle the 2021/2022 budget of \$4,192,833 under the Municipal Policing Contract which the City is responsible for 90% thereof;

AND THAT: the City of Salmon Arm advise that it has not approved or authorized any increases to member strength.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. INTRODUCTION OF BYLAWS

1. City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 4393 [OCP4000-42; Edelweiss Properties Inc./Timberline Solutions/Baer, J.; 220 Okanagan Avenue SE; CC to HR] – First Reading

0219-2020

Moved: Councillor Cannon

Seconded: Councillor Eliason

THAT: the bylaw entitled City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 4393 be read a first time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4394 [ZON-1175; Edelweiss Properties Inc./Timberline Solutions/Baer, J.; 220 Okanagan Avenue SE; C-2 to R-5]- First Reading

0220-2020

Moved: Councillor Eliason

Seconded: Councillor Lavery

THAT: the bylaw entitled City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4394 be read a first time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. RECONSIDERATION OF BYLAWS

1. City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4390 [ZON-1174; 508316 BC Ltd./Guenther, K.; 1141 18 Street NE; R-1 to R-4] – Final Reading

0221-2020

Moved: Councillor Cannon

Seconded: Councillor Flynn

THAT: the bylaw entitled City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4390 be read a final time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

12. CORRESPONDENCE

1. Informational Correspondence

Councillor Cannon declared a conflict of interest as the writer of the letter is a relative and left the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

4. P. Cannon, Shuswap Children’s Association – letter dated May 28, 2020 – StoryWalk

0222-2020

Moved: Councillor Wallace Richmond
Seconded: Councillor Lindgren

THAT: Council approve the Shuswap Children’s Association StoryWalk at the following locations and dates:

- Blackburn Park –July 8, 2020;
- Kin Park –July 15, 2020;
- Jackson Park – July 22, 2020;

Subject to the provision of adequate liability insurance.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Councillor Cannon returned to the meeting at 4:09 p.m.
Councillor Flynn left the meeting at 4:09 p.m.

2. Shuswap Youth Soccer Association – letter dated May 21, 2020 – Request for letter of support

0223-2020

Moved: Councillor Wallace Richmond
Seconded: Councillor Cannon

THAT: Council provide a letter of support to Shuswap Youth Soccer Association for a Community Gaming Grant.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

13. NEW BUSINESS

14. PRESENTATIONS

1. Jen Casorso – Urban Matters – Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan

Councillor Flynn returned to the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

J. Casorso, Urban Matters provided an overview of the Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan for Salmon Arm and was available to answer questions from Council.

0224-2020

Moved: Councillor Wallace Richmond
Seconded: Councillor Flynn

THAT: Council direct staff to submit the final UBCM grant report and the Child Care Community Planning Report to the UBCM and the Ministry of Child and Family Development fulfilling the grant obligations of the Child Care Space planning program.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. COUNCIL STATEMENTS

16. SALMON ARM SECONDARY YOUTH COUNCIL

17. NOTICE OF MOTION

18. UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND DEFERRED / TABLED ITEMS

19. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Rainbow Crosswalk

0225-2020

Moved: Councillor Eliason

Seconded: Councillor Cannon

THAT: Councilor Wallace Richmond work with the Social Services Committee to solicit input from the LGBTQ Community on rainbow crosswalks and infrastructure in Salmon Arm.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

20. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Council held a Question and Answer session with the members of the public present.

The Meeting recessed at 4:58 p.m.

The Meeting reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

- Mayor A. Harrison
- Councillor D. Cannon
- Councillor C. Eliason
- Councillor K. Flynn
- Councillor T. Lavery
- Councillor Lindgren
- Councillor L. Wallace Richmond

- Chief Administrative Officer C. Bannister
- Director of Corporate Services E. Jackson
- Acting Chief Financial Officer T. Tulak
- Director of Engineering & Public Works R. Niewenhuizen
- Director of Development Services K. Pearson
- Recorder B. Puddifant

21. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

22. HEARINGS

23. STATUTORY PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Zoning Amendment Application No. ZON-1176 [Micku, B. & V.; 3410 Lakeshore Road NE; R1 to R-8]

The Director of Development Services explained the proposed Zoning Amendment Application.

Submissions were called for at this time.

B. Micku, was available to answer questions from Council.

Following three calls for submissions and questions from Council, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:03 p.m.

24. RECONSIDERATION OF BYLAWS

- 1. City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4395 [ZON-1176; Micku, B. & V.; 3410 Lakeshore Road NE; R1 to R-8] – Third and Final Readings

0226-2020

Moved: Councillor Eliason
 Seconded: Councillor Lindgren
 THAT: the bylaw entitled City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4395 be read a third and final time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

25. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Council held a Question and Answer session with the members of the public present.

- 2. IN-CAMERA SESSION – continued

0227-2020

Moved: Councillor Wallace Richmond
 Seconded: Councillor Eliason
 THAT: pursuant to Section 90(1) of the Community Charter, Council move In-Camera.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Council moved In-Camera at 7:05 p.m.

Council returned to Regular Session at 8:09 p.m.

26. ADJOURNMENT

0228-2020

Moved: Councillor Flynn

Seconded: Councillor Wallace Richmond

THAT: the Regular Council Meeting of June 8, 2020, be adjourned.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

CORPORATE OFFICER

MAYOR

Adopted by Council the day of _____, 2020.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 7.1

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor Cannon

Seconded: Councillor Lindgren

THAT: the Development and Planning Services Committee Meeting Minutes of June 15, 2020, be received as information.

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING SERVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Meeting of the Development and Planning Services Committee of the City of Salmon Arm held by electronic means, as authorized under Ministerial Order M139, on Monday, June 15, 2020.

PRESENT:

Mayor A. Harrison
 Councillor D. Cannon
 Councillor K. Flynn
 Councillor C. Eliason (left the meeting at 8:55 a.m.)
 Councillor T. Lavery
 Councillor S. Lindgren
 Councillor L. Wallace Richmond

Chief Administrative Officer C. Bannister
 Director of Corporate Services E. Jackson
 Director of Engineering & Public Works R. Niewenhuizen
 Director of Development Services K. Pearson
 Recorder B. Puddifant

ABSENT:

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Harrison called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL TERRITORY

Mayor Harrison read the following statement: "We acknowledge that we are gathering here on the traditional territory of the Secwepemc people, with whom we share these lands and where we live and work together."

3. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

5. REPORTS

1. Development Variance Permit Application No. VP-516 [CDN Framing/Skjerpen, M.; 941 8 Avenue NE; Setback requirements]

Moved: Councillor Eliason

Seconded: Councillor Cannon

THAT: the Development and Planning Services Committee recommends to Council that Development Variance Permit No. VP-516 be authorized for issuance for Lot A, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 12703 Except Plans KAP71482 and EPP5318 to vary the provisions of Zoning Bylaw No. 2303 as follows:

5. REPORTS - continued1. Development Variance Permit Application No. VP-516 [CDN Framing/Skjerpen, M.; 941 8 Avenue NE; Setback requirements - continued

1. Section 6.10.2. – R-1 Single Family Residential Zone – reduce the minimum setback to a rear parcel line from 6.0 m (19.7 ft) to 5.0 m (16.4 ft) to allow for the siting of a new single family dwelling.

M. Skjerpen, the applicant, was available to answer questions from the Committee.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Zoning Amendment Application No. ZON-1171 [604895 BC Ltd./Arsenault, G.; 70 and 210 11 Street SE; R-1 to R-4]

Moved: Councillor Eliason

Seconded: Councillor Cannon

THAT: the Development and Planning Services Committee recommends to Council that a bylaw be prepared for Council's consideration, adoption of which would amend Zoning Bylaw No. 2303 by as follows:

1. Rezone that 5,140m² portion of Lot 1, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan KAP54150 shown on Schedule A of the Staff Report dated June 10, 2020, from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R-4 (Medium Density Residential); and
2. Rezone that part of Lot 1 shown on Plan B4487, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 1521 from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R-4 (Medium Density Residential);

AND THAT: the Public Hearing Date, as yet to be determined, be held at the Salmon Arm Recreation Centre;

AND FURTHER THAT: final reading of the Bylaw be withheld subject to:

1. Approval by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure;
2. Registration of Section 219 Land Title Act Covenants addressing the following:
 - i) Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulation, including establishment of a 30 m Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area;
 - ii) Approximately 1,733 m² of land for a City Road Reserve over the portion of Lot 1 shown on Plan B4487 consistent with the 4 Avenue SE Advanced Street Plan prepared by Lawson Engineering (Drawing 11-45 - Dated December 12, 2019) - FURTHER TO THAT, the applicant be compensated by the City in the amount of \$35,000.00 for the Road Reserve;
 - iii) No Subdivision or Development Permit approval until a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is provided to the satisfaction of the City Engineer with acknowledgment that the owner/applicant is

5. REPORTS - continued2. Zoning Amendment Application No. ZON-1171 [604895 BC Ltd./Arsenault, G.; 70 and 210 11 Street SE; R-1 to R-4] - continued

responsible for any and all off-site improvements recommended by the TIA; and

- iv) No Subdivision or Development Permit approval until a suitable area and location of land (minimum 5% of the gross area of the subject properties) are secured by the City either by dedication or Statutory Right of Way for a Greenway/Trail linkage from Trail Plan KAP53467 to 11 Street SE and a portion of a future Neighbourhood Park.

G. Arsenault, the applicant, outlined the application and was available to answer questions from the Committee.

Councillor Eliason left the meeting at 8:55 a.m.

M. Gardner, Vancouver Resource Society and G. Out, International Seniors Care Inc., provided an overview of their respective organizations and outlined the application. M. Gardner and G. Out were available to answer questions from the Committee.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. PRESENTATIONS7. FOR INFORMATION1. Agricultural Land Commission - letter dated June 3, 2020 - Application 58273 - Resolution #252/2020 - Smith, R.

Received for information.

8. IN CAMERA9. LATE ITEMS

10. ADJOURNMENT

Moved: Councillor Lavery

Seconded: Councillor Wallace Richmond

THAT: the Development and Planning Services Committee meeting of June 15, 2020, be adjourned.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting adjourned at 9:28 a.m.

Mayor Alan Harrison
Chair

Minutes received as information by Council
at their Regular Meeting of _____, 2020.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 7.2

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor

Seconded: Councillor

THAT: the Downtown Parking Commission Meeting Minutes of June 16, 2020, be received as information.

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Minutes of the **Downtown Parking Commission Meeting** held by electronic means on **Tuesday, June 16, 2020.**

PRESENT:

Chad Eliason	Councillor, City of Salmon Arm
Regan Ready	Member at Large
Bill Laird	Member at Large
Vic Hamilton	Member at Large
Cathy Ingebrigston	Member at Large
Jacquie Gaudreau	Downtown Salmon Arm Representative, Chair
June Stewart	Downtown Salmon Arm Representative
Linda Thompson	Downtown Salmon Arm Representative
Rob Niewenhuizen	Resource Personnel, Director of Engineering & Public Works
Jenn Wilson	Resource Personnel, City Engineer
Kevin Pearson	
Marcel Bedard	Resource Personnel, Bylaw Officer

ABSENT:

Gerald Foreman	Downtown Salmon Arm Representative
----------------	------------------------------------

GUEST:

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. by Chairperson Jacqui Gaudreau.

1. **INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME**

2. **PRESENTATIONS**

3. **APPROVAL / CHANGES / ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

Moved: Regan Ready
 Seconded: Vic Hamilton
 THAT: the Downtown Parking Commission Meeting Agenda of June 16, 2020 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2020

Moved: Chad Eliason

Seconded: Regan Ready

THAT: the Downtown Parking Commission Meeting Minutes of February 25, 2020 be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. OLD BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

None

6. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Ticket Machine Vandalism at Hudson Street Lot, Inner Core & 2nd Avenue SE

Moved: Chad Eliason

Seconded: Regan Ready

THAT: the Downtown Parking Commission recommend to Council that provisions be made to allow parking payments to the City by credit card, phone and/or Interac payment.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- b. Parking Plan Update – Survey has been suspended due to COVID-19
The Parking Plan Survey will be distributed as soon as businesses in the downtown area have been re-opened.

- c. Ross Street Underpass/Parkade deferral (5 years)
Additional funding required for the Ross Street Underpass was discussed. Rob Niewenhuizen explained how the additional funding will be accomplished using the General Revenue funds (approx. \$1,587,000.00) from the proposed Downtown Parkade to assist in completing the Underpass project. This will leave the parking reserve fund, which is coming from the downtown parking levy at approx. \$1,719,000.00. This will result in a delay of the parkade project by five years in the City's long term financial plan.

- d. Extending Downtown parking to 2 Hour (Assist with Economic Recovery of Downtown)

Moved: Vic Hamilton

Seconded: June Stewart

THAT: the Downtown Parking Commission recommend to Council that 2 hour parking be established in the downtown area with the exception of Alexander Street NE from the TCH to Lakeshore Drive NE, which would remain at 1 hour parking.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. OTHER BUSINESS

8. NEXT MEETING - Tuesday, July 21, 2020

The next meeting of the Downtown Parking Commission will be Tuesday, July 21, 2020. Chairperson will be Jacqueline Gaudreau.

9. ADJOURNMENT


Moved: Cathy Ingebrigston

Seconded: Vic Hamilton

THAT: the Downtown Parking Commission Meeting of June 16, 2020 be adjourned.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 a.m.



Marcel Bedard
Bylaw Officer

Minutes received as information by Council
at their Regular Meeting of _____, 2020.

CITY OF
SALMON ARM

File: 8620.02

TO: His Worship Mayor Harrison and Members of Council

FROM: Kevin Pearson, Director of Development Services

PREPARED BY: Maurice Roy, Manager of Permits and Licensing

DATE: February 27, 2020

SUBJECT: **Downtown Parking Pay Stations – Budget Amendment and Award**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT: The 2020 Budget contained within the 2019-2023 Financial Plan Bylaw be amended to reflect the transfer of \$40,000 from the General Parking Reserve to fund:

1. the purchase of three (3) "Pay by Plate" parking pay stations,
2. the installation of the three (3) parking pay stations, and
3. the purchase of one (1) "tablet" to read the stations.

AND THAT: Council approve the award for the purchase of the three (3) new parking pay stations, as listed in item 1. above, to Mackay Meters for the quoted price of \$21,364 including taxes.

Background

Near the end of August 2019 vandalism of street parking meters commenced, continued on a large scale through the autumn and continued into 2020. By the last estimate over 100 coin operated parking meters have been damaged beyond repair. The material replacement cost of 100 meters of the same type is approximately \$38,000.

To hopefully avoid similar vandalism in the future, other options have been explored such as large central ticket dispensers to serve multiple parking spaces. One such unit is already in use and serves the south side of Hudson Avenue NE between 4th and 6th Streets. The supplier of that machine was contacted to obtain a quote for additional machines but the City has been informed that "Pay by Plate" machines with more up to date features such as credit card, smart card or cell phone compatibility are basically the same price and more readily available.

Since the City would prefer to move away from the old fashioned, coin operated, meter-per-stall format, it seems the "Multi-Space Pay by Plate" machine is a sensible option for this present purpose and also to augment a broader smart metering program.

The proposal is to obtain three (3) Multi-Space Pay by Plate machines designed for future conversions to accommodate payment by credit card, smart card and cell phone. Quotes have been obtained for the purchase of these units and are attached as Appendices A, B and C. Additional funds beyond the purchase of the pay stations will be required for installation labour costs with the works being performed by City forces. The bylaw officer will also require a tablet or similar hand held device to display the registered licence plates on street patrols.

The location of the machines would be on the south side of Hudson Avenue NE in front of the post office, on the north side of Hudson Avenue NE serving the 400 to 600 block and on the south side of Hudson Avenue NE serving the 400 to 600 block. The ticket machine currently on the south side of Hudson Avenue NE serving the 400 to 600 block will be relocated to the north side of 2nd Avenue NE in front of City Hall. Map is attached as Appendix D.

An insurance claim was initiated this year to recoup some costs. At first, the deductible fee (\$10,000) had to be applied to each "individual occurrence", and later a cluster of occurrences would have been deemed suitable to the insurer. Neither claim option was deemed to be financially prudent by staff as there were far more than four clusters of occurrences.

The capital budgets for 2020 have already been established and there are no provisions for this type of unexpected burden. As no other funding in the amount of \$40,000 is readily available (other than \$25,000 in the Smart Meter Reserve – see below), the DPC and staff recommend that funding for the purchase and installation of 3 new Multi-Space pay stations be allocated from the General Parking Reserve with an estimated balance of \$1,379,744 as of Dec 31, 2019. The General Parking Reserve is intended for the future *4th Street Parkade* as outlined in the City's Corporate Strategic Plan. The last estimate from 2011 has a \$7.5 million project cost for the Parkade with construction starting in 2022. The City's long-term debt strategy attempts to balance the parkade costs and other major projects with a zero tax increase. The use of \$40,000 from this reserve may slightly erode this long-term plan somewhat (Analysis 1 is attached).

Council approved \$25,000 in the 2020 Budget for a new Smart Parking Meter Reserve. Smart metering was discussed in a staff memo to Council dated September 17, 2018, which included options for single and multi-spaced technology. The costs to implement a Smart Metering Strategy throughout the downtown parking area would be well over \$300,000 (based on a rough cost per unit and not including maintenance and technological upgrades to the City's financial software to handle smart phone and credit/debit card payments). The DPC was recommending a \$100,000 reserve allocation in 2019 for this purpose. Due to the limited amount within staff Smart Meter Parking Reserve, staff is recommending this reserve not be used.

Conclusion

The City's Downtown Parking Commission were advised of the parking meter vandalism and at their December 17, 2019 meeting a motion was approved to support the staff recommendation with the funds to be taken from the General Parking Reserve. The most favourable of the quotes recommended by staff is attached as Appendix A.



 Kevin Pearson, MCIP, RPP
 Director of Development Services

DOWNTOWN PARKING - USER SATISFACTION SURVEY

[INSERT LOGO]

Tell us how the current downtown parking system is working for you and you will be entered for a **chance to win a [PRIZE]!** Entries must be received by [MONTH] [DAY], 2020.

This survey can be completed at [www.salmonarm.ca/\[TBD\]](http://www.salmonarm.ca/[TBD]), or fill out this form and submit to City Hall:


- In person to 500 - 2 Ave NE, Salmon Arm BC
- By mail (Box 40, 500 - 2 Ave NE, Salmon Arm BC, V1E 2N4)
- By email to info@salmonarm.ca

Your information will only be used to contact you if you are the draw winner. You may choose to complete the survey anonymously; however, you will not be entered in the prize draw. All personal information will be kept confidential.

Name: _____ City of Residence: _____

Phone Number: _____ E-mail (Optional): _____

Downtown Parking Area (please only consider the highlighted area when considering the following questions)



In relation to the Downtown Parking Area, I am a(n): (Select all that apply)

- Employee
- Resident
- Business Owner
- Visitor

My main mode of transportation to Downtown Salmon Arm is:

- Vehicle
- Walking
- Transit
- Other: _____
- Bicycle

I typically visit Downtown during the following times (Select all that apply):

- Business hours (Mon-Fri 8am - 5pm)
- Weekday Evenings
- Weekend

How often do you visit the Downtown for the following?:

	3+ days per week	1-2 days per week	a few times a month	Rarely/Never
Restaurants/Café's	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shopping/Retail	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beauty Services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Health Services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Banking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Recreation/Events	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visiting Residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

When visiting the Downtown as a "Customer" how long do you typically park during business hours (Mon-Fri 8AM-5PM)

- Less than 30 min
- 30 min - 1 hour
- 1-2 hours
- Over 2 hours

What type of parking do you typically use when visiting Downtown Salmon Arm?

- On-Street Parking
- Public Parking Lot
- Private Parking Lot
- Permit Parking
- Don't Know

Please continue the survey on the reverse side.

In general I have been able to find parking that suits my needs when visiting Downtown Salmon Arm:

- Always
 Often
 Sometimes
 Rarely
 Never

The maximum time that I would walk from my parking spot to my destination would be:

- Less than 1 minute
 1-3 minutes
 4-5 minutes
 More than 5 minutes

If parking fees are implemented I would find it acceptable to pay up to:

- \$0/hr
 \$0.25/hr
 \$0.50/hr
 \$0.75/hr
 greater than \$0.75/hr

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about parking in Downtown Salmon Arm

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The directional signage to public parking facilities (off-street parking) is clear and easy to follow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is sufficient parking in Downtown Salmon Arm.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I generally find parking within acceptable proximity to my destination.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The parking time limits are visible, clear and easy to understand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking time limit options are flexible enough to meet my various needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking time limits are long enough to meet my various needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking time limits should be constant for all on-street parking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Smart Parking Meters (pay by license plate, pay by phone) would be beneficial.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking Enforcement should be enhanced.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking Fees should be implemented for on-street parking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking Fees should be implemented for off-street public parking lots.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Downtown has sufficient accessible parking locations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Downtown has sufficient bicycle parking facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Where parking fees are implemented, they should be stepped (eg. first hour free, \$0.50 for second hour, \$1 for third hour).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Additional Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Your feedback will help us assess parking needs for Downtown Salmon Arm and will be factored into recommendations for improvement in the 2020 Downtown Parking Plan.



City of Salmon Arm

Development Services Department Memorandum

TO: Downtown Parking Commission
FROM: Director of Development Services
DATE: September 17, 2018
SUBJECT: Parking Enforcement Technologies

Background

The City's Bylaw Enforcement staff was asked to report to the DPC on emerging parking meter technologies such as smart parking meters, both single space and multiple space. Modern parking meters and devices used in various municipalities were researched (Vernon, Nelson and Lethbridge).

The modern equipment offers convenience to the public with the ability to pay by credit / debit cards and Smartphone apps, which can allow a customer to top up payments remotely.

The modern equipment can streamline the monitoring, administration and enforcement of parking control with web-based / remote tracking control both in the field and from City Hall.

The modern equipment is expensive relative to the meters and various machines now operating in the downtown of Salmon Arm.

Multi-Space Metering

Staff received a quote from one of its suppliers for a new, multi-space ticket dispenser similar to the machines located in the Hudson Lot, Inner Core Lot and Hudson Ave. NE The modern machines (example below) are equipped for solar power, credit card payments, the options of Pay and Display or "Pay by Plate" and, for an extra cost, "expandable for Apple, Android and Debit payments". Model "MacKay Tango" specifications are attached. The base model is priced at \$7,900 + tax. Shipping, installation, warranty, central software and peripheral equipment, tech. support and training costs are not included vary.



Parking Meter Technologies

Single Space Metering

Smart, single-space parking meters with similar technology (example attached) could cost in excess of \$2,500 / meter, including capital, operating and maintenance over a 10 year time frame. Equipment costs alone amount to approximately \$1,000 / meter. There are approximately 50 traditional coin operated parking meters installed throughout downtown Salmon Arm, and just over 900 parking spaces.



Considerations for a New System

1. There would need to be "buy in" by the City's senior management and direction by Council to set up short, medium and long term funding for a new system. Council may consider a recommendation by the DPC for a new system; however, a more detailed study and cost / benefit analysis (conducted by an expert consultant) could be required before any decision is pondered.
2. Although the City could consider a relatively small pilot project to start out, Salmon Arm's meter rates and fines are very low relative to other communities – rates and fines would need to increase substantially to justify an expenditure on more technologically advanced equipment.
3. The City's Bylaw Enforcement staff would be tasked to champion, implement and manage a new system, and to coordinate the system with other City departments. The present ability and capacity of Bylaw Enforcement staff is limited in this regard. With help from IT staff, various other departments in City Hall would need to adjust and tie into the new technology, such as the Finance Dept. with its Vadim system.
4. Even with new technology, new systems can operate at loss. The City of Nelson, for example, employs 5 parking enforcement officers for its population 10,500, and they monitor approximately 750 parking spaces mostly equipped with modern metres. Nelson committed to a \$1 million parking meter replacement program from 2017 - 2019. While that community takes in nearly \$480,000 annually in meter and fine revenues (more than 10 times relative to Salmon Arm), it loses more than that because of its "First Hour Free" policy. The parking rates of \$1.25 / hour, \$5 / day, \$75 / month they charge is not enough to cover their meter or operating costs.

Sincerely,


 Kevin Pearson, MCIP, RPP
 Director of Development Services

cc

R. Niewenhuizen, Director of Engineering and Public Works
 Maurice Roy, Manger of Permits and Licencing
 Marcel Bedard, Bylaw Enforcement Officer
 Mayor and Council

Mackay TANGO™



Mackay TANGO™



Key features:

- High strength stainless steel keeps it secure and rust free.
- Flexible, modular design that is easy to upgrade, service and maintain.
- Powerful off-site monitoring capabilities by adding a communications kit and Sentinel™ Meter Management System. Monitor your equipment remotely, generate reports, and receive alerts, no matter where you are.
- Comprehensive and easy-to-use configuration menus.
- ADA Compliant.
- Features a large Liquid Crystal Display with back light, capable of displaying graphics.
- English? Español? Français? The multi-language capability allows users to select the language of their choice to carry out transactions.
- Optional credit card payment. Offer end users security, convenience, and reject fraudulent payment. Use Mackay's On-line Real-time Credit Card Approval feature utilizing secure PCI compliant electronic payment processes.
- Mackay Meters backs its product lines with a solid warranty based on the confidence in the quality of its products.

<over for specifications>

www.mackaymeters.com



Mackay TANGO™



Side View

SPECIFICATIONS

GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS

Environmental

- Extended operating temperature range¹: -20°C (-4°F) to +50°C (+122°F)
- Humidity: Up to 95% RH (non condensing)

Cabinet Materials, Dimensions & Weight

- Welded reinforced Grade 304-2B stainless steel (9 gauge carbon steel equivalence)² for cabinet and doors
- Aluminum front with Lexan® display covers for the LCD screens, rate/instruction plate, LED panel and site branding display
- Overall dimensions: 1359 mm (53.5 inches) (H) x 315 mm (12.4 inches) (W) x 349mm (13.75 inches) (D)

Power Supply Configurations/Options

- Solar powered with commercially available battery

Communication Options

- Cellular wireless technology supporting GPRS or CDMA modem³

Payment Systems

- Coins
- Tokens (optional)
- Credit cards utilizing secure, on-line real-time PCI compliant processes (optional)
- Mackay Smart (Chip) Cards (optional)
- Cell phone payment (optional)

Ticket Printing

- Thermal printer offers alphanumeric printing in various fonts and languages

COMPONENTS

Display

- High contrast, color, sunlight readable, 320 x 240 pixels graphics LCD
- Viewing area 114mm (4.5 inches) x 89mm (3.5 inches)

Coin Acceptor

- Programmable: Accepts up to 16 coins or tokens
- 3-coil design provides accurate coin reads and long life.
- Straight drop coin chute allows for superior detection and removal of foreign objects.
- High security, stainless steel coin box that holds 4.2 L or approximately 2400 US quarters.

Card Reader (Optional)

- Single slot, dual mode card reader captures magnetic stripe (ISO 7810/11) credit card data, and provides an ISO 7816 interface for smart card acceptance
- EMV upgradeable

Keypads & Buttons

- Alphanumeric keypad
- Vandal resistant and rated for resistance to impact, shock and vibration to MIL standards
- Sealed against ingress of water and dust to IP67, and designed for exposed outdoor and extreme environmental conditions
- LED accept and cancel buttons that light up.

Printer

- Heavy-duty printer head with minimal moving parts ensuring quality, reliability and endurance
- Print life of over 20 million character lines
- Designed for high-resolution printing
- Gullotline type cutter with full or partial paper cutting options (software selectable)
- Accessible for ease of maintenance

FEATURES

Security

- High security locks for cash box, cash vault, and main door
- System monitored access sensors on main and vault doors and sensor detecting presence of cash box

Audit and Statistic

- Remote monitoring of grand totals and subtotals for coins and card transactions per type
- Full or quick audit tickets are software selectable

Maintenance

- User-friendly graphic interface tools for diagnostics, configuration and editing
- Easy access modular design

Web-Based Hosted Sentinel™ Meter Management System

- Remotely monitor and generate audit, transaction and occupancy reports for all on-street equipment using a web browser and secure web portal
- Generates a variety of reports including grand totals and subtotals for coins, bills and card transactions per type, which can be exported as PDF or CSV files, or imported into other applications

Warranty

J.J. MacKay Canada Limited, the manufacturer, guarantees for a period of one year from the date of shipment against defects in workmanship and/or materials.

As our policy is one of continuous product improvement and development, we reserve the right to alter product specification and design.

Photos are representative; product appearance may differ.



95LT0000700TANGO-v3-6/16

Copyright © 2016 J.J. MacKay Canada Limited. All rights reserved. The Mackay Logo, MacKay TANGO and Sentinel are either trademarks or registered trademarks of J.J. MacKay Canada Limited in Canada and other countries. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners. J.J. MacKay Canada Limited reserves the right to modify the specifications without prior notice.

Head Office:

J.J. MacKay Canada Limited
1342 Abercrombie Road, PO Box 338,
New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, Canada B2H 5E3
Head Office customer support and technical support:
Toll free in North America: 1-888-4MACKAY (462-2529)
Fax (902) 752-4889
Email customer.service@mackaymeters.com
Web www.mackaymeters.com

Phone (902) 752-5124
Fax (902) 752-5955

Sales Office:



Item 9.1

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor

Seconded: Councillor

THAT: Council authorize submission of a grant application under the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Municipal Asset Management Program (MAMP), for the Shuswap Regional Airport Runway 14-32 Paving Project, Establishing Salmon Arm's Asset Management Program project estimated to cost \$50,000.00 plus taxes.

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
 - Carried
 - Defeated
 - Defeated Unanimously
- Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond



File: 2020-99

TO: His Worship Mayor Harrison and Members of Council

FROM: Robert Niewenhuizen, Director of Engineering and Public Works

PREPARED BY: Jenn Wilson, City Engineer

DATE: June 12, 2020

SUBJECT: **MUNICIPAL ASSET MANAGEMENT PROGRAM GRANT
ESTABLISHING SALMON ARM'S ASSET MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT: Council authorize submission of a grant application under the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Municipal Asset Management Program (MAMP), for the Shuswap Regional Airport Runway 14-32 Paving Project, Establishing Salmon Arm's Asset Management Program project estimated cost \$ 50,000 plus taxes.

BACKGROUND

FCM is offering grants to help municipalities strengthen their asset management practices in order to maximize the use of every infrastructure dollar.

The MAMP grant can fund up to 80% of eligible project costs for municipalities our size (up to a maximum total project amount of \$50,000) for a broad range of projects related to building asset management practices. There is currently no deadline of the 2020 application intake. All applications for funding require a resolution of Council supporting the application.

The City has been building our asset management practices in an informal manner over the last few years and has successfully completed two draft Asset Management Plans (sewer, water), trained several employees on asset management practices and has begun mapping out an overall strategy. However, due to workload, staff have not been able to dedicate the focused time required to formalize the processes.

The Asset Management Team has mapped the City's progress using the FCM Asset Management Readiness Scale assessment tool and reviewed the next steps required to advance the City's Asset Management Practices. The next crucial steps are to enact an Asset Management Policy, Strategy and 5-year Road Map document to give a framework and clear direction to the program.

The City has been working with IC Infrastructure out of Kelowna to put together a work plan for the grant application. IC infrastructure specializes in Asset Management and is a trusted partner of FCM, from training to being lead author on their Asset Management publications.


IC Infrastructure has put together a work program to maximize the City's AM progress within the limits of the grant which includes:

- Awareness Building and Training
 - o Training: (1-day for AM Staff, ½ day for Management and Council);
 - o AM Assessment (1/2 day Current State and ½ day Future State);
- Develop AM Policy, Strategy, Roadmap
 - o Develop and sign-off of AM Policy
 - o Develop and sign-off of AM Strategy
 - o Develop and sign-off of AM Roadmap
- Data and System Investigation
 - o Current State Assessment
 - o Industry Scan
 - o Outline of requirements spec (for purpose of RFP)

The City's funding share for this project would come from a combination of the water, sewer and transportation Asset Management fund (\$10,000, \$10,000 and \$15,000 respectively).

Staff request that Council authorize submission of a grant application under the FCM MAMP for the Establishing Salmon Arm's Asset Management Program project, estimated cost \$ 50,000 plus taxes.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Niewenhuizen, AScT
Director of Engineering and Public Works

cc Tracy Tulak, CFO

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 10.1

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor

Seconded: Councillor

THAT: the bylaw entitled City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4378 be read a first and second time;

AND THAT: the Public Hearing, be held at the Salmon Arm Recreation Centre on July 13, 2020;

AND THAT FURTHER THAT: Final Reading of the Bylaw be withheld subject to:

- 1) Approval by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure;
- 2) Registration of Section 219 Land Title Act Covenants addressing the following:
 - i. Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulations, including the protection of a 30 m Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area;
 - ii. Approximately 1,733 m² of land for a City Road Reserve over the portion of Lot 1 shown on Plan B4487 consistent with the of 4 Avenue SE Advanced Street Plan prepared by Lawson Engineering (Drawing 11-45 - Dated December 12, 2019) - FURTHER TO THAT, the applicant be compensated by the City in the amount of \$35,000 for the Road Reserve;
 - iii. No Subdivision or Development Permit approval until a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is provided to the satisfaction of the City Engineer with acknowledgement that the owner/applicant is responsible for any and all off-site improvements recommended by the TIA; and
 - iv. No Subdivision or Development Permit approval until a suitable area and location of land (minimum 5% of the gross area of the subject properties) are secured by the City either by dedication or Statutory Right of Way for a Greenway/Trail linkage from Trail Plan KAP53467 to 11 Street SE and a portion of a future Neighbourhood Park.

[ZON-1171; 11604895 BC Ltd./ G. Arsenault; 70 & 210 11 Street SE; R1/R4 to R4]]

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

CITY OF
SALMON ARM

To: His Worship Mayor Harrison and Members of Council

Date: June 10, 2020

Subject: Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application No. 1171

Legal: Lot 1, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 54150 and That Part of Lot 1 shown on Plan B4487, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 1521

Civic: 70 and 210 11 Street SE

Owner: 604895 BC Ltd. Applicant: Gary Arsenault

MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION

THAT: A Bylaw be prepared for Council's consideration, adoption of which would amend City of Salmon Arm Zoning Bylaw No. 2303 as follows:

- 1) Rezone that 5,140 m² portion of Lot 1, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan KAP54150 shown on Schedule A from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R4 (Medium Density Residential);
- 2) Rezone that part of Lot 1 shown on Plan B4487, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 1521 from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R4 (Medium Density Residential);

AND THAT: The Public Hearing, date yet to be determined, be held at the Salmon Arm Recreation Centre;

AND THAT FURTHER THAT: Final Reading of the Bylaw be withheld subject to:

- 1) Approval by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure;
- 2) Registration of Section 219 Land Title Act Covenants addressing the following:
 - I Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulation, including establishment of a 30 m Streamside Protection and Enhancement Area;
 - II Approximately 1,733 m² of land for a City Road Reserve over the portion of Lot 1 shown on Plan B4487 consistent with the of 4 Avenue SE Advanced Street Plan prepared by Lawson Engineering (Drawing 11-45 - Dated December 12, 2019) - FURTHER TO THAT, the applicant be compensated by the City in the amount of \$35,000 for the Road Reserve;
 - III No Subdivision or Development Permit approval until a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is provided to the satisfaction of the City Engineer with acknowledgement that the owner/applicant is responsible for any and all off-site improvements recommended by the TIA; and
 - IV No Subdivision or Development Permit approval until a suitable area and location of land (minimum 5% of the gross area of the subject properties) are secured by the City either by dedication or Statutory Right of Way for a Greenway/Trail linkage from Trail Plan KAP53467 to 11 Street SE and a portion of a future Neighbourhood Park.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Motion for Consideration be approved.

BACKGROUND

The subject parcels are located at 70 - 11 Street SE (Parcel A) and 210 - 11 Street SE (Parcel B) just south of Okanagan Avenue - Appendix 1 and 2. The parcels have a combined total area of 3.9 hectares and are designated "High Density Residential" Future Land Use Category in the City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4000 (OCP) - Appendix 3. Parcel A is currently split-zoned R-1 and R-4, while Parcel B is entirely zoned R-1 at the present time - Appendix 4.

The application under review is to rezone both parcels to R-4 to facilitate a multi-family residential development of various building forms and likely some kind of phased, strata subdivision involved. A conceptual development plan received May 27, 2020 is attached as Appendix 5. R-4 Zoning regulations are attached as Appendix 6 and site photos are attached as Appendix 7.

The concept plan demonstrates potential for approximately 120 multiple family residential units. According to the applicant, no building height would exceed three stories. The density proposed is approximately 30 units per hectare, which is less than the R-4 density ceiling of 40 units per hectare. No density bonus is required for a development plan < 157. As discussed further on, the OCP Land Use designation of the lands supports High Density Residential (R-5) zoning.

A number of units may meet the new *assisted living housing* definition of the Zoning Bylaw, which is a recently added use to the R-4 zone. This use may include daily meal preparation with a common commercial kitchen and central dining area along with cleaning or laundry services. Health services may also be provided including home support, rehabilitative services and transportation services. Those activities along with onsite recreation facilities would be deemed as *accessory uses* to the development.

Consolidation of the subject parcels is required to support the proposed density of residential units. If rezoned, subdivision and development would be subject to the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw No. 4163, while stratification (a form of subdivision) would be subject to the Strata Property Act / Regulations and most likely require security bonding for common amenities/facilities. The financial bonding required needs to be determined by an independent and registered Quantity Surveyor, with basically the funds held by the City until the facilities are completed. For clarification, common amenities in a strata development are not normally intended as public amenities for the use by citizens outside the strata. Furthermore, these matters of subdivision/stratification are not conditions for rezoning.

Several applications and initiatives have been made involving the subject parcels over the past 20 years. In 2003, a similar application to rezone the properties to R-4 was defeated at Third Reading after the Public Hearing. An important document from that application is the 2003 Traffic Report / Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) that was provided by the same owner as today; the development plan back then contemplated a 44 unit, medium density residential development - the former TIA is attached as Appendix 8.

In 2009 the City commissioned a report by a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) who determined that the unnamed watercourse (the "Creek") is subject to the Provincial Riparian Areas Regulation and therefore also subject to the City's Environmental Policies of the OCP. That report - attached as Appendix 9 - was not filed with the Province because there was no development plan to trigger that. Nevertheless, the QEP's assessment that the Creek is subject to Provincial riparian regulations is still valid.

In 2018 a subdivision application was made by Franklin Engineering Ltd. on behalf of the owner to create 28 bareland strata lots (i.e. single family lots within a strata with R-1 zoning) involving both properties. That application expired. That applicant was unable to provide the necessary documentation required by the Approving Officer to address the local traffic concerns or the Provincial requirements for a Creek alteration plan (i.e. essentially altering the Creek to a piped system). While one branch of the Ministry of Environment (Forest, Lands and Natural Resource Operations) initially approved in principle the Creek alteration plan, that approval was later rescinded in March 2017 when it was learned that the Creek is subject to its own riparian regulation. The last letters on this matter from FLNRO staff are attached as Appendix 10.

City staff do not object to a Creek alteration plan if it is approved by the Province. The potential benefits to storm water management, the natural barrier the Creek presents to a higher density development, the need for a new street (4 Avenue to 3 Avenue connector) and a pedestrian plan involving the Parcel B are the basic reasons for this support. Staff are also certainly cognizant that many in the local community support the Creek and the subject properties remaining in their present natural state. This has been a historical conundrum for new development on these lands and others throughout the City.

SITE / CONTEXT

Development is also challenged by a number of physical factors along with some of the aforementioned planning, policy and regulatory considerations. More than 50% of the properties combined gross area (3.9 hectares) can be discounted due to the Creek in its present alignment and challenging terrain. This would leave a net developable area of approximately 2.0 hectares or less. The map attached as Appendix 11 is intended to show the major limitations to development caused by:

- The Creek (10 m wide SPEA assumed)*	6,000 m ²
- Steep Slopes	7,500 m ²
- Road Reserve and Setbacks	2,700 m ²
- Public Greenspace Preservation and Trail**	3,000 m ² +

* The riparian assessment, "streamside protection and enhancement area" (or "SPEA") is actually measured as a 30 m horizontal width off each bank or "High Water Mark" of the Creek as a starting point under the old RAR and new RAPR. The 10 m SPEA assumption in the analysis above (and on the attached map) considers that a QEP may reduce that width to 10 m which is quite a common reduction for a creek of this magnitude. Turner Creek has a SPEA of 7.5 m. As discussed more on the next page, the applicant has agreed to Covenant the land with a 30 m SPEA off each side of the Creek as a condition for rezoning.

** The applicant is further willing to allocate > 8% of the gross land area to greenspace preservation and a public trail connection with a restrictive Covenant, which is 3% over and above the statutory requirement for parkland dedication at the time of subdivision.

The Creek stems from both open channelled and underground water sources comprising a broader micro watershed to the southeast. The system has served as an important pre and post development upland drainage corridor. Mature trees encompass much of the eastern sloped portions of both lots.

From a development perspective, the surrounding properties are designated "High Density Residential" in the OCP, yet the built landscape is comprised mainly of long established, R-1 zoned parcels containing single family dwellings. There are some medium density (R-4) and residential suite (R-8) zoned properties in the area and a notable absence of High Density (R-5) zoned land. Land uses and zoning adjacent to the subject property include the following:

- North: Okanagan Avenue / Single-Family (R-1) parcels
- South: Single-Family Residential (R-1) parcels
- East: Dedicated pedestrian trail - 3.0 m wide (Plan KAP 53467) and Bayview townhouse development (R-4)
- West: 11 Street SE / Single-Family Residential (R-1) parcels

OCP POLICIES

Land Use

The subject parcels are located within the heart of the Urban Containment Boundary and Residential Development Area A; considered to be a top priority for urban residential development and City investment in infrastructure.

With the subject parcels are designated "High Density Residential" in the OCP, the proposed R-4 density of 30 units per hectare is significantly lower than the 100 units per hectare supported by the OCP if zoned R-5. That being said, R-4 zoning may be a 'better fit' for development over the short term given the predominant single family context of the local neighbourhood.

Residential - Development Permit Area

Pursuant to Section 8.4 of the OCP, actual development of the land will require Council's review of a "Form and Character" Development Permit application. Such applications address site planning, landscape planting, tree / vegetation retention and building design. The "Residential Development Permit Area Guidelines" of the OCP are applicable for a multiple family development proposal on the subject properties.

As mentioned, the attached development plan is not under review for Council's approval. It has been provided by the applicant as a baseline concept to demonstrate how the land could potentially be developed. The applicant has been encouraged to hire an architect familiar with the applicable guidelines to prepare the Development Permit drawings. Public notification and a Hearing are part of the Development Permit application process.

Environmentally Sensitive Riparian Areas - Development Permit Area

To address the Creek in the context of the RAPR, Section 5.4 of the OCP identifies the subject parcels as designated "Environmentally Sensitive Riparian Areas (ESRA) Development Permit Area". No development, including the removal or alternation of soil or trees/vegetation, can occur until either an ESRA Development Permit is approved by Council, or alternatively a Development Permit Waiver is approved by the undersigned (i.e. without review by City Council). The conditions for approval of an ESRA Development Permit Waiver are usually satisfied with either of the following options:

- 1) The owner registers a Section 219 Land Title Act Covenant stipulating a 30 m wide streamside protection and enhancement area (SPEA) on either side of the watercourse, thereby in effect meeting the Provincial Riparian Areas Protection Regulation; or
- 2) A Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) determines a lesser SPEA in an RAPR Assessment Report, approved by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy, with that lesser stipulated on a Covenant.

As a condition for adoption of the rezoning Bylaw (Item: 2) I in the Motion for Consideration), the applicant has agreed to address RAPR and City policy with Option 1) above. As the applicant is ultimately proposing a complex creek diversion for development, the following is therefore required, not as a condition for rezoning but prior to development:

- 1) Approval by Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development in accordance with 39 (1) of the Water Sustainability Act will be required including a submission of recorded ecosystem data, and possibly a hydrological study involving the broader watershed;
- 2) Approval or concurrence of some kind by Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy approval as the watercourse is subject to the RAPR;
- 3) Engineering Department approval of the related storm water management plan; and
- 4) Approval City Council of an ESRA Development Permit.

A work plan prepared by a QEP (Arsenault Environmental Consulting Ltd.) dated January 21, 2020 is attached as Appendix 12. Justification of the Creek's re-alignment will require FLNRO's "Water Management Decision" approval, the conclusion of which is to determine if the project would result in harm to, net loss or gain in environmental value. Should rezoning be approved, the applicant is prepared to address the above in an ESRA Development Permit application to City Council which would involve a Hearing and public notification.

Potentially Hazardous Areas - Development Permit Area

To address the steep terrain on the subject parcels (i.e. slopes > 30%), Section 6.4 of the OCP identifies the subject parcels as designated "Potential Hazardous Areas (PHA) Development Permit Area". No development, including the removal or alternation of soil or vegetation, can occur until either a PHA Development Permit is approved by Council, or alternatively a Development Permit Waiver is approved by the undersigned.

The conditions for a PHA Development Permit Waiver approval are typically met with a geotechnical report prepared by a registered professional and the report ascertaining the safe intended use of the development site. For the subject properties, a "Category C" Landslide Assessment report will be required to address, among other things, safe build zones, where trees and vegetation should be retained, and any measures required to prevent land slippage. In addition, the Waiver approval requires the registration of a Section 219 Land Title Act Covenant saving the City Harmless from any related claims and liability.

City staff is comfortable with a Development Permit Waiver application to address the steep slopes without the need for a PHA Development Permit application to City Council. However, if the applicant chooses, and/or Council requests, the geotechnical report could be presented to Council and the public concurrently with the Development Permit applications for Residential Form and Character and ESRA.

Tree / vegetation removal cannot occur on the subject properties unless either exempted by the Tree Removal Bylaw, or if a Servicing Agreement between the City and developer is signed and executed. The Servicing Agreement will not be drafted by staff until such time as a geotechnical report is complete and the various Development Permits and Waivers are approved. For the exemption, the Bylaw permits a limited amount (5%) of trees to be cleared annually, not including trees or vegetation within the SPEA or on steep slopes. Trees < 31.5 cm in circumference are also exempt.

Parks and Greenways

Map 11.1 of the OCP identifies a future Neighbourhood Park generally somewhere on Parcel B and on adjacent lands to the south. This along with a Proposed Greenway identified on Map 11.2 of the OCP are shown clearer on the map attached as Appendix 11. Actual parkland and trail dedication, up a maximum of 5% of a lot area, may only occur at the subdivision stage pursuant to the Local Government Act.

However, because the OCP's Neighbourhood Park designation affects other lands to the south, the 5% allocation could and should be split over three lots. At this rezoning stage, the applicant is agreeable to the idea of dedicating > 5% of the subject parcels to greenspace and a trail connection at the subdivision or development stages.

The general idea for greenspace preservation at this stage includes a 10 m wide swath of land dedicated (or secured by a Statutory Right of Way in favour of the City) off the existing trail (Plan KAP53467) that traverses off the eastern boundary of the subject parcels, and same for a public trail connection from the existing trail to 11 Street, which would include a segment of a future sidewalk along the proposed 4 Avenue to 3 Avenue Road Reserve. For all intents and purposes, a 10 m wide greenspace buffer adjacent to the existing dedicate trail would preserve the trees and vegetation along that embankment, which likely has limited development potential anyways.

The above is only in a conceptual stage of planning at this point, yet the applicant has committed in principle to address this matter with a covenant (item: 2) IV in the Motion for Consideration). With a Form and Character Development Permit application and the drawings that would go with that, the details of parkland dedication, greenspace preservation and trail alignments can addressed more precisely.

TRAFFIC AND STREET PLANS

Traffic Impact Analysis

The 2003 Hamilton Associates Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is attached as Appendix 8. As mentioned, that report was intended for a 44 unit, R-4 zoned development. The main finding of that report is that the intersection at 11 Street SE and Okanagan Avenue was unsafe in regards to site lines, grades, traffic stacking and movements off and on to the avenue.

Since then, the population of Salmon Arm has grown by approximately 5,000 along with a corresponding traffic increase. During that time span of 17 years, there were several requests by the owner to have the City budget for improvements to the intersection which would involve a detailed design, extensive grading to physically lowering the road and utilities, and most likely property acquisition.

The applicant did commission a minor traffic report for this application which provides an updated traffic count (attached as Appendix 8a); however this is considered by staff to be insufficient information. An updated, full scale TIA with more considerations is deemed to be necessary. For example, through the City's Terms of Reference for a TIA, the report should provide specific recommendations for local street and traffic safety improvements needed as a direct result of the proposed development of > 100 units.

The Covenant agreed to by the applicant (Item 2) III in the Motion for Consideration) will ensure that: a) an updated traffic study is necessary for the City's review at the Form and Character Development Permit application stage; and b) the owner/developer is responsible for all associated off-site traffic improvement costs, unless the City wishes to partner or budget for some of the improvements needed. Located in Residential Development Area A, the local street network could be regarded as a priority for Council for capital works and improvements. Staff envision upgrades to 3 Avenue SE and/or 2 Avenue SE leading to 10 Street SE will be necessary to support the proposed density and traffic generation, and doing so would align with what staff is recommending for a new 4 Avenue SE connector. Furthermore, the applicant has agreed to provide an additional width of asphalt for on-street parking along a new 11 Street frontage of the subject properties.

4 Avenue SE Connector

An Advanced Street Plan is a technical document used by City staff to determine new road alignments for undeveloped neighbourhoods and future developments. They are planned with best engineering practices in mind, public safety and operational/maintenance considerations. These plans help ensure access to lands beyond, connectivity and they influence road reserve funding. Without them, new neighbourhoods could not be developed in an orderly manner. Benefitting the broader neighbourhood, they are often contentious as typically no landowner wants an ASP demarcated over his/her property let alone being responsible for building a portion of the road network. Along with that and higher density development, there can be neighbourhood resistance to new road extensions that will generate higher traffic volumes.

For more than 10 years the City has been contributing to a "4 Avenue SE Reserve Fund" to assist with the planning, design, potentially land acquisition and partial construction of a new 4 Avenue SE connection in the vicinity of the subject properties. The intention is for 4 Avenue SE to be upgraded to the Local Urban Street Standard and connect to the constructed segment intersecting with 17 Street SE, and then westward to 10 Street SE making a less interrupted linkage to the central core of the City. Bypassing the Okanagan Avenue / 11 Street SE intersection is also a major objective. The current alignment of 4 Avenue SE is over 100 years old and feeds to Okanagan Avenue via 11 Street SE. With numerous right-angled jogs, no paving or drainage controls, the road is substandard and lacks a fluid design. The present alignment also acts as a notable pedestrian/cycling route that ends up trespassing over several properties.

City staff have commissioned two design options in recent years, both attached in Appendix 13.

Option 1 - design was completed in 2017. Its alignment more or less resembles the present alignment of 4 Avenue SE from where it physically terminates on private property and intersects with 11 Street SE. From there it would continue westward down a dedicated road corridor with a relatively steep embankment connecting to 10 Street SE. Staff have concerns with the finished grades nearing 12% on this design and retaining wall construction required, particularly through the embankment just west of the 11 Street SE. With this alignment there is slightly more properties with established homes to negotiate with, which is not factored into the cost estimate. The benefit of this route is a truer east – west continuation of 4 Avenue with a more direct line to 5 Street SE.

Estimated Cost - less land acquisition = approximately \$1.2 million

Option 2 - design was completed in 2019. This option is recommended by City staff. It is a slightly longer alignment with more curves and therefore a costlier design but with fewer grade issues and less developed properties to negotiate with. This route would connect to 3 Avenue SE at the 11 Street SE intersection and then continue to 10 Street SE. Parcel B would be the starting and end point of the new connector that would continue along 3 Avenue SE, which is presently constructed at a gravel standard. The downside of this option is that it would reconnect to Okanagan Avenue at 10 Street SE versus Option 1 with the straighter route to the lower core area at 5 Street SE.

Estimated Cost - less land acquisition = approximately \$1.4 million

Either option would have positive and negative implications on the future development potential of the large pieces of underdeveloped property in the vicinity. The merits of each can be debated, opposed and/or supported. This report does not delve into that. Option 2 is recommended by City staff because it is a more realistic option for connectivity in the near term, less grade issues and operationally more cost efficient. It would cross over four properties, including the southern boundary (1,733 m²) of Parcel B. If fully constructed, it would serve as a suitable, alternative route and linkage for vehicles, pedestrian, cyclists, etc. from 'downtown to mid-town'.

The 2019 concept for Option 2 was forwarded to the applicant in December 2019. At that time the applicant was advised that Staff would be recommending the registration of a road reserve covenant as a condition of rezoning to protect a future alignment of 4 Avenue SE. The 2019 design was also forwarded to land agents and owners of adjacent lots to the south that are directly affected by the road design.

With or without this rezoning application several scenarios could unfold:

Scenario 1 - If there is Council support for rezoning and Option 2, Item 2) II in the Motion for Consideration speaks to the registration of a Road Reserve Covenant in exchange for a payment of up to **\$35,000** for the land. This dollar amount represents the approximate 2020 assessed value of the subject property Parcel B on a per m² basis for the 1,733 m² of land required for road. As discussed, the applicant is agreeable to providing the City with such Road Reserve Covenant.

Scenario 2 - No rezoning. If the subject properties were only under an application to subdivide, in particular Parcel B, the Approving Officer would require, as a condition for subdivision approval, the dedication and construction to the Local Urban Street Standard the approximate 1,733 m² portion shown traversing the southern boundary of Parcel B. Pursuant to the Land Title Act, there would be no compensation payable to the owner/applicant needed for this procedure at subdivision. This scenario also assumes that Council endorses the alignment for Option2.

Scenario 3 - Council rejects Option 2. The proposed Road Reserve tied to this rezoning application would not be needed. That would leave Option 1 as the only future route planned for a 4 Avenue connector.

Because the City is dealing with a rezoning application, and the applicant is agreeable, staff believe it is worth the funds to secure a Road Reserve for the Option 2 alignment now.

OTHER COMMENTS

Engineering Department

Comments are attached as Appendix 14.

Building Department

No concerns with rezoning proposal.

Fire Department

No concerns with rezoning proposal.

Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

Preliminary approval of Bylaw granted - Appendix 15.

CONCLUSION


The proposed rezoning of the subject parcels to R-4 is consistent with Land Use and Density Policies of the OCP. Considering that High Density Residential (R-5) zoning and development is supporting by the OCP on the subject parcels and surrounding lands to the south and west, the proposed R-4 development concept and density would be an appropriate fit in this neighbourhood.

The current Motion for Consideration is more complicated than most rezoning applications. It was negotiated and agreed to by staff and the applicant on June 1, 2020. All of the issues and challenges with this land, the need to secure a new alignment for 4 Avenue SE, concerns with the Creek and staff's general expectations for development have been under discussions with the applicant since November 2019. Staff appreciates the cooperation by the applicant in the process.



This is also an opportune time for the City to secure a much needed starting and end point of a future 4 Avenue connector that would benefit the SE quadrant of the City. Being in Residential Development Area A, the City has prioritized such a connector with a Reserve Fund, and staff recommend Council continue to build up that reserve in the years to come.

With a very limited land base remaining to develop in the UCB, and the properties situated well within the core residential area of the City, staff are supportive of the rezoning, the conditions outlined in the Motion for Consideration, and for this development concept moving to the Development Permit application stages. Registration of the Covenants referred to in the Motion for Consideration would effectively freeze subdivision or development on the subject properties until further approvals are considered by Council.



Sincerely,




Kevin Pearson, MCIP, RPP
Director of Development Services





Subject Parcel



Subject Parcel



<p>0 12.5 25 50 75 100 Meters</p>	<p>N</p> <p>Subject Parcel</p>	<p>Residential Low Density</p> <p>Residential Medium Density</p> <p>Residential High Density</p>	<p>Park</p>
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	-------------



Subject Parcel

- P-1 Park & Recreation
- R-1 Single Family Residential
- R-4 Medium Density Residential
- R-8 Single Family/Secondary Suite Residential

INTERNATIONAL SENIORS CARE INC. SHUSWAP VILLAGE

ISSUED FOR REZONING - APRIL 7 2020

PROJECT No. 1968-1


DRAWING INDEX	
DWG NO	DWG NAME
1968-1-000	COVER SHEET, DRAWING INDEX, KEY PLAN, AND LOCATION PLAN
1968-1-101	SITE PLAN
1968-1-102	SLOPE PROFILE LOCATIONS
1968-1-103	SLOPE PROFILES 1, 2 AND 3
1968-1-104	SLOPE PROFILES 4, 5 AND 6

PREPARED FOR: INTERNATIONAL SENIORS CARE INC
MR. GARY OUT

PREPARED BY:

ONSITE
ENGINEERING LTD.

INTERIOR OPERATIONS
#201-231 TRANS CANADA HWY
SALMON ARM, BC, V1E 4R1
PH.: 250-833-5643
FAX: 1-866-235-6943



LOCATION PLAN
NTS

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

REZONING OF 70 11th STREET SE FROM R1 TO R4
LEGAL ADDRESS: LOT 1, PLAN KAP54150, S13, T20, R10, KDYD
PID: 019-142-188

REZONING OF 210 11th STREET SE FROM R1 TO R4
LEGAL ADDRESS: LOT 1, PLAN KAP1521, S13, T20, R10, KDYD
PART SHOWN ON PL B4487
PID: 011-535-199

SHUSWAP VILLAGE PROJECT SUMMARY

- A1: LOTS: 10.97 m WIDTH, 24.38 m DEPTH (17 DOORS)
- A2: LOTS: 10.97 m WIDTH, 21.34 m DEPTH (30 DOORS)
- B1: LOTS: 10.97 m WIDTH, 24.38 m DEPTH (1 TRIPLEX, 3 DOORS)
- B2: LOTS: 7.32 m WIDTH, 13.41 m DEPTH (1 TRIPLEX, 3 DOORS)
- C: LOTS: 7.32 m WIDTH, 13.41 m DEPTH (8 DOORS)
- D: 5.10 m WIDTH, 9.14 m DEPTH ROW HOUSING 3 STORIES HIGH (16 DOORS)
- E: COMMUNITY CENTRE WITH 40 CONDOS; APPROX 800 m2 FOOTPRINT
- F: MAINTENANCE SHED/OFFICES/WOODSHOP
- G: DRAINAGE RESERVE
- H: PARK AND TRAIL


PARCEL LINE SETBACKS:

- FRONT EXTERIOR: 5.0 m
- FRONT FROM INTERNAL ROADS: 2.0 m
- SIDE FROM INTERNAL ROADS: 1.2 m
- SIDE FROM ADJACENT PROPERTIES: 1.8 m
- REAR: 3.0 m
- BUILDING DISTANCE: 2.4 m

ROADS:

- PAVED ROADS 7.0 m TRAVELED WIDTH
- 75 SURFACE PARKING STALLS, 25 UNDERGROUND PARKING STALLS

LEGEND	EXISTING	PROPOSED
PROPERTY LINES	---	---
ROAD CENTRELINE	---	---
PARCEL LINE SETBACKS (R4)	---	---
DRAINAGE	---	---
POND	---	---
STORM MAIN	---	---
BOUNDARY OF PARK LAND	---	---



SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1:500

REVNO	REVISIONS	DATE	DRAWN	APPROV
0	ISSUED FOR REZONING	02/19/20	JV	DP
1	RECEIVED FOR REZONING	04/07/20	JV	DP




PREPARED: JV
DRAWN: JV
CHECKED: DP
SURVEYED: N/A
DATE: FEB 2020

ONSITE
ENGINEERING LTD.
INTERIOR OPERATIONS
899-1251 TRINDR CANADA HWY
SHEWANAVILLE, BC V2E 6T1
TEL: 250-860-9842
FAX: 250-860-9843


INTERNATIONAL SENIORS CARE INC
SHUSWAP VILLAGE
70 AND 210 11th STREET SE
PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN

CLIENT PROJECT NO. _____
DCL PROJECT NO. 1968-1
DRAWING NO. 101
SHEET: 2 of 5

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



REVNO	REVISIONS	DATE	DRAWN	APPROV
0	ISSUED FOR RECORDING	08/04/2020	JV	EP
1	RE-ISSUED FOR RECORDING	04/07/2021	JV	EP



PREPARED: JV
 DRAWN: JV
 CHECKED: EP
 SURVEYED: N/A
 DATE: FEB 2020




ONSITE
 ENGINEERING LTD.

INTERIOR OPERATIONS
 15742 174th STREET NW
 SHELTON, BC, V1E 4R1
 TEL: 604-552-0552
 FAX: 1-604-735-0863


INTERNATIONAL SENIORS CARE INC
 SHUSWAP VILLAGE
 70 AND 210 11th STREET SE
 SLOPE PROFILE LOCATIONS

CUSTOMER PROJECT NO. _____
 DEL. PROJECT NO. 198-1
 DRAWING NO. 102
 SHEET: 3 of 5
 REV 1

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



REV NO	REVISIONS	DATE	DESIGN	APPROV
0	ISSUED FOR REZONING	08/08/20	JV	SP
1	RE-CHECKED FOR REZONING	04/07/20	JV	SP






PREPARED: JV
 DRAWN: JV
 CHECKED: DP
 SURVEYED: N/A
 DATE: FEB 2020

ONSITE
 ENGINEERING LTD.
 INTERIOR OPERATIONS
 8942 171st STREET NW
 SALEM, ALB. T3C 1V6 R1R1
 TEL: 800-663-6840 FAX: 1-800-225-6840

INTERNATIONAL SENIORS CARE INC
 SHUSWAP VILLAGE
 70 AND 210 11th STREET SE
 SLOPE PROFILES 1, 2 AND 3

CLIENT PROJECT NO. ---
 DEL PROJECT NO. 1068-1
 DRAWING NO. 103
 SHEET 4 of 5 REV 1

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



REVNO	REVISIONS	DATE	DRAWN	APPROV
0	BASED FOR REZONING	20-09-2025	JY	BP
1	RECALCULATED FOR REZONING	24-07-2025	JY	BP

SCALE:



PREPARED: JY
DRAWN: JY
CHECKED: BP
SURVEYED: N/A
DATE: MON YYYY

ONSITE
ENGINEERING LTD.
INTERIOR OPERATIONS
8914-21 TRAVIS CANADA HWY
SALMON ARM, BC, V1E 4S1
PH: 250-833-8662
FAX: 1-800-833-8662

INTERNATIONAL SENIORS CARE INC
SHUSWAP VILLAGE
70 AND 210 11TH STREET SE
SLOPE PROFILES 4, 5 AND 6

CLIENT PROJECT NO. _____
CEL PROJECT NO. 1966-1
DRAWING NO. 104
SHEET: 5 of 5 REV 1

SECTION 9 - R-4 - MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE**Purpose**

- 9.1 The purpose of the R-4 Zone is to provide for medium *density, multiple family* and small lot *single family* residential developments. New *multiple family* developments zoned R-4 shall be required to obtain a *Development Permit* as per the requirements of the *Official Community Plan*, and shall comply with the provisions of the *Fire Services Act, British Columbia Building Code*, and other applicable legislation. #289, #3740

Regulations

- 9.2 On a *parcel zoned R-4*, no *building or structure* shall be constructed, located or altered and no plan of subdivision approved which contravenes the regulations set out in the *R-4 Zone* or those regulations contained elsewhere in this Bylaw.

Permitted Uses

- 9.3 The following uses and no others are permitted in the R-4 Zone:

- .1 *assisted living housing*; #4336
- .2 *bed and breakfast* in a *single family dwelling*, limited to two let rooms;
- .3 *boarders*, limited to two;
- .4 *boarding home*; #2789
- .5 *commercial daycare facility*;
- .6 *dining area*; #4336
- .7 *duplexes*;
- .8 *family childcare facility*; #3082
- .9 *group childcare*; #3082
- .10 *home occupation*; #2782
- .11 *multiple family dwellings*;
- .12 *public use*;
- .13 *public utility*;
- .14 *single family dwelling*;
- .15 *triplexes*;
- .16 *accessory use*.

Maximum Height of Principal Buildings

- 9.4 The maximum *height* of a *principal buildings* shall be 10.0 metres (32.8 feet). This may be increased to 13.0 metres (42.7 ft.), via the *Development Permit* process, if any of the special amenity(ies) in Table 2 are provided.

Maximum Height of Accessory Buildings

- 9.5 The maximum *height* of an *accessory building* shall be 6.0 metres (19.7 feet).

Maximum Parcel Coverage

- 9.6 The total maximum *parcel coverage* for *principal* and *accessory buildings* shall be 55% of the *parcel area*, of which 10% shall be the maximum *parcel coverage* for *accessory buildings*. #2811

Minimum Parcel Area

- 9.7
- .1 The minimum *parcel area* for a *single family dwelling* shall be 300.0 square metres (3,229.3 square feet).
 - .2 The minimum *parcel area* for a *duplex* shall be 600.0 square metres (6,458.6 square feet).
 - .3 The minimum *parcel area* for all other uses shall be 900.0 square metres (9,687.8 square feet).

SECTION 9 - R-4 - MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE - CONTINUED**Minimum Parcel Width**

9.8

- .1 The minimum *parcel width* shall be 30.0 metres (98.5 feet). #3740
- .2 Notwithstanding Section 9.8.1, the minimum *parcel width* for a *single family* lot shall be 10.0 metres (32.8 feet).
- .3 Notwithstanding Section 9.8.1, the minimum *parcel width* for a stacked *duplex* lot shall be 14.0 metres (45.9 feet).
- .4 Notwithstanding Section 9.8.1, the minimum *parcel width* for a side-by-side *duplex* lot shall be 20.0 metres (65.6 feet).

Minimum Setback of Principal Buildings9.9 The minimum *setback* of *principal buildings* from the:

- .1 *Front parcel line*
 - adjacent to a *highway* shall be 5.0 metres (16.4 feet)
 - adjacent to an *access route* shall be 2.0 metres (6.6 feet)
- .2 *Rear parcel line*
 - adjacent to a *parcel zoned*
R-4 shall be 3.0 metres (9.8 feet)
 - all other cases shall be 5.0 metres (16.4 feet)
- .3 *Interior side parcel line*
 - adjacent to a *parcel zoned*
R-4 shall be 1.2 metres (3.9 feet) #3475
 - all other cases shall be 1.8 metres (5.9 feet)
- .4 *Exterior side parcel line*
 - adjacent to a *highway* shall be 5.0 metres (16.4 feet)
 - adjacent to an *access route* shall be 2.0 metres (6.6 feet)
- .5 Minimum separation between residential *buildings* on the same lot of not more than one storey in height shall be 1.5 metres (4.9 feet)
- .6 Minimum separation between residential *buildings* on the same lot of more than one storey in height shall be 3.0 metres (9.8 feet)
- .7 Notwithstanding Sections 9.9.2 and 9.9.3, a *principal building* on a corner *parcel* may be sited not less than 1.5 metres (4.9 feet) from the *rear parcel line* provided the combined total of the *rear* and *interior side yards* shall be not less than 6.0 metres (19.7 feet).
- .8 Refer to Section 4.9 for "Special Building Setbacks" which may apply. #2811

Minimum Setback of Accessory Buildings9.10 The minimum *setback* of accessory *buildings* from the:

- .1 *Front parcel line* shall be 5.0 metres (16.4 feet)
- .2 *Rear parcel line* shall be 1.0 metre (3.3 feet)
- .3 *Interior side parcel line* shall be 0.6 metre (1.9 feet)
- .4 *Exterior side parcel line* shall be 5.0 metres (16.4 feet)

Refer to "Pound and Animal Control Bylaw" for special setbacks which may apply. #2811

Maximum Density

Note: The following *density* provisions are based on the *gross parcel area*. Parking requirements, *setback* requirements, road dedication, etc. have not been taken into consideration.

9.11

- .1 The maximum *density* shall be a total of 40 *dwelling units* or *sleeping units* per hectare (16.2 *dwelling units* or *sleeping units* per acre). #2789
- .2 Notwithstanding Section 9.11.1, the maximum *density* in the R-4 Zone may be increased to a maximum of 50 *dwelling units* per hectare (20.2 units per acre) in accordance with Table 2. In Table 2, Column I sets out the special amenity to be provided and Column II sets out the added *density* assigned for the provision of each amenity.
- .3 Notwithstanding Section 9.11.1, the maximum *density* in the R-4 Zone may be increased to a maximum of 50 *dwelling units* per hectare (20.2 units per acre) for the provision of *Assisted Living Housing*. #4336

TABLE 2

COLUMN I SPECIAL AMENITY TO BE PROVIDED	COLUMN II ADDED DENSITY
1. Provision of each dwelling unit which caters to the disabled (e.g. wheelchair access)	□ 2 units per hectare (0.8 units per acre)
2. Provision of <i>commercial daycare facility</i> 7 - 10 children 11 - 15 children 16 or more children	□ 3 units per hectare (1.2 units per acre) □ 4 units per hectare (1.6 units per acre) □ 7 units per hectare (2.8 units per acre)
3. Provision of below <i>grade</i> or <i>parkade</i> type parking for at least 50% of the required off street parking	□ 10 units per hectare (4.0 units per acre)
4. Provision of each rental <i>welling unit</i>	□ 2 units per hectare (0.8 units per acre)
5. Provision of affordable rental <i>dwelling units</i> in accordance with special agreement under Section 904 #3218	□ 5 units per hectare (2.0 units per acre)

Maximum Floor Area Ratio

9.12 The maximum *floor area ratio* of a *single family dwelling* shall be 0.65.

Parking

9.13 Parking shall be required as per Appendix I.



11 Street SE Looking North



11 Street SE Looking South



Top of Ravine Looking North



Top of Ravine Looking East

Engineering and
Planning Consultants

9th Floor
1199 West Hastings
Vancouver
British Columbia
Canada V6B 3T5

Telephone: 604 / 684 4488
Facsimile: 604 / 684 5908
email: office@gdhamilton.com
www.gdhamilton.com

9901 Gallaghers Circle
Kelowna, B.C.
V1W 3Z9

April 2, 2003

Mr. Orville Cumming
c/o 604895 B.C. Ltd.,
1860 - 20th Street S.E.
Salmon Arm, B.C.
V1E 2N2

Dear Mr. Cummings:


**Re: Traffic Review, Okanagan Avenue East and 11th Street SE,
District of Salmon Arm**

We are pleased to submit this letter report summarizing the results of our traffic review for the Okanagan Avenue East and 11th Street SE intersection. This letter describes our study process, and the results and conclusions about the traffic impact of the proposed residential unit development south of the intersection.

1.0 Background

A 44 unit residential development is proposed on 11th Street SE immediately south of Okanagan Avenue E. 11th Street SE is a local north-south low standard paved rural roadway that extends southwards from Okanagan Avenue E and currently services approximately six residences. Residents can also access Okanagan Avenue E via unpaved 2nd and 3rd Avenue SE to the nearby intersection of 10th Street SE.

Okanagan Avenue E is an east-west collector street that connects residential subdivisions in southeast Salmon Arm with the Central Business Area. A 1997 traffic count west of 20th Street SE, indicated that nearly 6,000 vehicles per day travel on Okanagan Avenue E.



ISO 9001 Registered
Quality Assured



The District of Salmon Arm is concerned about sight line limitations at the intersection of 11th Street SE and Okanagan Avenue E and the generally poor condition of the roadway network in this neighborhood. Given the increased traffic volume that the proposed subdivision will generate at the three-leg intersection, the District has requested that a traffic study be carried out by the developer to determine the impact that the increased volumes may have on the safe movement of traffic. The developer commissioned Hamilton Associates to carry out the traffic study.




FIGURE 1 EXISTING STREET CONFIGURATION IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Note that 4th Avenue is not continuous between 11th Street and 17th Street and that 11th Avenue does not connect between Auto Road and 4th Avenue.



2.0 Literature Search

Intersection sight distance is defined as the sight distance available from a point where vehicles are required to stop on the intersecting road (11th Street SE), while drivers are looking left and right along the major roadway (Okanagan Avenue E), before entering the intersection. The intersection sight distance is considered adequate when it allows vehicles to safely make all maneuvers that are permitted, without significantly affecting vehicles travelling on the main roadway.

In the case of a stop control on the minor roadway, the sight triangles are a function of the vehicle speeds on the major roadway and the departure maneuver of the vehicle leaving the stopped condition. In the case of tee intersections, a stopped vehicle should be able to see an oncoming vehicle and be able to turn left or right onto the intersecting roadway and then accelerate to the normal running speed of the vehicles on the main roadway without interfering with the passage of the through traffic.

The *Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads (Guide)*, (1999), published by the Transportation Association of Canada, defines the sight distance for turning movements from a stop condition. This Guide is used by most jurisdictions in Canada to design and operate streets and highways. The Guide recommendations were used to evaluate the study intersection.

The Guide specifies the height of eye for the observer to be 1.05 metres and the height of the approaching object as 1.30 metres, which would be the upper part of a passenger vehicle. Also specified are average driver perception and reaction times and vehicle acceleration rates. Adjustments are necessary to the acceleration rates to account for grades and heavy vehicles.

Typically, the desirable sight distance required for a driver leaving a stop condition to enter a 2 lane road with a design speed of 50 km/h is 120 metres. 160 metres is required for a design speed of 60 km/h. While some drivers can accelerate their vehicles rapidly and can enter a roadway with less sight distance, the purpose of the values specified in the Guide are to provide sufficient sight distances for drivers with slower perception and reaction times to safely complete their turns as well.



3.0 Site Visit

On January 29-2003, Mr. Albert Popoff, P.Eng. visited the study site in Salmon Arm. He met with the District of Salmon Arm Municipal Engineer, Mr. Dale McTaggart and the developer, Mr. Orville Cumming. Both provided plans and other information. Data were gathered and observations were carried out in the study area.

A. 11TH STREET SE AND OKANAGAN AVENUE EAST

The following observations and measurements were made at the main study intersection:

- The Intersection operates as a tee intersection because the north leg is not developed and is unlikely to develop in the future.
- 11th Street SE has a significant downgrade immediately south of Okanagan Avenue East. 11th Street SE does not level off before it intersects Okanagan Avenue E, therefore when vehicles are stopped at the stop sign, the front of their vehicle is higher than the rear.
- Okanagan Avenue E carries significant volumes of traffic between the business area and residential subdivisions with approximately 6,000 per day according to a 1997 count. Assuming a growth rate of 1.5% per year the current traffic volumes on Okanagan Avenue E would be about 6500 vehicles per day. During the mid-day observations there were approximately three vehicles per minute approaching the 11th Street SE intersection, from each direction.
- Okanagan Avenue E rises from west to east at an approximate grade of 10 percent
- Westbound vehicles travel at an average speed of 60 kilometres per hour (downhill), whereas eastbound vehicle speeds are estimated to be 50 kilometres per hour (uphill).
- The approach speeds on 11th Street SE are below 50 kilometres per hour.
- A northbound vehicle on 11th Street SE stopped at the stop sign has over 200 metres of visibility of approaching vehicles from the east, as shown in FIGURE 1. Sight lines to the west are approximately 50 metres due to a vertical curve on Okanagan Avenue E between 11th Street SE and 10th Street SE, as shown in FIGURE 2.
- A solid wood fence, shrubs and a group mailbox in the southwest quadrant restrict the sight triangle for vehicles approaching Okanagan Avenue E. The southeast quadrant has a clear sight triangle.
- An eastbound vehicle was parked for a short period of time on south side of Okanagan Avenue E between 10th and 11th Streets SE in a location that further restricted the sight lines to the west. Currently there are no signs prohibiting parking.



FIGURE 2 11TH STREET SE AND OKANAGAN AVENUE E LOOKING EAST
View from 11th Street SE looking east while stopped and waiting to enter Okanagan Avenue E. Good sight lines are available to see oncoming vehicles.



FIGURE 3 11TH STREET SE AND OKANAGAN AVENUE E LOOKING WEST
View from 11th Street SE looking west while stopped and waiting to enter Okanagan Avenue E. The vehicle with the headlights on has just become visible and is approximately 50 metres away from the intersection.



- Stopped vehicles entering Okanagan Avenue E had to react and accelerate very quickly in order to make a right or left turn safely.
- Collision information gathered for the November, 2001, Safer City Initiative Study by Hamilton Associates, indicates that there were three collisions at or near the intersection between 1995 and 2000. One was a rear-end collision, and another involved a left turning vehicle. The configuration of the third collision is not known. There is insufficient information to determine collision patterns.

B. 10TH STREET SW AND OKANAGAN AVENUE EAST

The characteristics of the intersection of 10th Street SE and Okanagan Avenue E (the nearest intersection to the west) were observed to determine if it would be an alternative access for the new development instead of 11th Street SE.

- The traffic volumes, speeds, and grade observations on Okanagan Avenue E are similar at 10th Street SE to those at 11th Street SE.
- 10th Street SE would have more than double the traffic volume than 11th Street SE because 10th Street SE currently serves a larger number of residents.
- 10th Street approaches Okanagan Avenue E on a flatter grade than 11th Street SE, but approach speeds would be similar.
- Vehicles on 10th Street NE, when stopped at the stop sign at Okanagan Avenue E, have over 150 metres visibility of vehicles approaching from the west. Visibility of vehicles approaching from the east is limited by the vertical curvature to approximately 80 metres.

3.0 Review of Sight Lines

TABLE 1 summarizes the required and available sight lines at the intersection of 11th Street SE and Okanagan Avenue E. The sight distances to the right were not compared, as a clear sight triangle currently provides over 250 metres of visibility in this direction,



**TABLE 1 REQUIRED AND AVAILABLE SIGHT DISTANCES
AT 11TH STREET SE AND OKANAGAN AVENUE EAST**

CONDITION	REQUIRED Sight Distance from the left*	AVAILABLE SIGHT DISTANCE FROM THE LEFT*
Sight distance for a passenger vehicle to turn <u>right</u> onto a two-lane roadway and attain enough speed so as not to be overtaken by an approaching vehicle from the left at a speed of 50 km/h	120 metres**	50 metres
Sight distance for a passenger vehicle to turn <u>left</u> onto a two-lane roadway across the path of passenger vehicles approaching from the left at a speed of 50 km/h.	100 metres	50 metres

* Adequate sight distances are available to the right and are not an issue.

** This assumes passenger vehicles on a level grade. Heavy trucks would need more sight distance because of their slower acceleration, especially on an upgrade.

A northbound vehicle stopped on 11th Street SE must be able to see a vehicle approaching at 50 km/h on their left at least 100 metres away (approximately at 10th Street SE) to be able to safely make a left turn onto Okanagan Avenue E. This translates to approximately 7 seconds of time to perceive a safe gap from both directions, make a decision, then react and begin to accelerate across the eastbound lane and turn left into the westbound lane. The current sight distance is about 50 metres due to a vertical curve on Okanagan Avenue E. The 50 metre sight distance point is located near the back lane between 11th and 10th Street SE.

The sight distance required for right turns is 120 metres because the entering vehicle has to accelerate to a speed so as not to interfere with the approaching vehicle from their left traveling at a speed of 50 km/h.

A review of general collision information indicates that right angle collisions have more serious outcomes than rear end collisions, especially in terms of causing injuries and fatalities.

At 10th Street SE and Okanagan Avenue E., the required sight triangle to the left is met, however the existing sight distance to the right is 80 metres and does not meet the 160 metre requirement. The sight distances are greater to the right because the average speed of the westbound vehicles is estimated to be 60 km/hr.



4.0 Review of Alternatives

The following alternatives were explored to improve the sight distance for all road users at the study intersection, including the vehicle trips generated by the proposed 44 unit residential development on 11th Street SE.

A. IMPROVEMENTS TO THE INTERSECTION OF 11TH STREET SE AND OKANAGAN AVENUE E

It may not be economically feasible to change the vertical alignment of Okanagan Avenue E to overcome the sight line deficiency. The following improvements at the intersection of 11th Street and Okanagan Avenue E will improve the intersection sight distances and operational safety.

- PHASE I
- ✓1. Remove the shrubs growing outside of the fence on the southwest corner of the intersection.
 - ✓2. Post No Parking on both sides of Okanagan Avenue E between 10th and 11th Street SW so that vehicles do not park and create further sight restrictions. Prohibiting parking may inconvenience the adjacent residents.
 - ✓3. Install a "Concealed Road" warning sign for eastbound traffic on Okanagan Avenue E, in advance of 11th Street SE. In the *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Canada* (Transportation Association of Canada, 1998), this sign is recommended for use "on major roads in advance of crossroads where the vision triangle is inadequate, and where the crossroads are concealed to the extent that a driver on the major road would not be adequately prepared for turning movements or cross traffic". The MUTCDC sign number is WA-13R. Such signs are most effective immediately after installation, and the effectiveness may diminish over time.
 4. Restricting the right turn movements from 11th Street SE onto Okanagan Avenue E will eliminate the worst case sight line situation. Drivers wishing to turn right would require an alternate access to Okanagan Avenue. This option is discussed in subsection B.
 5. Make 11th Street SW a southbound one-way street. This will require alternative routes for vehicles to have access to the Central Business District. These options are discussed in subsections B and C.



6. Revise the vertical alignment of 11th Street SE so that a vehicle will be horizontal when stopped at the stop sign and waiting to enter Okanagan Avenue E. The change of the grades will enable vehicles to accelerate more quickly when entering the intersection, especially during snowy or icy conditions. The grade change may increase the drivers eye height marginally but it would need to be raised by approximately one metre to achieve significant improvements to the sight lines.
7. Construct an acceleration lane along Okanagan Avenue E for vehicles turning right onto Okanagan Avenue E. An acceleration lane will allow right turning vehicles to reach the speed of approaching vehicles, before merging into the eastbound lane.

B. USE 10TH STREET SE AS THE ACCESS TO OKANAGAN AVENUE E

The sight lines at 10th Street SE and Okanagan Avenue E, are only marginally better than those at 11th Street SE. The sight distance requirements to the left are met, however only 80 metres of sight distance is available to the right. The Guide requires a sight distance of 160 metres to detect an approaching vehicle.

If traffic generated by the new development is required to use 10th Street SE to access Okanagan Avenue E, it may be necessary to upgrade 2nd Avenue SE and/or 3rd Avenue SE between 11th and 10th Street SE to accommodate two-way traffic.

C. DIVERT TRAFFIC TO 6TH OR 7TH STREET SE TO ACCESS OKANAGAN AVENUE E

The 6th and 7th Street SE access to Okanagan Avenue E have sight lines in both directions that meet the required design standards. These intersections are options to consider as the primary access intersections to the proposed development. The disadvantage of this option is that the routing of traffic via 1st, 2nd, or 4th Avenue SE is not direct, creating a slightly longer travel route through an existing residential neighborhood. To make this option workable, it may be necessary to implement restrictions at the 10th and 11th Avenue SE in order to encourage motorists to use the safer 6th and 7th Street SE access to Okanagan Avenue E. Some motorists have a tendency to use the shortest route even though it may be less safe.

A capacity analysis has not been carried out, but it is not expected that the approximately 50 vehicles generated during the peak hours by the proposed development would cause any traffic delays or operating difficulties. Currently northbound traffic on 6th and 7th Avenue SE is controlled by a Stop Sign before entering Okanagan Avenue E.

7
details



It may be necessary to implement a one-way southbound operation on 11th Street SE in order to successfully divert traffic to an alternate access.

5.0 Summary and Conclusions

The intersection of 11th Street SE and Okanagan Avenue E is the most direct access to the proposed 44 unit residential development. The existing sight distances from the intersection to the west are less than the minimum values specified in the Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads. As a result, vehicles emerging from the 11th Street stop sign may conflict with vehicles on Okanagan Avenue. While the options to make significant improvements are limited, shrub trimming, warning signs, and parking restrictions can improve the visibility and driver awareness of the intersection.

The traffic generated by the proposed development also has the options to access Okanagan Avenue E via 10th Street SE, 7th Street SE or 6th Street SE. 10th Street SE has marginally better sight lines than 11th Street SE, but sight distance improvements would also be required at this intersection to comply with the design guidelines. The 6th and 7th Street SE access have sight lines exceeding the recommended values, however the route to the proposed development is indirect. The implementation of a one-way street system or the closure of the intersections at 10th St. and 11th St. may be required to enforce the diversion.

If 4th Avenue SE connects to 17th Street SE in the future, it would provide another viable access to the proposed development on 11th Street SE.

The level of safety at an intersection is a relative measure. No intersection can be absolutely "safe" or "unsafe". Certain characteristics can make an intersection more or less safe. Standards and guidelines are set to minimize risk and to establish a reasonable level of safety.

Given enough data and information it is possible to develop intersection collision prediction models. These models use the total traffic volume entering an intersection to predict collision occurrence. At the location under review, the addition of approximately 100 vehicles per day on 11th Street relative to the 6,500 vehicles that already travel on Okanagan Avenue represents a relatively small increase in the measurable collision risk.



In summary it is recommended that:

1. As a minimum, the shrub trimming, warning signs, and parking signs be implemented;
2. The option of using 7th St. as an alternative entry point to areas south of Okanagan Ave be explored, including the implications to the existing local roads and methods of ensuring that traffic is diverted;
3. If continued growth is expected in this area, a long term strategy be developed to improve the geometry and sight lines at the 10th St. and 11th St. intersections, or to phase-out the use of these intersections as the traffic volumes on Okanagan Avenue E continue to increase. For further development to occur in this area a plan is required to improve the transportation network which may require significant expenditures to implement.

Refer to Section 4 for a more detailed discussion of alternatives and recommendations.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or comments. Thank you for considering Hamilton Associates.

Yours truly,

G.D. HAMILTON ASSOCIATES CONSULTING LTD.

per: Albert J. Popoff P.Eng.
Manager of Kelowna Office



From: Dave Cullen <DCullen@ctqconsultants.ca>
 Sent: February 14, 2020 2:01 PM
 To: Green Emerald Construction <office@greenemeraldinc.com>
 Cc: Gary Out <grout01@hotmail.com>
 Subject: RE: Seniors development 11th St, SE, Salmon Arm SHUSWAP VILLAGE

ITE Trip Generation Rates - 10th Edition

Description/ITE Code	Units	ITE Vehicle Trip Generation Rates							Expected Units	Total Generated			Total Distribution of Generated			
		Peak Hour of Generator								Daily	AM Hour	PM Hour	AM In	AM Out	PM In	PM Out
		Weekday	AM	PM	AM In	AM Out	PM In	PM Out								
Senior Adult Housing- Detached 251	DU	3.60	0.22	0.27	35%	65%	61%	39%	70.0	250	16	19	5	10	12	7
Senior Adult Housing- Attached 252	Occ DU	3.14	0.19	0.23	35%	65%	60%	40%	40.0	130	8	9	3	5	0	4
Congregate Care Facility 253	Occ DU	2.15	0.00	0.17	61%	39%	58%	44%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Congregate Care Facility 253	DU	2.02	0.00	0.17	69%	41%	55%	45%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted Living 254	Occ Beds	2.74	0.18	0.20	66%	32%	50%	50%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted Living 254	Beds	2.66	0.14	0.22	65%	35%	44%	56%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted Living 254	Employees	3.93	NA	0.55	NA	NA	43%	57%		0	NA	0	NA	NA	0	0
Continuing Care Retirement Comm 255	Occ Units	2.50	0.15	0.20	65%	35%	40%	60%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
									110	395	23	28	8	15	17	11

ITE Trip Generation Rates - 10th Edition

Description/ITE Code	Units	ITE Vehicle Trip Generation Rates							Expected Units	Total Generated			Total Distribution of Generated			
		Peak Hour of Generator								Daily	AM Hour	PM Hour	AM In	AM Out	PM In	PM Out
		Weekday	AM	PM	AM In	AM Out	PM In	PM Out								
Senior Adult Housing- Detached 251	DU	3.68	0.22	0.27	35%	65%	61%	39%	350.0	1,200	77	95	27	50	58	37
Senior Adult Housing- Attached 252	Occ DU	3.14	0.19	0.23	35%	65%	60%	40%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Congregate Care Facility 253	Occ DU	2.15	0.00	0.17	61%	39%	58%	44%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Congregate Care Facility 253	DU	2.02	0.00	0.17	69%	41%	55%	45%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted Living 254	Occ Beds	2.74	0.18	0.20	66%	32%	50%	50%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted Living 254	Beds	2.66	0.14	0.22	65%	35%	44%	56%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted Living 254	Employees	3.93	NA	0.55	NA	NA	43%	57%		0	NA	0	NA	NA	0	0
Continuing Care Retirement Comm 255	Occ Units	2.50	0.15	0.20	65%	35%	40%	60%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
									350	1,200	77	95	27	50	58	37

Gary the two spread sheet above show the trip generation as follows:
 The first shows 70 detached senior homes and 40 attached senior homes with a total PM Peak hour trip generation of 28 vehicles, well be low the threshold of 100 pm peak hour trips for a full traffic study
 The second show that 350 detached homes would generate close to the 100 trip threshold


I have included the trip generation rates for other types of senior housing. All other types of senior housing generate fewer trips per unit then the adult housing noted above.

Hope this helps to get a handle on what the site could support from a traffic generation standpoint
 Please call if you have any questions

David D. Cullen, P.Eng.

CTQ
 CTQ Consultants Ltd.
 Tel: 250.979.1221 ext.120
 Cel: 250.870-6525

Jeremy Ayotte MSc RPBio
180 Larch Hills, Salmon Arm BC, V1E 2Y4
Tel. 250-804-3513
Jeremy.Ayotte@gmail.com



August 28, 2009

Corey Paiement
Director of Development Services
City of Salmon Arm
Box 40 Salmon Arm BC
V1E 4N2

Re: Application of the Riparian Areas Regulation and the Water Act to a water course flowing through property at **70 and 210 11 Street SE.**

The following is a summary of a field assessment and a review of regulations and relevant documents on behalf of the city of Salmon Arm during the week of August 25-31, 2009.

- A) Previous assessments of this water course suggest the source of water is city storm water, however the volume of water flowing through the water course at the time of this assessment (late August of a particularly dry summer) suggests that the water course is partially spring fed or that city water lines are potentially leaking upstream.
- B) If further confirmation of the source and history of this water course is required, an assessment by a professional hydrologist would be appropriate.
- C) Regardless of the source of the water above the subject property, the water course in question eventually drains into a fish-bearing system (Shuswap Lake) and consequently meets the criteria defining a "stream" in the Riparian Areas Regulation (given authority under the *Fish Protection Act*, S.B.C. 1997, c.21, ss.12, 13 (1) and 37 (2)). Any development on this property therefore must meet the provisions of the Riparian Areas Regulation (effective March 31, 2005).
- D) Using standard methods prescribed by the Detailed Assessment of the Riparian Areas Regulation, the average channel width for this water course is 1.7 m, with an average slope of 9.5 %. Based on these measurements, the channel type is a riffle-pool, and the resulting streamside protection and enhancement area (SPEA) would be set at 10 m horizontal distance out from the high water mark on each side of the water course.
- E) A previous assessment alluded to an option available to the property owners to enclose the water course in a pipe through the subject property. Given the well-developed and relatively

undisturbed riparian vegetation along this water course (Fig. 1), an application for Approval under Section 9 of the Water Act (Works In and About a Stream) to enclose the water course in an underground pipe would likely meet with considerable resistance from federal and provincial regulatory agencies (e.g., Fisheries and Oceans Canada, and Ministry of Environment). The current exposure that this water course has to functioning riparian vegetation provides a source of nutrients (derived from insect drop and woody debris) that flows downstream to a known fish bearing system.

- F) Given that there is definitely storm water flow in this water course, and that the surface exposure through the subject property provides a net benefit to downstream fish habitat, regulatory agencies may be flexible with RAR provisions in order to support a proposal to maintain this water course above surface. The following excerpt is from the Riparian Areas Regulation Assessment Methodology Manual (Version 3.3, April 2006):

1.4.3 Day-lighting of Streams

There is interest in some urban areas to open up culverted and buried stream channels and bring them back above ground. Having to meet RAR standards on a day-lighting project where there is often limited room to re-establish the stream channel could cause many day-lighting projects to be discarded. In this regard, MOE and DFO staff are able to negotiate specific riparian protection standards to enable these positive projects to proceed.

Discussions between the property owner and regulatory agencies may benefit from consideration of the option to maintain the water course in its present channel and design the proposed development to minimize potential disturbance outside of a reduced set back that where possible, allows for the retention of the most biologically important features of the site - the diverse, mature overstory riparian vegetation.

As referenced to RAR methodology manual, day-lighting of streams in urban areas is growing across North America. This growth is driven mainly by the positive effects on property value. This site is rare in an urban setting and given appropriate design and planning, the natural features that exist on this property can become marketable.

Sincerely,



Jeremy Ayotte MSc RPBio



Figure 1. Examples of well-developed and relatively undisturbed riparian vegetation along the water course through the subject property at 70 and 210 11 Street SE. Overstory is dominated by Maple, Douglas fir, Birch, and Western red cedar..



File: R3-3005900

January 17, 2017

Via Email: info@valhallaconsulting.ca

Matthew Davidson
Valhalla Environmental Consulting Inc.
11510 Upper Summit Drive
Coldstream, British Columbia
V1B 2B4

**Re: Section 11 Water Sustainability Act Application "Changes In and About a Stream"
– Storm Sewer Outfalls – Construction / Maintenance – Storm system in Salmon Arm**

Staff with the Ecosystems Section of the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations have reviewed the above mentioned authorized change application. A Section 11 *Water Sustainability Act* Change Approval is not required for the proposed work as long as the work is done in accordance with BC Regulation 36/2016 – Part 3.

As per section 38 (1) *A person proposing to make an authorized change, other than an authorized change described in Section 39 (1) (o) to (s), (2) and (5), must*

- (a) *Provide a notice, signed by the person or the person's agent, to a habitat officer of the particulars of the proposal at least 45 days before beginning the authorized change, and*
- (b) *Obtain from a habitat officer a statement of the Terms and Conditions described in section 44 (2) [protection of aquatic ecosystems] on which the authorized change can proceed.*

The terms and conditions you must follow for your works are outlined here:

http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/air-land-water/water/water-rights/terms_and_conditions_for_cias_th_ok_2016.pdf

It is the proponent's responsibility to ensure their activities are in compliance with all legislation, including the *Fisheries Act*, as well as with local government bylaws and regulations.

If you have further questions please contact the undersigned at 250-371-6219.

Yours truly,

Mark Phillipotts
Ecosystems Biologist



File R3-3005900

March 14, 2017

Via Email: info@valhallaconsulting.ca

Matthew Davidson
Valhalla Environmental Consulting Inc.
11510 Upper Summit Drive
Coldstream, British Columbia
V1B 2B4

Re: File R3-3005900 Section 11 Water Sustainability Act Notification Letter for Construction - Maintenance of a Stormwater Pipe System on an Unnamed Watercourse in Salmon Arm

Dear Matthew,

After reviewing additional information received regarding the unnamed watercourse on or near 70 and 210 11th Street SE Salmon Arm, the Ministry of Forests Lands and Natural Resource Operations (FLNRO) is rescinding its authorized change under Part 3 of the Water Sustainability Act Regulations. An assessment of the watercourse which was not included in your authorized change notification to Front Counter British Columbia claims the watercourse is likely a natural stream. The assessment also states that the Riparian Areas Regulation (RAR) would apply to this stream. Once a subdivision application is submitted by the proponent, RAR would be triggered and the required RAR assessment would be based on the current state of the property.

FLNRO does not support extensive culverting of natural drainages. Due to the conflicting information mentioned above, FLNRO will take a precautionary approach and at this time considers the watercourse in question to be a natural stream.

To move forward FLNRO suggests the proponent adopt one of the following options;

1. Hire a qualified professional hydrologist to determine if the watercourse in question is a natural stream or exclusively stormwater collection flow. If a hydrologist determines the watercourse has no natural water input, FLNRO would allow the watercourse to be culverted.
2. Proceed with development of the property while following a Riparian Areas Regulation assessment report prepared by a qualified professional. FLNRO

Ministry of Forests, Lands
& Natural Resource
Operations

Thompson/Okanagan Region
Thompson Office

Mailing Address:
1259 Dalhousie Drive
Kamloops BC V2C 5Z5


Telephone: 250 371-6200
Facsimile: 250 828-4000

contends there are social and environmental benefits from the watercourse and recommends retaining the streamside protection and enhancement area identified from a RAR assessment.

3. Proceed with development of the property while following a Riparian Areas Regulation assessment prepared by a qualified professional and apply to realign the watercourse to minimize interference to subdivided lots.

Please advise how you would like to proceed at your earliest convenience by contacting the undersigned at 250-371-6219

Sincerely,




Mark Phillpotts
Ecosystems Biologist

Ministry of Forests, Lands
& Natural Resource
Operations

Thompson/Okanagan Region
Thompson Office

Mailing Address:
1259 Dalhousie Drive
Kamloops BC V2C 5Z5

Telephone: 250 371-6200
Facsimile: 250 828-4000



Arsenault Environmental Consulting Ltd.

21 January 2020

Proposal No. 19-34

Gary Out
(gary@65plusliving.com)
International Seniors Community Inc.
577 Palmerston Avenue,
Toronto, ON, M6G 2P6

SCOPE OF WORK AND COST ESTIMATE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES RELATED TO ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FOR A STREAM POTENTIALLY EFFECTED BY SUBDIVISION AND HOUSE CONSTRUCTION THROUGH LOT 210, 11TH STREET, SALMON ARM, BC

Dear Gary,

As per our discussion today regarding work scope and project staging, Arsenault Environmental Consulting Ltd. (Arsenault) is pleased to provide the following *revised proposal* for environmental planning services to International Seniors Community Inc. (the Client). This revision is partly based on the results of a meeting and site visit conducted during 08 January 2020. The services specifically relate to conducting an assessment of a small drainage that presently passes diagonally through Plan B4487, Lot 210, and beside Lot 70, 11th Street SE, Salmon Arm, BC (the Property).

Arsenault has over 27 years of environmental consulting experience, 21 years of consulting experience in the Shuswap region, and has direct experience in Salmon Arm.

1:0 PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

Arsenault understands that the work proposed by the Client is to subdivide lots 70 and 210 of Plan B4487 (the Property) and potentially realign or culvert the lower portion of a stream. City of Salmon Arm mapping indicates that a stream bisects Lot 210. Our Property visit confirmed the presence of a stream. Local residents indicated to Arsenault that drainage has been altered upstream of the Property and that what used to be an ephemeral stream now flows year-round. Arsenault discussed the potential to realign portions of the drainage with Kevin Pearson, Director of Planning at the City of Salmon Arm on 20 September 2017. Mr. Pearson was aware of the history of the property. He stated that the City considers the drainage a stream, which



would require a Riparian Areas Regulation (RAR) assessment. He agreed with the concept of stream realignment, with enhancement and retention of trees as much as possible, under provincial permission. The City would be a referral agent for an application to the province. Once the lower portion of the drainage is approved to be realigned, a subdivision application can be made, triggering the need for a RAR assessment of the new stream alignment. General buffer distances can be worked into the development plan.

An application to subdivide property containing environmentally sensitive features triggers the requirement for a development permit (K. Pearson, pers. comm., 2017). A RAR assessment report would be required to support a subdivision application. Although the drainage is not mapped as a stream on Map 5.2 from the Salmon Arm Official Community Plan, a note on the map indicates that inventory is incomplete.

The following sections outline the scope of work for Arsenault to complete these tasks.

Task 1 – Environmental Assessment of Property

An environmental assessment will layout environmental constraints and opportunities on the Property. This includes valuable tree clusters, wildlife corridors, aesthetic views, and riparian buffers. Information collected during this task can be used for environmental planning throughout the duration of the project.

A RAR report may be required to support the subdivision application. The RAR assessment would be conducted on the existing stream alignment. A report will be submitted to the client. Arsenault would require copies of other RAR assessments completed for the Property. These will help to keep the RAR assessment cost down. This preliminary RAR assessment report would not be submitted to the Province unless stream realignment turns out to not be a desired option. A call will be made to the Province to inquire about the feasibility of realignment of part of the drainage.

If the Client wishes to realign the stream to allow for housing development on the lower portion of Lot 210, a Change Order approval from the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operation and Rural Development (FLNRO&RD) under Regulation 39(1) of the *Water Sustainability Act* (WSA) will be required. Details will be required on the present stream including where the stream flow used to originate, and on the overall riparian values in the existing and potential new alignment.

The project biologist, and an assistant, would visit the Property over one day to map and record ecosystem and species data, including significant tree clusters and steep slopes. Data will be collected with a hand-held mapping-grade GPS. The assessment would include documentation of the riparian habitat, including selection of an appropriate alignment for sections of the stream. A meeting to discuss the new alignment with the Client would be beneficial.

Task 1 would provide the information required to decide whether realignment of a portion of the stream changes the feasibility of your project. If the Client decides that realignment of a portion of the stream is required, Arsenault can provide the following tasks to get you through the permitting and construction stages. The RAR report would then be updated, and submitted to the Province, after the stream has been realigned (see Task 7).

Task 2 – Realignment and Environmental Management Plan

The information obtained from this assessment will be incorporated in an environmental management plan (EMP) report that will be required to gain approval from FLNRO&RD. The plan will be presented as a concept with sufficient detail for approvals. Ponds will be considered as potential desirable features in the design to retain post-development flows equivalent to pre-development flows. The Client will be consulted on the design.

The report will provide a project description, stream realignment justification (to be provided by Client), assessment methods, effects assessment, mitigation measures, planting and enhancement designs, and a conclusion on whether the project would result in harm to aquatic habitat and a net loss or gain in environmental values.

The EMP report will also include conceptual designs for offsets and trade-offs for Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) encroachment (including tree clusters). GIS maps will be provided that will show ESAs and enhancement areas. A detailed topographic survey of the existing stream and the potential realignment route will be required from the Client.

Task 3 – WSA Permit Application

Changing the path of a stream will require approval from the Water Management Division at the Ministry of FLNRO&RD. Arsenault will prepare and submit a WSA Change Order application on your behalf. The Client will need to provide a letter of permission in order for Arsenault to act on your behalf. The Client will also need to provide a \$250 permit fee (not included in budget estimate) to FrontCounter BC.

Task 4 – Permit Facilitation, Meetings and Project Management

Task 4 provides time for permit facilitation, meetings, and project management. Arsenault will meet with FLNRO staff from Kamloops at the Property and follow up with phone calls and emails, if required. Arsenault assumes that one meeting will be required with the Client and potentially one with City staff. In addition, there are likely to be numerous phone calls and emails to the Client, FLNRO&RD, as well as to the City.

Project management bridges all tasks and is an important part of getting a project done on time and within budget. Arsenault will communicate budget and timelines with the Client on a monthly basis, at time of invoicing or sooner.

Task 5 – Environmental Monitoring of Realignment

Environmental monitoring will be a requirement from the Province and City during construction of the new stream channel and potentially during construction of the sub-division, especially during diversion of water out of the existing channel. Salvage may be required if aquatic species could perish during drying out of the existing channel. Effort for monitoring cannot be estimated at this time. Arsenault will be pleased to provide a detailed cost estimate for monitoring, and maybe even construction supervision, after the WSA permit is received. As a rough estimate for budgeting one should allow for \$13,700 for environmental services during construction.

Task 6 – RAR Update and Environmental Compliance Monitoring

An uploaded RAR and monitoring are general requirements of Development Permits and recommendations for an appropriate monitoring program are required in the RAR report. The

RAR report will be updated with the new stream alignment section and setbacks overlaid with the Client's development plan. The RAR report then has to be uploaded on the Provincial RAR Registry. Once the RAR is accepted by the Province, the City can issue their development permit. Monthly monitoring during construction, a post-construction visit, and a one-year post construction visit are required under the RAR legislation. Allow \$4,500 for an estimated budget.

2.0 COST ESTIMATE

Arsenault's charges associated with the Project will be on a time and expenses basis in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the attached Consulting Agreement, which along with this proposal would form the contract for this cost for completing tasks 1 to 3 of the scope of work outlined in the attached proposal. Project management and permit facilitation could cost about \$ [REDACTED] environmental services during construction to cover stream [REDACTED] monitoring. The RAR assessment can be updated after the [REDACTED] has been realigned and is estimated at [REDACTED] (including RAR monitoring). Arsenault expects that channel measurements will be taken from the as-built designs of the new stream channel, or during environmental monitoring of the realignment. A cost estimate breakdown is provided in Table 1 below. A detailed fee schedule can be provided at the Client's request.

Table 1: Cost Estimate for QEP and Project Management Services

Task Description	Fees	Equipment and Disbursements	Subtotal
Task 1 – Inventory and Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report			
Task 2 – Stream Relocation and Environmental Management Plan			
Task 3 – WSA Permit Application			
Sub Total			
Task 4 – Permit Facilitation, Meetings and Project Management			
Task 5 – Monitoring of Realignment			
Task 6 – RAR Update and Post-construction Monitoring			

*Tax not included. Disbursements includes 10% fee. Costs for tasks 5 and 6 are at Client's request.

A 60% retainer of tasks 1 to 3 will be required.

Assumptions

- Arsenault assumes that the Client will commence with this scope of work within two-months. This work scope and cost estimate is valid for 60 days.
- Construction-related service cost estimates are rough estimates in this work program.
- The RAR re-assessment and monitoring (Task 6) will be required once the stream has been relocated, and is provided for budgeting purposes. Arsenault assumes that the

RAR re-assessment, and notification to the Province via the RAR Notification System, may be required prior to issuance of a development permit.

- The Client will provide digital base mapping of the Property with property boundaries and easements, etc.

3.0 SCHEDULE

Arsenault will commence with tasks 1 and 2 upon receiving the signed Consulting Agreement and retainer. We would expect to have Task 1 completed within three weeks and tasks 2 and 3 completed within 10 weeks after receipt of the signed contract. WSA permit approvals can take about 120 days to process, depending upon the complexity of the project.

4.0 CLOSURE


We trust the information contained in this proposal meets your requirements at this time. Should you wish to proceed with this work, please sign and return the Consulting Agreement. A retainer of \$4,500 will be required. If you have any questions, please call the undersigned at 250-300-9206.

Regards,



Darryl Arsenault, M.Sc., R.P. Bio.
Senior Fisheries Biologist





Attachments: Consulting Agreement



 Subject Properties



PLAT BOOK 16, 2014, CONNECTOR 41, SALMON ARM DISTRICT, LAWSON ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES/PROJECT 11111 - 4TH AVENUE SE CONNECTOR/AVENUE SE CONNECTOR - 0+ - PROJECT 0102-040-0000



LEGEND

EXISTING

- HYDRO/TELEPHONE POLE
- HYDRO/TELEPHONE POLE C/W SHIRT
- TELEPHONE POLE
- HYDRO POLE C/W TRANS.
- POST TOP STREET LIGHT
- SEW
- SANITARY MANHOLE
- STORM MANHOLE
- GATCHMASH
- FIRE HYDRANT
- GATE VALVE
- SANITARY SEWER
- FORCE MAIN
- WATER MAIN
- GAS
- UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE
- FDCE
- DEBRIS/AIR/VENTHOLE

PROPOSED

- SANITARY MANHOLE
- STORM MANHOLE
- GATCHMASH
- GATE VALVE
- FIRE HYDRANT
- SANITARY SEWER
- STORM SEWER
- WATER MAIN
- ETC/ETC
- WELT/BULLET HEADWALL
- END CAP
- WHEEL CHAIR RAMP
- DECKWAY LIFTDOWN

NOTES:

- CONTRIBUTE TO VERIFY LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES WITH ALL UTILITY COMPANIES PRIOR TO DIGGING.
- CONTRIBUTE TO RE-EVALUATE UTILITY RELATIONSHIP WORKS WITH UTILITY COMPANIES AS REQUIRED.
- ALL CONSTRUCTION TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF SALMON ARM RESOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT BYLAW NO. 4163.

NO.	DATE	ISSUED FOR	BY	CHK.
1	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL
2	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL
3	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL
4	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL

REVISIONS

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY	CHK.
1	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL
2	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL
3	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL
4	MAR	ISSUED FOR DESIGN	AT	BL

DRAFT

DESIGN: AGW
 DRAWN: AGW
 DATE: 14-MAR-18
 CHECKED: BTL

P.DWG
 SCALED: 0 HORIZ. = 1:1000 23

LAWSON ENGINEERING & DEVELOPMENT
 1111 1111
 1000 LAMAR DRIVE W
 SALMON ARM, BC

4TH AVE SE CONNECTOR

4TH AVENUE SE SALMON ARM, BC


4TH AVENUE SE PROJECT DISTURBANCE & PROPERTY ACQUISITION PLAN

STATIONS 0+000 TO 0+450

PRODUCT No. **11-11**

SHEET **9** OF **10**

DRG. No. **C-1** REV. No. **1**



**DRAFT
(ISSUED FOR
DISCUSSION)**

LEGEND

- EXISTING:
 - PROPOSED 20th ROAD
 - PROPOSED SEWER ALIGNMENT
 - PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER ALIGNMENT
 - PROPOSED 20th ROAD RELOCATION ROAD
 - PROPOSED URBAN LOCAL ROAD STANDARDS
 - UTILITY RIGHT OF WAY
 - EXISTING ROAD RIGHT OF WAY EDUCATION
 - PROPOSED WATER MAIN ALIGNMENT

NOTES:

- CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES WITH ALL UTILITY COMPANIES PRIOR TO DIGGING.
- CONTRACTOR TO CO-ORDINATE UTILITY RELOCATION WORKS WITH UTILITY COMPANIES AS REQUIRED.
- ALL CONSTRUCTION TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF SALMON ARM SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BY-LAW No 418.

NO.	DATE (BY DRAWER)	DESCRIPTION	BY	APP'D
1		ISSUED FOR DISCUSSION	AGW	BTJ

REVISIONS

DESIGN	AGW
DRAWN	AGW
DATE	19-12-19
CHECKED	BTJ

SCALE: NONE = 1:500

LAWSON ENGINEERING & SURVEYING
4236 LAWSON DRIVE
PO BOX 100 SALMON ARM, BC V1E 4N2
(250) 833-3200

CITY OF SALMON ARM

4 AVENUE CONNECTOR REALIGNMENT

OVERALL PROJECT SERVICING PLAN

PROJECT No. **11 - 45**

SHEET **2** OF **6**

DWG. No. **S-1** OF **0**

CITY OF
SALMON ARM

*Memorandum from the
 Engineering and Public
 Works Department*

TO: Kevin Pearson, Director of Development Services
 DATE: 29 April 2020
 PREPARED BY: Chris Moore, Engineering Assistant
 OWNER: 604895 BC Ltd. 1860 – 20th St SE, Salmon Arm, BC, V1E 4N2
 APPLICANT: Green Emerald Construction/ Gary Arsenault
 SUBJECT: ZONING AMENDMENT APPLICATION FILE NO. ZON-1171
 LEGAL: Lot 1 Section 13 Township 20 Range 10 W6M KDYD Plan KAP54150
 AND That Part of Lot 1 Shown on Plan B4487; Section 13 Township 20
 Range 10 W6M KDYD Plan 1521
 CIVIC: 70 – Street SE and 210 - 11 Street SE

Further to your referral dated 28 February 2020, we provide the following servicing information.

At rezoning stage, the owner shall provide the City with a Road Reserve for 4 Avenue SE, on the subject property's southern boundary. The Road Reserve will be up to 20m width, aligning with existing 3 Avenue SE (extent to be confirmed by a BCLS). The City will pay fair market value for the Road Reserve.

As a condition of rezoning the Owner / Developer shall undertake an updated Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). This shall include a Traffic Generation Analysis based on the highest and best use for the proposed zoning. Recommendations from the updated TIA may result in additional road improvement requirements. Prior to completion of rezoning a covenant shall be registered on title specifying that the requirements of the TIA are to be fulfilled prior to any further development.

The following comments and servicing requirements are not conditions for Rezoning; however, these comments are provided as a courtesy in advance of any development proceeding to the next stages:

General:

1. Full municipal services are required as noted herein. Owner / Developer to comply fully with the requirements of the Subdivision and Development Services Bylaw No 4163. Notwithstanding the comments contained in this referral, it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure these standards are met.
2. Comments provided below reflect the best available information. Detailed engineering data, or other information not available at this time, may change the contents of these comments.
3. Properties shall have all necessary public infrastructure installed to ensure properties can be serviced with underground electrical and telecommunication wiring upon development.
4. Property under the control and jurisdiction of the municipality shall be reinstated to City satisfaction.
5. Owner / Developer will be responsible for all costs incurred by the City of Salmon Arm during construction and inspections. This amount may be required prior to construction. Contact City Engineering Department for further clarification.

ZONING AMENDMENT APPLICATION FILE NO. ZON-1171

29 April 2020

Page 2

6. Erosion and Sediment Control measures will be required prior to the commencement of construction. ESC plans to be approved by the City of Salmon Arm.
7. At the time of subdivision the applicant will be required to submit for City review and approval a detailed site servicing / lot grading plan for all on-site (private) work. This plan will show such items as parking lot design, underground utility locations, pipe sizes, pipe elevations, pipe grades, catchbasin(s), control/containment of surface water, contours (as required), lot/corner elevations, impact on adjacent properties, etc.
8. For the off-site improvements at the time of development the applicant will be required to submit for City review and approval detailed engineered plans for all off-site construction work. These plans must be prepared by a qualified engineer. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant will be required to deposit with the City funds equaling 125% of the estimated cost for all off-site construction work.

Roads / Access:

1. The limitations of the Okanagan Avenue East /11 Street SE intersection are documented in the Hamilton Associates Traffic Review dated April 2, 2003. However, this report did not include a full Traffic Generation Analysis and an updated Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) will be required. The TIA shall include a Traffic Generation Analysis based on the highest and best use for the proposed zoning and the recommendations from the updated TIA may result in additional road improvement requirements.
2. 11 Street SE, on the subject property's western boundary, is designated as an Urban Local Road standard, requiring 20.0m road dedication (10.0m on either side of road centerline). Available records indicate that no additional road dedication is required (to be confirmed by a BCLS).
3. 11 Street SE is currently constructed to an Interim Local Paved Road standard. Upgrading to an Urban Local Road Standard is required, in accordance with Specification Drawing No. RD-2. Upgrading may include, but is not limited to, road widening and construction, curb & gutter, sidewalk, boulevard construction, street lighting, fire hydrants, street drainage and underground hydro and telecommunications. Owner / Developer is responsible for all associated costs.
4. An undeveloped portion of Okanagan Avenue SE, on the subject property's northern boundary is designated as an Urban Collector Road standard, requiring 20.0m road dedication (10.0m on either side of road centerline). Available records indicate that no additional road dedication is required (to be confirmed by a BCLS). No vehicle access will be permitted to the Okanagan Avenue SE frontage and a covenant to this effect should be registered on title. No upgrades are required at this time.
5. 4 Avenue SE, on the subject property's southern boundary is designated as a Urban Local Road. Upgrading to an Urban Local Road Standard is required, in accordance with Specification Drawing No. RD-2. As this work is considered premature, the developer will be required to pay to the City a cash in lieu payment, equivalent to the cost of construction of 50% of 4 Avenue SE along the subject property's frontage prior to development. Construction costs shall include, but not be limited to, road widening and construction, curb & gutter,

ZONING AMENDMENT APPLICATION FILE NO. ZON-1171

29 April 2020

Page 3

sidewalk, boulevard construction, street lighting, fire hydrants, street drainage and hydro and telecommunications. Owner / Developer is responsible for all associated costs.

6. Owner / Developer is responsible for ensuring all boulevards and driveways are graded at 2.0% towards the existing roadway. Drainage course shall not be located within boulevard.
7. A trail connection is required to be dedicated and constructed as shown in the OCP Bylaw No. 4000. Dedication shall be a minimum of 3.0m wide. Trails to be constructed as per Specification Drawings Nos. CGS 8 -10.
8. Internal roadways are to be a minimum of 7.3m measured from face of curb. Truck turning movements shall be properly analysed to ensure internal road network will allow emergency and service vehicle access.

Water:

1. The subject property fronts a 200mm diameter Zone 2 watermain on Okanagan Avenue SE and 150mm on 11 Street SE. Upgrading of the 150mm diameter watermain on 11 Avenue SE to 200mm along the subject property's frontage will be required. All internal mains to be looped. A stub has been previously been installed on the 200mm watermain on Okanagan Avenue SE for use by proposed development.
2. Since the section of watermain on 11 Avenue SE from the subject property to Okanagan Avenue will remain undersized, the Owner / Developer's authorized engineer is to complete a flow test on the closest fire hydrant to confirm that this existing watermain is adequately sized to provide fire flows in accordance with the requirements of the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw No 4163. If the existing watermain has insufficient capacity to meet the required fire flow, the Owner / Developer will be required to upgrade this section of watermain to 200mm also.
3. Records indicate that 70 & 210 11 Street SE are serviced from the 150mm diameter watermain on 11 Street SE by services of unknown size. All existing inadequate / unused services must be abandoned at the main. Owner / Developer is responsible for all associated costs.
4. The proposed development is to be serviced by single metered water service connection (as per Specification Drawing No. W-11), adequately sized to satisfy the proposed. Water meter will be supplied by the City at the time of building permit, at the Owner / Developer's cost. Owner / Developer is responsible for all associated costs.
5. The subject property is in an area with sufficient fire flows and pressures according to the 2011 Water Study (OD&K 2012).
6. Fire protection requirements to be confirmed with the Building Department and Fire Department.
7. Fire hydrant installation will be required. Owner / Developer's engineer shall review the site to ensure placement of fire hydrants meet the medium / high density spacing requirements of 90 meters.

Sanitary:

1. The subject property is at the easterly termination of a 200mm diameter sanitary main on 11 Street SE. No upgrades are anticipated at this time.
2. The proposed development is to be serviced by a single sanitary service connection adequately sized (minimum 100mm diameter) to satisfy the servicing requirements of the development. Owner / Developer is responsible for all associated costs.
3. Records indicate that the 70 & 210 11 Street SE are serviced by 100mm services from the sanitary sewer on 11 Street SE. All existing inadequate/unused services must be abandoned at the main. Owner / Developer is responsible for all associated costs.
4. Developer to extend sanitary main internally as well as extending the sanitary mains in such a manner as to be provide servicing for properties to the south-east. Sanitary mains shall be sized with capacity for external post development flows. Developer would be entitled to register a Latecomer's Agreement to recoup costs should any over sizing be required.
5. The City Sanitary Sewer Master Plan (2016) indicates that the downstream sanitary system has capacity concerns. Owner / Developer's engineer is required to prove that there is sufficient downstream capacity within the existing City Sanitary Sewer System to receive the proposed discharge from the development or external improvements may be required prior to development proceeding.

Drainage:

1. The subject property fronts a 450mm diameter storm sewer on its northern interior boundary, located within a 3m right-of-way. No upgrades are anticipated at this time; however, a 3m right-of-way shall be provided to increase total right-of-way width to 6m.
2. An Integrated Stormwater Management Plan (ISMP) conforming to the requirements of the Subdivision and Development Servicing Bylaw No. 4163, Schedule B, Part 1, Section 7 shall be provided.
3. Where onsite disposal of stormwater is recommended by the ISMP, an "Alternative Stormwater System" shall be provided in accordance with Section 7.2.
4. Where discharge into the Municipal Stormwater Collection System is recommended by the ISMP, this shall be in accordance with Section 7.3. The proposed lots shall be serviced each by a single storm service connection adequately sized (minimum 150mm) to satisfy the servicing requirements of the development. There are known capacity issues downstream of the development. Owner / Developer's engineer is required to prove that there is sufficient downstream capacity within the existing City Storm System to receive the proposed discharge from the development. All existing inadequate / unused services must be abandoned at the main. Owner / Developer is responsible for all associated costs.
5. Storm infrastructure should be sized with capacity for external post-development flows. Developer would be entitled to register a Latecomer's Agreement to recoup costs should any over sizing be required.

ZONING AMENDMENT APPLICATION FILE NO. ZON-1171

29 April 2020

Page 5

6. Extension of the storm sewer along 11 Street SE will be required to provide street drainage to the frontage of the subject property, to the 4 Avenue SE connector and to the re-routed overland storm drainage. Storm sewer shall be sized with capacity for external post development flows. Developer would be entitled to register a Latecomer's Agreement to recoup costs should any over sizing be required.
7. The subject properties are crossed by a watercourse that is subject to Riparian Area Regulations. Subject to all necessary approvals including but not limited to QEP and FLNRO approvals, the Engineering Department would not object to the re-routing of the watercourse and piping of the stormwater within any City roadways.
8. Natural drainage course shall be subject to 7.16.6 of the SDSB No. 4163.

Geotechnical:

1. A geotechnical report in accordance with the Engineering Departments Geotechnical Study Terms of Reference for: Category A (Building Foundation Design), Category B (Pavement Structural Design), Category C (Landslide Assessment), is required.



Chris Moore
Engineering Assistant



Jenn Wilson P.Eng., LEED® AP
City Engineer



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
PRELIMINARY BYLAW
COMMUNICATION

Your File #: ZON-1171
eDAS File #: 2020-01068
Date: Apr/15/2020

City of Salmon Arm
Development Services
500 2nd Avenue NE
PO Box 40
Salmon Arm, BC V1E 4N2
Canada

Attention: City of Salmon Arm, Development Services

Re: Proposed Bylaw 4378 for:
**LOT 1 SECTION 13 TOWNSHIP 20 RANGE 10 W6M KDYD PLAN KAP54150
THAT PART OF LOT 1 SHOWN ON PLAN B4487; SECTION 13 TOWNSHIP
20 RANGE 10 W6M KDYD PLAN 1521
210 11 Street SE
70 11 Street SE**

Preliminary Approval is granted for the rezoning for one year pursuant to section 52(3)(a) of the *Transportation Act*.

If you have any questions please feel free to call Tara Knight at (250) 833-3374.
Yours truly,

Tara Knight
Development Officer

Local District Address
Salmon Arm Area Office Bag 100 850C 16th Street NE Salmon Arm, BC V1E 4S4 Canada Phone: (250) 712-3660 Fax: (250) 833-3380

From: noreply@civicplus.com <noreply@civicplus.com>

Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2020 9:14 PM

To: Alan Harrison Chad Eliason Debbie Cannon Kevin Flynn Louise Wallace-Richmond Sylvia Lindgren Tim Lavery Carl Bannister Erin Jackson

Subject: Online Form Submittal: Mayor and Council

Mayor and Council

First Name Shannon

Last Name Hecker

Address:

Return email address:

Subject: 11th Street SE proposed rezoning application

Body To Mayor and Council,

As a resident on 11th Street SE, I am aware that there is an application before council to rezone and develop the land currently zoned R-1 low density(30, 70, 210) to R-4 high density.

It is my understanding that the developer has indicated that there is support from neighbourhood residents in favour of the rezoning and the development. This is not the case for all residents. I am against rezoning. The artist rendering of Shuswap Village that I saw in December 2019, which the developer and the Vancouver Resource Society proposed to citizens, in no way resembles what is currently proposed to Council. The rendering may have misled the publics understanding of the development.

In theory, it would be an innovative idea to have a "live in place" eco village for seniors.
In reality, this is the wrong land for this to happen. There are no easy walking paths for walkers to the downtown core, therefore, seniors would likely have to drive, which would

increase automobile traffic on Okanagan Ave and the proposed route down 3rd avenue.

Living through a pandemic has cities all around the world reconsidering urban planning and zoning applications by developers for higher density. What we have learned from months of isolation, is that we need more green space, not less. Thriving, connected neighbourhoods with easy access to streams, forests and pathways require less density, not more.

The City of Salmon Arm has the opportunity to continue to act on its Green Ways Strategy to preserve and protect green space, support corridors for ecological connectivity and provide healthy transportation routes.

To be clear, I am not opposed to development. My main concerns and reasons for opposing R-4 zoning:

- Protecting the Riparian Zone: There is an existing stream that needs protection from being directed underground.
- Transportation considerations that will alter this already thriving and connected downtown neighbourhood.
- Lessons learned from Covid-19 outbreak: Nature heals. We need less density, not more.
- Soil sensitivity issues

Thank you for your consideration,

Shannon Hecker

Would you like a response: Yes

Disclaimer

Written and email correspondence addressed to Mayor and Council may become public documents once received by the City. Correspondence addressed to Mayor and Council is routinely published within the Correspondence Section of Regular Council Agendas.

From: noreply@civicplus.com <noreply@civicplus.com>

Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2020 9:29 PM

To: Alan Harrison Chad Eliason Debbie Cannon Kevin Flynn Louise Wallace-Richmond Sylvia Lindgren Tim Lavery Carl Bannister Erin Jackson

Subject: Online Form Submittal: Mayor and Council

Mayor and Council

First Name Mike and Laurie

Last Name DeFelice

Address:

Return email address:

Subject: R1 - R4 Zoning Application (Arsenault, Gary) / Shuswap Village

Body June 14, 2020

Dear Mayor Harrison and City Council

Re: Proposed Rezoning Change from R1 to R4 (11th Street, S.E.)

This has been a long established R1 Community and we chose this location for our home and it has been our home for 28 years. We love this area, the Community and the Forests that surround us that provide a green space that many other cities or towns would envy.

The lay of this land is not conducive to high density living due to the steep slopes, the already identified Riparian designation and the soil sensitivity issues on said property as well as the traffic safety issues for all roads and access onto Okanagan Avenue. The increase in driver's making their way downtown

would make for a myriad of twists and turns with some drivers either trying to access Okanagan from all streets below and/or off 11th Street, S.E. putting lives, and families with children, at risk. We live on a hill and for that fact, the issues are vast.

We are writing to advise that we do not support the proposed rezoning application from R1 to R4 on 11th Street, S.E. through Land Developer, Gary Arsenault whom will be addressing the Planning Committee on June 15th. For many of us, we would hope this does not go past first or second reading. We believe that this area should remain R1 to be better suited for larger lots for single family dwellings with Park Space.

We would like to take this opportunity to have Council meet with the residents on 11th Street, S.E. to view the property and address their concerns and are open to coordinating this at any time

Thank you for your time and consideration.....

Respectfully,

Mike and Laurie DeFelice
(250-803-1522 – Mike's Cell)

Would you like a response: Yes

Disclaimer

Written and email correspondence addressed to Mayor and Council may become public documents once received by the City. Correspondence addressed to Mayor and Council is routinely published within the Correspondence Section of Regular Council Agendas.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

From: noreply@civicplus.com <noreply@civicplus.com>

Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2020 9:36 PM

To: Alan Harrison Chad Eliason Debbie Cannon Kevin Flynn Louise Wallace-Richmond Sylvia Lindgren Tim Lavery Carl Bannister Erin Jackson

Subject: Online Form Submittal: Mayor and Council

Mayor and Council

First Name Janet

Last Name Naylor

Address:

Return email address:

Subject: Rezoning of property 70 and 210 11th St. SE

Body Dear Mayor Harrison and City Council

I understand that at the Planning Committee meeting of June 15, Gary Arsenault will be giving a presentation on the development he envisions on 11th St. SE., advertised as Shuswap Village. I would like to state that I would like the zoning to remain R1. The whole area is single family residential. Any development needs to keep to the spirit of the area. People bought their properties here because of the area. In December, I wrote a list of questions about this development to you and received a very explanatory reply from Kevin Pearson. I also met separately with Mayor Harrison and Kevin Pearson. I felt that I was listened to and I understood more about the process. Thank you to both. My main concerns were that we keep the creek and maintain the look of the street, with all its trees. The development itself actually looked promising, if development had to happen. There were public meetings to show us what the company was thinking of building. I would say the response to the idea was positive. The conceptual drawings showed houses with space between them, a community building with various activities,

including a swimming pool, paths around the property, green space etc. The advertising is for bungalow style homes. We were told that this was just an artist's rendering, but it was certainly made to be appealing. I spoke against the site, not the idea, because I do not think this site is suitable for seniors. In the six months since then, I can't believe how different the proposal appears! It looks like there could be 120 units, some of which are three stories high. They are all crammed together and I no longer get that sense of openness or community. The developer is already assuming that the creek will be put into a drainage canal of some sort.

The developer has been talking with various people in the neighbourhood, and I feel that rumours are flying. We hear that the Septs and Mr. Cuisson have already sold their properties to the developer. We have heard that many people have signed a statement that they are totally in agreement with this proposal. How can that be, when we don't really know what the proposal is? Zelda, who lives at the corner of 4th and 11th, has felt very pressured to sell her property, or to give a right of way for the road. She was packing boxes in anticipation of having to move out by this summer. She is afraid she will be forced to move. Barb Hughes, who lives on the property, and has rented there for at least 45 years, hears very little first hand and has to rely on others to tell her what is happening. Where is the concern for these seniors?

I understand the traffic needs are being addressed. But unless you live on this street, you can't truly understand that even opening up 3rd or 4th Ave. will not help the problem. People will try to go downtown using the intersection of 11th and Okanagan, which is a blind hill. We are talking of adding a considerable number of cars to an already dangerous corner. The other routes require going slightly out of the way, which people tend not to like to do. This development will put far too many cars on the street. And yes, seniors do drive a lot! I, like many of the people who attended the presentations in December, think the village idea sounds good. I really don't think this is the site. This site would be better suited to 20 big lots for single family homes, with a park area included.

Personally, I feel that the developer is really not sure of what his final project is going to look like. If he receives R4 zoning, with the difference in plans we have seen in six months, what can we expect by the time building commences?

I understand we will have time to say our piece if this comes to a public hearing. My hope is that it will not pass the first two readings. Please feel free to come for a walk on our property, where the creek flows through on its way to the subject property.

Thank you,
Jan Naylor

Would you like a response: Yes

Disclaimer

Written and email correspondence addressed to Mayor and Council may become public documents once received by the City. Correspondence addressed to Mayor and Council is routinely published within the Correspondence Section of Regular Council Agendas.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

CITY OF SALMON ARM

BYLAW NO. 4378

A bylaw to amend "District of Salmon Arm Zoning Bylaw No. 2303"

WHEREAS notice of a Public Hearing to be held by the Council of the City of Salmon Arm in the Salmon Arm Recreation Centre Auditorium, 2600 10 Avenue NE,, Salmon Arm, British Columbia, on _____, 2020 at the hour of 7:00 p.m. was published in the _____ and _____, 2020 issues of the Salmon Arm Observer;

AND WHEREAS the said Public Hearing was duly held at the time and place above mentioned;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Salmon Arm in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. "District of Salmon Arm Zoning Bylaw No. 2303" is hereby amended as follows:

Rezone that 5,140 m² portion of Lot 1, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan KAP54150 from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R4 (Medium Density Residential); and that part of Lot 1 shown on Plan B4487, Section 13, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 1521 from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R4 (Medium Density Residential); attached as Schedule "A".

2. SEVERABILITY

If any part, section, sub-section, clause of this bylaw for any reason is held to be invalid by the decisions of a Court of competent jurisdiction, the invalid portion shall be severed and the decisions that it is invalid shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this bylaw.

3. ENACTMENT

Any enactment referred to herein is a reference to an enactment of British Columbia and regulations thereto as amended, revised, consolidated or replaced from time to time.

4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This bylaw shall come into full force and effect upon adoption of same.

5. CITATION

This bylaw may be cited as "City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4378"

READ A FIRST TIME THIS DAY OF 2020

READ A SECOND TIME THIS DAY OF 2020

READ A THIRD TIME THIS DAY OF 2020

APPROVED PURSUANT TO SECTION 52 (3) (a) OF THE TRANSPORTATION ACT
ON THE DAY OF 2020


For Minister of Transportation & Infrastructure

ADOPTED BY COUNCIL THIS DAY OF 2020

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER

SCHEDULE "A"



Item 11.1

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor

Seconded: Councillor

THAT: Pursuant to Section 475 of the *Local Government Act*, Council has considered this Official Community Plan amendment after appropriate consultation with affected organizations and authorities;

AND THAT: Pursuant to Section 476 of the *Local Government Act*, Council has considered this Official Community Plan amendment after required consultation with School District No. 83;

AND THAT: Pursuant to Section 477 (3) (a) of the *Local Government Act*, Council has considered the amendment in conjunction with:

- 1) The Financial Plans of the City of Salmon Arm; and
- 2) The Liquid Waste Management Plan of the City of Salmon Arm;

AND THAT: the bylaw entitled City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 4393 be read a second time;

AND FURTHER THAT: the Public Hearing, be held at the Salmon Arm Recreation Centre on July 13, 2020.

[OCP4000-42; Edelweiss Properties Inc./Timberline Solutions/Baer, J.; 220 Okanagan Avenue SE; CC to HR]

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

CITY OF
SALMON ARM

TO: His Worship Mayor Harrison and Members of Council

DATE: May 25, 2020

SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. OCP4000-42
 Zoning Amendment Application No. 1175

Legal: Lot 1, Block 3, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 392,
 Except Plan EPP88691
 Civic: 220 Okanagan Avenue SE
 Owner: Edelweiss Properties Inc.
 Applicant / Agent: Timberline Solutions / J. Baer

MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION

- THAT:** A bylaw be prepared for Council's consideration, adoption of which would amend Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4000 Land Use Designation of Lot 1, Block 3, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 392, Except Plan EPP88691 from CC (City Centre Commercial) to HR (High Density Residential);
- AND THAT:** Pursuant to Section 475 of the *Local Government Act*, Council shall consider this Official Community Plan amendment after appropriate consultation with affected organizations and authorities;
- AND THAT:** Pursuant to Section 476 of the *Local Government Act*, Council shall consider this Official Community Plan amendment after required consultation with School District No. 83;
- AND THAT:** Pursuant to Section 477 (3) (a) of the *Local Government Act*, Second Reading of the Official Community Plan bylaw be withheld pending Council's consideration of the amendment in conjunction with:
- 1) The Financial Plans of the City of Salmon Arm; and
 - 2) The Liquid Waste Management Plan of the City of Salmon Arm.
- AND THAT:** A bylaw be prepared for Council's consideration, adoption of which would amend Zoning Bylaw No. 2303 by rezoning Lot 1, Block 3, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 392, Except Plan EPP88691 from C-2 (Town Centre Commercial Zone) to R-5 (High Density Residential Zone);
- AND FURTHER THAT:** Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw be withheld subject to:
- 1) Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure approval;
 - 2) Registration of a Section 219 Land Title Act restrictive covenant, restricting five residential dwelling units to rental units located on the subject property (220 Okanagan Avenue SE); and
 - 3) Adoption of the associated Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Motion for Consideration be adopted.

BACKGROUND

The civic address of the subject property is 220 Okanagan Avenue SE. The property is located at the corner of Okanagan Avenue SE and 2nd Street SE, near the Trans Canada Highway (Appendices 1 & 2). The owner and applicant wish to convert the lower floor of commercial space into 2 residential dwelling units. The applicant has submitted a site and a proposed lower floor plan (Appendix 3). Site photos are attached as Appendix 4. In 2018 a 2-storey building was constructed with 180 m² (1935 ft²) of commercial space on the lower floor and two residential units, approximately 75 – 85 m² (820 – 900 ft²) on the upper floor. Although the 3 upper floor dwelling units have been rented, the lower commercial space has been vacant since the building was constructed in 2018. Only upper or lower floor dwelling units, not both, are permitted in the C-2, Town Centre Commercial Zone. To convert the building to a residential building and eliminate commercial space on the lower floor, both an OCP and a zoning amendment are necessary. This application proposes to change the OCP designation from CC (Commercial City Centre) to HR (High Density Residential); and, a Zoning Amendment, to change the zoning from C-2, Town Centre Commercial Zone to R-5, High Density Residential Zone. OCP and zoning maps are attached as Appendices 4 & 5.

Land uses adjacent to the subject parcel include the following:

- North: Okanagan Avenue SE, C-2, Town Centre Commercial
- South: Single family dwelling, C-2, Town Centre Commercial
- East: Laneway & multi-family residential, R-5, High Density Residential
- West: 2nd Street SE, C-2 Town Centre Commercial

Originally the subject property, along with the two adjacent properties to the south were designated as High Density Residential and zoned R-1, Single Family Residential. In 2012, OCP and Zoning Bylaw Amendments were adopted which changed the OCP designation and zoning to it's present state, Commercial City Centre and C-2 Town Centre Commercial Zone respectively. A Development Permit was approved for the existing 2-storey mixed use building for the subject property, subject to conditions in 2013 and the Development Permit was issued in 2018. There was no further development on the two adjacent properties to the south (20 & 30 – 2 Street SE) as the owner of the property changed their development plans.

OCP POLICIES

This application proposes to reverse the OCP designation on the subject property back to its original designation of High Density Residential. This property borders the boundary between City Centre Commercial and High Density Residential. OCP Policy 8.3.19 supports high density residential developments in areas with good access to the following:

- transportation routes, including transit, trails and sidewalks, and roads;
- recreation, parks and open space;
- community services, e.g., commercial uses, schools.

Section 475 & 476– Local Government Act

Pursuant to Section 475 and 476 of the Local Government Act (consultation during OCP development / amendments), the proposed OCP amendment was referred to the following external organizations:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Adams Lake Indian Band: | No response to date |
| Neskonlith Indian Band: | No response to date |
| Economic Development Society: | No response to date |
| School District No. 83: | No response to date |

Section 477 – Local Government Act

Pursuant to Section 477 of the Local Government Act (adoption procedures for official community plan), after first reading, the OCP amendment bylaw must be considered in relation to the City's financial and waste management plans. In the opinion of staff, this proposed OCP amendment is largely consistent with both the City's financial and waste management plans.

COMMENTS

Engineering Department

No Engineering Department concerns.

Building Department

No concerns from a building point of view. Architect required if there are 5 or more dwelling units in the building. Building plans were submitted by Marc Lamerton Architect for the existing building.

Fire Department

No Fire Department concerns.

Planning Department

The location of the property is just south of the Trans-Canada Highway and borders the downtown commercial area to the north and the residential area to the south. The property is centrally located and provides good access to amenities in the downtown core in a neighbourhood which ranges from low density, single family homes to higher density multi-family residential developments.

A covenant prohibiting some commercial uses that were considered non-compatible in this transitional area between the Town Centre commercial area and the residential area was a condition to rezoning the parcel to C-2 in 2013. Because the property is located in this transitional area, changing the designation and rezoning the property back to residential is supported based on its location.

The maximum density permitted in the R-5 zone is 100 dwelling units or 40.5 dwelling units per acre. With a density bonus the maximum density increases to 130 dwelling units per hectare or 52.6 dwelling units per acre. With R-5 zoning, the maximum density on this property would be 4 dwelling units or 5 units with a density bonus. To qualify for a density bonus, a special amenity of rental units is proposed to be provided and secured in perpetuity by a Section 219 Land Title Act Covenant. The owner of the property is agreeable to the requirement for a covenant, see Appendix 7.

Unfortunately, the setbacks are significantly different between commercial and residential zoned properties. Under the current zoning, C-2 Town Centre Commercial, the maximum parcel or site coverage can be 100% of the parcel or site area and no setbacks. Under the proposed R-5, High Density Residential zoning, the maximum parcel coverage is 55% of the parcel area for all buildings, 70% if there is underground parking which is not applicable in this situation. The specified setbacks for principal buildings in the R-5 zone are: 5.0 m for front, rear and exterior parcel lines; and, 2.4 m for interior parcel lines. The existing building does not meet any of the required R-5 setbacks, see attached survey attached as Appendix 8. Therefore, it should be noted that if the property is rezoned to R-5, the building will have the status of legal, non-conforming with respect to parcel coverage and setbacks and subject to Section 529, of the Local Government Act (Non-conforming structures: restrictions on maintenance, extension and alteration).

With respect to parking requirements, the existing 6 parking spaces will meet the parking requirements as specified in the Zoning Bylaw. In this scenario, fewer parking spaces are required with R-5 zoning as compared to C-2 zoning; 1.25 off-street parking spaces are required under R-5 zoning and under C-2 zoning the parking requirements are based on gross floor area and the commercial use. A parking


variance was not required with the original Development Permit for the building because the property was included in the Downtown Specified Parking Area (Bylaw No. 4007) and the parking requirements are further reduced from 1.25 parking spaces to 1 parking space per dwelling unit because the property is included in the Downtown Specified Parking Area. Therefore, the existing 6 parking spaces is sufficient for the proposed 5 dwelling units.


CONCLUSION

This OCP & zoning amendment application proposes to revert the subject property from commercial back to residential to facilitate the conversion of lower floor commercial space to 2 residential dwelling units. The primary reason for the proposal is because the owner has been unable to lease the commercial space.

The property is located in a transitional area bordering the downtown commercial area to the north and the high density residential area to the south. The location of the property is supportive of this proposal. In addition, the density and parking provisions of the R-5 zone can be achieved. However, there are some implications with regards to parcel coverage and setbacks that will leave the property with a legal, non-conforming status should the OCP and zoning amendments be adopted:


Denise Ackerman
Planner, Development Services Department


Kevin Pearson, MCIP, RPP
Director of Development Services



0 5 10 20 30 40
Meters



Subject Parcel




0 1.25 2.5 5 7.5 10
Meters



Subject Parcel

SITE PLAN NOTES

1. Show building set out back of base Property Line.
2. Existing unshaded surface areas for reference purposes only. Shaded Outlines to be removed pending further review with City of Kelowna and per Development Permit 2 bylaws requirements.
3. Landscaping to be provided as per Development Permit requirements.




24
Block 2
Plan 392

23
Block 2
Plan 392

2
Block 3
Plan 392

1
Plan 11

<p>PROJECT: 220 Okanagan Ave. Mixed-Use Building Edwards Properties Kelowna, BC</p>	<p>DATE: February 2018</p>						
<p>SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" (AS SHOWN)</p>	<p>DRAWN BY: PL</p>						
<p>REVISIONS:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>NO.</th> <th>DATE</th> <th>DESCRIPTION</th> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </table>	NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION				<p>DATE: February 2018</p>
NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION					
<p>PROJECT TITLE: SITE PLAN</p>							
<p>DRAWING NO: A01</p>							



660 sq.ft.

1060 sq.ft.

220 Okanagan Ave. Ground Floor
 SCALE 1/32" = 1'-0"



View of subject property looking east (from 2nd Street SE)




View of subject property looking west (from laneway)











View of subject property looking south (from Okanagan Avenue SE)



View of subject property looking northwesterly (from laneway)



	 Subject Parcel	 Commercial City Centre
	 0 5 10 20 30 40 Meters	 High Density Residential
		 Institutional
		 Park



Subject Parcel

Denise Ackerman

From: Denise Ackerman
Sent: May-27-20 3:26 PM
To: Denise Ackerman
Subject: FW: 220 Okanagan Avenue SE

From: Jordan Baer
Sent: May-15-20 2:37 PM
To: Denise Ackerman <dackerman@salmonarm.ca>
Cc: Kevin Pearson <kpearson@salmonarm.ca>
Subject: Re: 220 Okanagan Avenue SE

Hi Denise
Roger is good with signing a covenant to keep them rentals.
Did I ever send you a DP letter?

Regards,

Jordan

On May 14, 2020, at 5:04 PM, Denise Ackerman <dackerman@salmonarm.ca> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

I am working on the OCP and zoning amendment report for 220 Okanagan Avenue SE and I wanted to let you know that the maximum density in the R-5 zone, based on the parcel size is only 4 dwelling units.

With bonus density you could get 5 units; but, to qualify for bonus density, all the units would be restricted to rental units. We would require a covenant restricting the units to rental units, meaning the units could not be strata units with individual titles which then could be sold as individual strata lots.

I am not sure of the owner's intention but before proceeding any further I wanted to pass along this information to you and the owner.

Please let me know how you wish to proceed.

Kind Regards,
Denise Ackerman | Planner | Development Services Department
Box 40, 500-2nd Avenue NE, Salmon Arm, BC, V1E 4N2 | P 250.803.4021 | F 250.803.4041
E dackerman@salmonarm.ca W www.salmonarm.ca

<image001.png>

BROWNE JOHNSON
Land Surveyors

BRITISH COLUMBIA AND CANADA LANDS
Box 362, Salmon Arm, B.C. V1E 4N5
250-832-9701 | office@brownejohnson.com



BC LAND SURVEYOR'S BUILDING LOCATION CERTIFICATE

To: Timberline Solutions
c/o Dave Ogilvie
Box 532
Salmon Arm, BC, V1E 4N6
Your File:


Re: Lot 1, Blk 3, Sec 14, Tp 20, R 10, W6M
KOYD, Plan 392, Except Plan EPP88891
Parcel Identifier (PID): 012-410-438
Civic Address: 220 Okanagan Avenue, Salmon Arm

List of documents registered on title which may affect the location of improvements:

Covenant: CA2285491
Covenant: CA6730394



Scale 1:125



All distances are in metres.
Dimensions derived from Plan 392

Offsets from property line to building are measured from the sheathed siding and foundation.

The signatory accepts no responsibility or liability for any damages that may be suffered by a third party as a result of any decisions made, or actions taken based on this document.
This plan was prepared for inspection purposes and is for the exclusive use of our client. This document shows the relative location of the surveyed structures and features with respect to the boundaries of the parcel described above. This document shall not be used to define property boundaries.
This building location certificate has been prepared in accordance with the Professional Reference Manual and is certified correct this 5th day of June, 2019.

Digitally signed by Joseph Johnson LYSXJB
Date: 2019.06.12 06:54:25 -07'00'

BCLS

COPYRIGHT © BROWNE JOHNSON 2019 LAND SURVEYORS

All rights reserved. No person may copy, reproduce, transmit or alter this document in whole or in part without the prior written consent of BROWNE JOHNSON LAND SURVEYORS.

THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT VALID UNLESS ORIGINALLY or DIGITALLY SIGNED.

Our File: 241-19

Fb: 241-19,row

CITY OF SALMON ARM

BYLAW NO. 4393

**A bylaw to amend "City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan
Bylaw No. 4000"**

WHEREAS notice of a Public Hearing to be held by the Council of the City of Salmon Arm in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 500 - 2 Avenue NE, Salmon Arm, British Columbia, on _____, 2020, at the hour of 7:00 p.m. was published in the _____ and _____, 2020 issue of the Salmon Arm Observer;

AND WHEREAS the said Public Hearing was duly held at the time and place above mentioned;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Salmon Arm in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. "City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4000" is hereby amended as follows:

1. Re-designate Lot 1, Block 3, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 392 Except Plan EPP88691 from CC (City Centre Commercial) to HR (High Density Residential), as shown on Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this bylaw;

2. SEVERABILITY

If any part, section, sub-section, clause of this bylaw for any reason is held to be invalid by the decisions of a Court of competent jurisdiction, the invalid portion shall be severed and the decisions that it is invalid shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this bylaw.

3. ENACTMENT

Any enactment referred to herein is a reference to an enactment of British Columbia and regulations thereto as amended, revised, consolidated or replaced from time to time.

4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This bylaw shall come into full force and effect upon adoption of same.

5. CITATION

This bylaw may be cited as "City of Salmon Arm Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 4393".

READ A FIRST TIME THIS	8th	DAY OF	June	2020
READ A SECOND TIME THIS		DAY OF		2020
READ A THIRD TIME THIS		DAY OF		2020
ADOPTED BY COUNCIL THIS		DAY OF		2020

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



Item 11.2

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor

Seconded: Councillor

THAT: the bylaw entitled City of Salmon Arm City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4394 be read a second time;

AND THAT: final reading be withheld subject to:

- 1) Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure approval;
- 2) Registration of a Section 219 Land Title Act restrictive covenant, restricting five residential dwelling units to rental units located on the subject property (220 Okanagan Avenue SE); and
- 3) Adoption of the associated Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw;

AND FURTHER THAT: the Public Hearing, be held at the Salmon Arm Recreation Centre on July 13, 2020.

[ZON-1175; Edelweiss Properties Inc./Timberline Solutions/Baer, J.; 220 Okanagan Avenue SE; C-2 to R-5]

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
 - Carried
 - Defeated
 - Defeated Unanimously
- Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

CITY OF SALMON ARM

BYLAW NO. 4394

A bylaw to amend "District of Salmon Arm Zoning Bylaw No. 2303"

WHEREAS notice of a Public Hearing to be held by the Council of the City of Salmon Arm in the Salmon Arm Recreation Centre Auditorium, 2600 10 Avenue NE, Salmon Arm, British Columbia, on _____, 2020 at the hour of 7:00 p.m. was published in _____ and _____, 2020 issues of the Salmon Arm Observer;

AND WHEREAS the said Public Hearing was duly held at the time and place above mentioned;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Salmon Arm in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1. "District of Salmon Arm Zoning Bylaw No. 2303" is hereby amended as follows:

Rezone Lot 1, Block 3, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 392 Except Plan EPP88691 from C-2 (Town Centre Commercial Zone) to R-5 (High Density Residential Zone), attached as Schedule "A".

2. SEVERABILITY

If any part, section, sub-section, clause of this bylaw for any reason is held to be invalid by the decisions of a Court of competent jurisdiction, the invalid portion shall be severed and the decisions that it is invalid shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this bylaw.

3. ENACTMENT

Any enactment referred to herein is a reference to an enactment of British Columbia and regulations thereto as amended, revised, consolidated or replaced from time to time.

4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This bylaw shall come into full force and effect upon adoption of same.

5. CITATION

This bylaw may be cited as "City of Salmon Arm Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 4394"

READ A FIRST TIME THIS 8th DAY OF June 2020

READ A SECOND TIME THIS DAY OF 2020

READ A THIRD TIME THIS DAY OF 2020

APPROVED PURSUANT TO SECTION 52 (3) (a) OF THE TRANSPORTATION ACT
ON THE DAY OF 2020

For Minister of Transportation & Infrastructure

ADOPTED BY COUNCIL THIS DAY OF 2020

MAYOR

CORPORATE OFFICER



INFORMATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE - JUNE 22, 2020

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | M. Croft-Steen - letter dated June 6, 2020 - Mt. Ida Cemetery | A |
| 2. | S. Ridout - email dated June 14, 2020 - 5G What you need to know | A |
| 3. | Salmon Arm Roots and Blues - email dated June 16, 2020 - ROOTSandBLUES Online Festival Experience | N |
| 4. | M. Regier, Festival Co-ordinator, Shuswap Immigrant Services Society - letter dated June 17, 2020 - Revised Plan for the Multicultural Festival | A |
| 5. | S. Seale, Shuswap Naturalist Club - email dated June 17, 2020 - Shuswap Naturalist Club Project - Removing Burdock Plants from Peter Jannink Park | A |
| 6. | Interior Health - newsletter dated June 2020 - Healthy Communities | N |
| 7. | Interior Health - news release dated June 17, 2020 - IH progress update in renewing surgeries | N |
| 8. | Senator N. Greene Raine - letter received May 2020 - National Health & Fitness Day | A |
| 9. | euroProductions Entertainment Services - email dated June 16, 2020 - Event support for your community... | N |

N = No Action Required
A = Action Requested

S = Staff has Responded
R = Response Required

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 12.2

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

L. Wong, Manager, Downtown Salmon Arm – letter dated June 15, 2020 –
Alexander Street

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond



Mayor and Council
 City of Salmon Arm
 PO Box 40
 Salmon Arm, BC V1E 4N2

June 15, 2020

To Mayor and Council

Re: Alexander Street

The Salmon Arm Downtown Improvement Association at its' regular board meeting of June 10, 2020 approved the following:

Motion to approve a trial project called Alexander Plaza – a 10 week open air pedestrian mall along Alexander Street, from Hudson Avenue to Lakeshore Drive, on Saturdays beginning July 4.

Please note that Althea Mongerson abstained from voting and declared a conflict of interest.

Many communities are expanding available public street space as one way to accommodate more people, encourage more visitation by our locals, and enable physical distancing while being outdoors. Current Provincial messaging supports being outdoors while safe distancing.

In efforts to think outside the box, be creative, and approach this new reality with a different perspective, Downtown Salmon Arm is seeking support for this proposal, as an initial trial:

- Open up Alexander Street from Hudson to Lakeshore as an open-air mall to accommodate more people by redirecting vehicle traffic from 7 am - 4 pm, Saturdays, July 4 - Sept 5, with a possible extension to Oct 17 (to coincide with the Farmer's Market)
- Program select activities on the street during this time like artisan and informational booths, buskers and displays
- Create a socially connected walking route from the Downtown Farmer's Market to Alexander Street
- Support businesses who wish to set up 'sidewalk' sales, outdoor benches, or dining areas.
- Create a framework for evaluating success
- City staff to provide assistance with the street closure at 7am

We are also requesting that alcohol be permitted in this public space during the times/dates stated above.

Recently, Penticton and North Vancouver became the first two BC Municipalities to designate public spaces for drinking.

DOWNTOWN SALMON ARM
 250 SHUSWAP STREET NE, PO BOX 1928
 SALMON ARM, BRITISH COLUMBIA V1E 4P9

SALMON ARM

We are fortunate to have a variety of locally owned breweries, distilleries and wineries. With the current regulations, our local producers are only able to sample their products but not sell in public spaces. This opportunity would provide the public with an option to purchase a locally crafted beverage to enjoy on Alexander Plaza. This could create a cultural shift in the way we utilize this street – not only for the passage of vehicles but for pedestrians to experience a sense of community.

Should you require further information, please contact me.

Thank you for your time

Respectfully submitted

Lindsay Wong
Manager

DOWNTOWN SALMON ARM
250 SHUSWAP STREET NE, PO BOX 1928
SALMON ARM, BRITISH COLUMBIA V1E 4P9

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 14.1

CITY OF SALMON ARMDate: June 8, 2020**Presentation 4:00 p.m. (approximately)****NAME:** Terry Smith, Sk'atsin Silvatech Ventures LLP, a Neskonlith Indian Band Subsidiary**TOPIC:** Update on 2020 Community Resiliency Investment (CRI)**Vote Record**

- Carried Unanimously
 - Carried
 - Defeated
 - Defeated Unanimously
- Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 18.1

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

A. Morris - email and attachments date April 20, 2020 - Nuclear Weapons Disaster [deferred from April 27, 2020 Regular Council Meeting] and A. Morris - email and attachments dated June 15, 2020 - Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
 - Carried
 - Defeated
 - Defeated Unanimously
- Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

12. CORRESPONDENCE

1. Informational Correspondence

2. A. Morris - email and attachments dated April 20, 2020 - Nuclear Weapons Disaster

0166-2020

Moved: Councillor Lavery

Seconded: Councillor Wallace Richmond

THAT: Mayor Harrison provide a letter in support of Canada making nuclear arms control and disarmament a national priority.

Moved: Mayor Harrison

Seconded: Flynn

THAT: Council defer Motion 0166-2020 to the Regular Council Meeting of June 22, 2020.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

From: Anne Morris
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 1:14 PM
To: Erin Jackson
Subject: Letter to City Council and attachment; also E-mail addresses for relevant Parliamentarians
 Good afternoon, Ms. Jackson,

I am attaching a **letter to Council** from the Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee, which we hope to have considered by City Council at its April 28th meeting.
 Also an article from *The Hill Times* by veteran Canadian diplomat and arms control specialist, Earl Turcotte. We would appreciate if you would circulate this to Council as well.

Regarding follow-up action: Assuming that Council adopts our proposed resolution, I would like to give you E-mail addresses for the **Prime Minister and Foreign Affairs Minister**, and for sending copies to the **opposition party leaders**, and to our MP for North Okanagan Shuswap:

The Right Hon. Justin Trudeau
 Prime Minister of Canada
 E-mail: pm@pm.gc.ca

The Hon. Francois-Philippe Champagne
 Minister of Foreign Affairs
 E-mail: francois-philippe.champagne@international.ca

Copies to:
 Andrew Scheer, MP
 Leader of the Official Opposition
 E-mail: andrew.scheer@parl.gc.ca

Jagmeet Singh, MP
 Leader of the New Democrats
 E-mail: jagmeet.singh@parl.gc.ca

Yves-Francois Blanchet, MP
 Leader of the Bloc Québécois
 E-mail: yves-francois.blanchet@parl.gc.ca

Mel Arnold, MP
 for North Okanagan Shuswap
 E-mail: mel.arnold@parl.gc.ca

.....

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have questions.

Best wishes,

Anne Morris

April 20, 2020

His Worship Mayor Alan Harrison
and Members of City Council
City of Salmon Arm, BC

Your Worship and Members of Council,

In the past months, Council has heard from Salmon Arm citizens concerned about the existential threat of climate change to humankind and the planet. This letter concerns *the other* existential threat - *a nuclear weapons disaster*.

Early this year, the hands of the Doomsday Clock were moved ahead to 100 seconds before midnight, signifying the increased risk of nuclear war. In so doing, members of the Science and Security Board of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists are explicitly warning political leaders and citizens around the world that "*the international security situation is now more dangerous than it has ever been, even at the height of the Cold War*". The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research has echoed this warning.

There are still about 14,000 nuclear weapons in the world. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons — the cornerstone of the international effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons — is in dire jeopardy.

Several other international treaties have been abandoned or are in jeopardy: In May 2018, President Trump withdrew the U.S. from the Iran nuclear deal (the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action), although the U.S. could not point to a single instance of Iran's non-compliance with the terms of the deal. In February 2019, the U.S. withdrew from the INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces) Treaty. Predictably, the US and Russia have begun a new competition to develop medium ranged nuclear weapons that are banned by this Treaty.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty lacks ratification by key states including the U.S. and China, and thus cannot go into effect. In addition, the U.S. continues to suggest that it will not extend New START, the agreement that limits US and Russian deployed strategic nuclear weapons and delivery systems. The U.S. is also threatening to pull out of the Open Skies Treaty of 2002.

There are also several disturbing developments: a) The 2018 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review explicitly *expands the number of scenarios in which nuclear weapons can be utilized*, including in response to *non-nuclear* threats such as cyber; b) the 'Defender of Europe 2020' military exercises, curtailed because of the virus pandemic, were scheduled to bring thousands of U.S. soldiers into Europe for military exercises culminating at the Russian border.

In this context, the leaders of the world's nations will gather some time in the coming months for the 2020 Review of the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), postponed because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The NPT imposes on all nations a legal obligation to engage in good faith negotiations toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. But the nine nuclear weapons nations are all engaged in modernizing their nuclear weapons. As a result, the Treaty is in danger of being abandoned by the growing number of non-nuclear-weapon nations that question whether the nuclear weapon nations will ever forgo their nuclear weapons. Without concrete action to address this situation, certain Middle East non-nuclear nations will inevitably conclude that they have no choice but to seek nuclear weapons for themselves.

Is there a role for Salmon Arm in the face of this dangerous situation?

In 2006, Salmon Arm became a member of Mayors for Peace, an international organization of 7,689 cities. Headed by the Mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the two cities that were destroyed by U.S. atomic bombs in 1945, its main goal is the elimination of nuclear weapons. Mayors for Peace believes there is a role for cities and engaged citizenry toward achieving a nuclear weapons-free world. Since 2006, Salmon Arm City Council has taken a number of initiatives encouraging the Canadian government to take action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

In the past, Canada has worked actively with like-minded states to strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Canada's recent work within the 16-nation Stockholm Initiative is a laudable example. <<https://new-york-un.diplo.de/un-en/news-corner/stockholm-initiative/2310512>> This creative diplomacy should be greatly expanded to help preserve the Non-Proliferation Treaty and promote a political climate in which international negotiations can take place on a treaty that contains a timetable for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

We therefore request that Salmon Arm City Council support the following resolution:

That, Council authorize Mayor Alan Harrison to write to Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon. François-Philippe Champagne, urging that Canada make nuclear arms control and disarmament a national priority, and work toward achieving an international consensus that will save the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) when it comes up for Review at the United Nations in the coming months.

Sincerely,

Anne Morris and Carol McAndrew
Co-Chairs,
Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee

Attachment: 'Public health crisis offers new lens towards nuclear disarmament' *Hill Times* Apr. 15/20

Endorsements:

The Right Reverend James A.J. Cowan
Incumbent of St. John the Evangelist Anglican Church
Salmon Arm

The Reverend Jenny Carter and
First United Community of Faith, Salmon Arm

The Reverend Fennegina van Zoeren, Minister
St. Andrews Presbyterian Church, Salmon Arm

The Reverend Dale Normandeau
St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Salmon Arm

The Reverend Erik Bjorgan, Pastor
Deo ELCIC Lutheran Church, Salmon Arm

The Hill Times, April 15, 2020

by Earl Turcotte, veteran Canadian diplomat and arms control specialist, and Chair of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons.

Public health crisis offers new lens towards nuclear disarmament

The COVID crisis might also serve as a cautionary tale, helping us to appreciate the fragility of life and avoid threats to humanity that are within our control.



Earl Turcotte

Opinion

That COVID-19 has created a new global reality is clear. If there is any positive aspect to this unfolding situation, it could be a deeper understanding of the fact that the well-being of people throughout the world is inextricably linked. The COVID crisis might also serve as a cautionary tale, helping us to appreciate the fragility of life and avoid threats to humanity that are within our control.

In 2019, a team of researchers at Princeton University simulated a limited exchange of low-yield "tactical" nuclear weapons to depict "a plausible escalating war between the United States and Russia, using realistic nuclear force postures, targets, and fatality estimates." They concluded that more than 90 million people would be killed or injured within a few hours and many more would die in the years following.

This is far from the worst-case scenario. In 1982, the Ronald Reagan administration conducted a war game dubbed "Proud Prophet" that concluded that even a limited nuclear attack on the then-Soviet Union would almost certainly elicit a massive

response, resulting in a half-billion people killed in the initial exchanges and many more from radiation and starvation over following decades.

To be sure, the nuclear threat has been around for a while. Why worry about it now more than usual, when we have so much else to worry about? Because developments of late have made the "unthinkable"—nuclear Armageddon—more probable than ever; factors that led the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists on Jan. 23 of this year to move the hands of the Doomsday Clock up to 100 seconds to midnight, closer than ever before.

Over the past few years, nuclear-armed states have embarked on a new nuclear arms race, precipitated by the U.S. under the banner of "modernization." Russia and the U.S. have produced missiles that can travel up to 27 times the speed of sound and are considered to be unstoppable. There has been steady deterioration of the nuclear arms control regime with U.S. withdrawal and subsequent unravelling of the nuclear deal with Iran; U.S., then Russian withdrawal from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty; and U.S. refusal to renew the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia that is set to expire in 2021, to name just a few. Add to the mix rising tension among nuclear-armed states, ongoing testing by North Korea, signs that Iran, Saudi Arabia, and South Korea might also pursue nuclear weapons capability, the possibility that one or more terrorist groups will acquire nuclear weapons and the ever-present potential for human miscalculation or accident.

Canada is to be congratulated for recently joining 15 other non-nuclear armed nations in the Stockholm Initiative—led by Sweden—that calls upon nuclear-armed states to "advance nuclear disarmament and ensure in the interest of humanity, nuclear weapons will never be used again." Does this represent a more forceful posture on nuclear disarmament more generally? We pray it does. Our lives and indeed the future of our planet could depend upon it.

Earl Turcotte is chair of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons.

The Hill Times

From: Anne Morris
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2020 9:48:12 AM
To: Erin Jackson
Cc: Carol McAndrew
Subject: For City Council Meeting June 22

Good morning, Ms. Jackson,

Regarding the Letter of April 20th from the Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee, scheduled for discussion on June 22, I am attaching four files:

1. Information on Canada and Nuclear Weapons
2. Information on Salmon Arm Council's previous action to promote elimination of nuclear weapons
3. Letter Summarizing information from April 20th letter, the two information pages, and our request to Council
4. A draft action letter offered in the event Council might find it useful

We suggest that you title our request as: **Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons**

We ask that this topic be included as a separate agenda item rather than included with the letters.

We would also be grateful if I could have 5 minutes (or less) at the Council meeting to make a short statement (**not** a presentation).

Thank you for your help with this,

Anne Morris, Co-Chair
Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee

Canada and Nuclear Weapons

Although Canada has never acquired nuclear weapons, it is one of the “nuclear umbrella” nations. As such, Canada embraces NATO’s nuclear deterrence doctrine as a valid security policy, effectively legitimizing the stockpiling and potential use of nuclear weapons. This is deeply contradictory to efforts to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons.

For example, Canada supports NATO policy that declares nuclear weapons are the “supreme guarantee” of security. Accordingly, Canada refuses to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which would stigmatize and de-legitimize nuclear weapons.

Canada claims strong support for the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), cornerstone of the international effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The NPT imposes a legal obligation on all nations to engage in good faith negotiations towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. But the NPT is only as strong as its implementation. Canada, together with the nuclear weapons nations and their NATO allies, are ignoring their nuclear disarmament obligation. Without progress on this obligation, some non-nuclear nations will inevitably conclude that they too need nuclear weapons. The NPT is thus in danger of unravelling.

In early 2020, Canada participated in the **Stockholm Initiative**, which brought representatives of 16 nations together to discuss how to strengthen and protect the NPT. They concluded: “Commitments must be implemented. We must advance nuclear disarmament in accordance with Article VI of the NPT, and ensure that in the interest of humanity, nuclear weapons will never be used again”.

Recognizing the urgency of the situation, Canada should further this creative diplomacy by undertaking a forceful and sustained campaign within NATO and around the world in support of nuclear disarmament, in accordance with the unanimous motion passed in the House of Commons in 2010, and an all-party recommendation to this effect by the House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence in 2018. Canada should promote security arrangements that do not rely on the threat of nuclear annihilation.

Canada should also sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), which 81 nations have signed, and 37 have ratified. Once 50 countries have ratified it, the Treaty will go into effect, thus stigmatizing and de-legitimizing nuclear weapons, and increasing domestic and international pressure for their elimination. Joining the TPNW would also help erode the perception that nuclear weapons are somehow legitimate in certain hands.

The Canadian Council of Churches – including all 26 member denominations and Canada’s Catholic Bishops – have written to the Prime Minister, demanding that Canada push NATO for new policies that don’t rely on the threat of nuclear annihilation, and urging Canada to sign the Nuclear Weapons Prohibition Treaty.

Such action by Canada would serve to strengthen the beleaguered Non-Proliferation Treaty and help create a political environment in which international negotiations can take place on a treaty that contains a timetable for the elimination of all nuclear weapons. This would be an important contribution towards the security of Canada and the world.

History of Salmon Arm City Council's Initiatives towards Nuclear Disarmament

Nuclear Weapons are a municipal issue as well as a national and international issue. Why?

Municipal authorities are responsible for taking all possible action to promote the health and well-being of their citizens. But they cannot protect citizens from a nuclear weapons disaster. Nor could they offer any meaningful medical response to the catastrophic humanitarian and environmental consequences of a nuclear weapon explosion.

Thus, municipal councils have an obligation to take what action they can to promote the elimination of nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to humankind and the planet.

During the 1990s, Salmon Arm City Council responded to a citizens' initiative by declaring Salmon Arm a Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone (NWFZ), a symbolic action affirming the City's support for a world where there is no manufacture, acquisition, testing, or possession of nuclear weapons. The creation of NWFZs is consistent with Article VII of the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is the cornerstone of the international effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

During the early 1990s, there was progress in substantially reducing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, but by the late 1990s this progress began to be reversed.

Thus, in response to a request in 2005 by the Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee and supported by several local church leaders, Salmon Arm City Council adopted a Resolution to urge the Canadian Government to work urgently for an international treaty that sets a timetable for the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

In 2006, City Council decided to join the World Conference of Mayors for Peace, which was formed in 1982 with the primary goal of working internationally towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Mayors for Peace has grown tremendously since then, and now comprises 7,689 cities. People around the world are increasingly calling for a world without nuclear weapons and an end to security policies that rely on the threat of nuclear annihilation.

In 2018, City Council adopted a Resolution re-affirming the City's Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone status. Council also adopted a Resolution to urge the Canadian Government to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and to work urgently in the international community for the conclusion of a treaty that sets a timetable for the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Now, the Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee, **with the declared support of five local church leaders**, is requesting that Salmon Arm City Council write to the Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Justin Trudeau, Foreign Affairs Minister, the Hon. François-Philippe Champagne, and Minister of National Defence, the Hon. Harjit Sajjan, **urging that Canada make nuclear arms control and disarmament a national priority, and work towards achieving an international consensus that will save the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty when it comes up for Review at the United Nations in the coming months.** We also ask Council to **reiterate its call to the Canadian Government to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.**

His Worship Mayor Alan Harrison and
Members of Salmon Arm City Council

Your Worship and Members of Council,

In our letter of April 20, endorsed by 5 local church leaders, we brought to your attention the ongoing nuclear weapons modernization programs being carried out by all nine nuclear weapons nations, the erosion of the global nuclear arms control and disarmament fabric, and warnings by arms control experts around the world that the risk of nuclear war is greater now than at the height of the Cold War.

The attached information page, '**Canada and Nuclear Weapons,**' shows how Canada, as a "nuclear umbrella" nation is complicit in the stockpiling and potential use of nuclear weapons. An example: While claiming strong support for the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty, (cornerstone of international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons), Canada is helping to undermine this vital Treaty by failing to act on the Treaty's legal obligation on all nations to engage in good faith negotiations towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The attached information page, '**History of Salmon Arm City Council's Initiatives,**' details how, in past years, the City of Salmon Arm has demonstrated concern about the need to eliminate nuclear weapons and the threat they pose: by declaring itself a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone; by joining the World Conference of Mayors for Peace; also, by adopting a number of resolutions urging action by the Canadian Government to promote a world without nuclear weapons and an end to security policies that rely on the threat of nuclear annihilation.

At this time, we are asking that City Council support a Resolution to **write to the Prime Minister, Foreign Affairs Minister, and Defence Minister, urging that Canada make nuclear arms control and disarmament a national priority, and work towards achieving an international consensus that will save the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty when it comes up for Review at the United Nations in the coming months.**

We also urge Council to reiterate its call for Canada to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, on the basis of an unanimous decision by Council to this effect in 2018.

We offer Council a draft letter to Government (with contact information) in the event that the draft may be useful. Council could adapt it, or ignore it and write its own.

Sincerely,

Anne Morris and Carol McAndrew, Co-Chairs,
Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee

Suggested draft of letter to the Prime Minister and key government ministers:

The Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee has brought to our attention concerns about the ongoing erosion of the global nuclear arms control and disarmament fabric, nuclear weapons modernization programs that contribute to undermining the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and warnings by arms control experts that the risk of nuclear war is greater now than at the height of the Cold War.

In the past, Salmon Arm City Council has taken a number of initiatives encouraging action by the Canadian Government to promote a world without nuclear weapons and an end to security policies that rely on the threat of nuclear annihilation.

At the Regular Council Meeting of June 22, 2020, Salmon Arm City Council adopted a resolution to urge the Canadian Government to **make nuclear arms control and disarmament a national priority, and to work towards achieving an international consensus that will save the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty when it comes up for Review at the United Nations in the coming months.**

On the basis of a resolution unanimously adopted by City Council in May 2018, **we urge the Canadian Government to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.**

The Right Hon. Justin Trudeau
Office of the Prime Minister
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON, K1A 0A6
E-mail: pm@pm.gc.ca

The Hon. François-Philippe Champagne
Minister of Foreign Affairs
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON, K1A 0A6
E-mail: Francois-Philippe.Champagne@parl.gc.ca

The Hon. Harjit Sajjan
Minister of National Defence
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON, K1A 0A6
E-mail: DND_MND@forces.gc.ca

cc to: Mel Arnold, MP
House of Commons
Ottawa, ON, K1A 0A6
E-mail: Mel.Arnold@parl.gc.ca

cc to: Salmon Arm Ecumenical KAIROS Committee
Anne Morris, Co-Chair
E-mail: willae@alumni.uleth.ca

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 18.2

CITY OF SALMON ARMDate: June 22, 2020**Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan****Vote Record**

- Carried Unanimously
 - Carried
 - Defeated
 - Defeated Unanimously
- Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

14. PRESENTATIONS

1. Jen Casorso - Urban Matters - Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan

J. Casorso, Urban Matters provided an overview of the Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan for Salmon Arm and was available to answer questions from Council.

0224-2020

Moved: Councillor Wallace Richmond

Seconded: Councillor Flynn

THAT: Council direct staff to submit the final UBCM grant report and the Child Care Community Planning Report to the UBCM and the Ministry of Child and Family Development fulfilling the grant obligations of the Child Care Space planning program.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY



KEY RECOMMENDATIONS & ACTIONS

Given the complex nature of child care, a multi-faceted approach is required to support a systems change within the City of Salmon Arm. We have proposed five recommendation areas that will help the City move towards a more sustainable, community system:

- Education & Training
- Policy
- Process
- Partnerships
- Advocacy

The recommendations set out in this plan are grounded in the province's goal to move towards Universal Child Care, a model that encourages licensed child care that offers inclusive and culturally-appropriate programming and programming for children with diverse needs.

A more detailed action plan can be found in Table 10.

EDUCATION & TRAINING

Providing educational opportunities for child care providers and operators in Salmon Arm – particularly around transitioning to or creating licensed child care programs – will lead to greater knowledge around high-quality space creation. Education is key to retaining ECEs locally and helping to understand how to navigate the system within Salmon Arm.

Key recommendations related to education and training include:

- » Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage unlicensed providers to pursue licensing.
- » Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage those starting new child care programs to pursue licensed programming.
- » Provide professional development opportunities in the area of basic business training to support licensed child care operators with running their business.
- » Expand the level of service of licensed child care operators by providing local education and professional development opportunities.

Table 10: Recommendations & Actions – Education & Training

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage unlicensed providers to pursue licensing.	Continue to hold child care start-up workshops for individuals interested in starting a child care program	CCRR/Okanagan College	1-2 years
	Secure local, ongoing and consistent training opportunities to support new child care providers entering the community and existing child care providers with professional development opportunities.	Okanagan College	1-2 years
	Create opportunities for mentorship or job shadowing for prospective child care providers	CCRR	1-2 years
	Hold workshops for unregistered/unlicensed child care providers interested in pursuing registration/licensing	Okanagan College/CCRR	3-5 years
	Revisit results of workshops and explore next steps, changes in strategy	Child Care Planning Committee	5-10 years
Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage those starting new child care programs to pursue licensed programming.	Hold workshops or training for child care providers on business planning and systems/policy development	Okanagan College/CCRR	3-5 years
	Seek to align educational opportunities with current community child care needs (i.e. flexible child care, infant toddler, school age care)	Okanagan College/CCRR	3-5 years
Provide professional development opportunities in the area of basic business training to support licensed child care operators.	Establish communication between licensing, Child Care Resource and Referral, and those providing education to ensure alignment with current needs	Child Care Planning Committee	1-2 years
	Reach out to Indigenous and immigrant organizations to help deliver cultural education and programming to child care providers	CCRR/Child Care Planning Committee	1-2 years
Expand the level of service of licensed child care operators by providing local education and professional development opportunities.			

POLICY

Improvements to municipal plans and policies related to child care is within the role of local government. It helps to ensure that child care is identified as a priority. Updating definitions, permitted land use zones, and strategic goals within municipal plans can facilitate additional investment in child care from the provincial government through supports and funding to both public and private entities. Additionally, clear policies and guidelines from local government assists the development community to provide opportunities for partnering with local child care organizations to create new spaces to meet the demand.

Key recommendations related to policy include:

- » Review and update municipal plans and policies to incorporate child care space priorities as part of growth management, neighbourhood planning, and well-being priorities
- » Review existing child care definitions to ensure they are aligned with the province's definitions
- » Consider establishing municipal incentives for child care providers

Table 11: Recommendations & Actions - Policy

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Review and update municipal plans and policies to incorporate child care space priorities as part of growth management, neighbourhood planning, and well-being priorities.	Identify municipal plans and policies where child care can be incorporated	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
	Establish a schedule to update/amend municipal policies or plans to include child care priorities and guidance	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
	Prioritize and implement schedule as identified and expediate specific policy updates where appropriate to meet annual child care space needs	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-5 years
Review existing child care definitions to ensure they are in alignment with provincial government definitions.	Identify child care definitions within existing policies and update, where applicable, to meet provincial government definitions	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
Consider establishing municipal incentives to minimize the financial impacts of operating a licensed child care centre.	Amend Permissive Tax Exemption Policy No. 715 to include licensed, non-profit child care providers and licensed private child care operators	City of Salmon Arm Financial Services	3-5 years
	Provide incentives (e.g. first year free business license fees, site or neighbourhood specific property tax exemptions, etc.) to child care providers who start-up licensed child care in underserved neighbourhoods in the community	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	5-10 years

PROCESS

Lowering the barrier to licensed space creation in Salmon Arm can be achieved by streamlining regulatory processes for child care start-up and expansion.

- » Streamline the municipal processes for child care provider space creation and ensure alignment with licensing procedures.
- » Pursue an expedited criminal record checks process for ECEs to speed the process of entering the workforce.

Table 12: Recommendations & Actions – Process

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Streamline the municipal process for child care provider space creation and ensure alignment with licensing procedures.	Create easy to follow checklist and/or infographic to assist prospective child care providers in navigating municipal government processes	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
	Establish partnership between the City of Salmon Arm Development Services and Interior Health licensing to support processing and approving child care applications in a coordinated and timely manner	City of Salmon Arm Development Services, Interior Health Community Care Licensing Division	1-2 years
Pursue an expedited criminal record checks for ECEs to speed the process of entering the workforce	Engage with the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General to discuss delay issues and possible solutions.	CCRR	1-2 years

PARTNERSHIPS

Child care is provided and supported by a number of organizations in Salmon Arm. Improving child care and adding spaces to the community will depend on enhancing existing partnerships and/or encouraging new ones. Building partnerships to create linkages to resources across the city will be key to finding solutions to meet the child care space demand in Salmon Arm.

Key recommendations related to partnerships include:

- » Consider joint-use agreements between public institutions to help facilitate the creation of additional child care spaces.
- » Consider opportunities to leverage public assets and underutilized space to facilitate child care space creation.
- » Continue to convene meetings of the Child Care Planning Committee to facilitate Child Care Action Plan implementation.
- » Meet with industry employers in community to consider in-house employee provided child care.

Table 13: Recommendations & Actions – Partnerships

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Consider joint use agreements between public institutions to help facilitate the creation of additional child care spaces.	Convene meetings between School District 83 and the City to discuss joint use opportunities for child care and ways to facilitate in current or new public facilities	City of Salmon Arm/School District 83	1-2 years
Consider opportunities to leverage public assets and underutilized space to facilitate child care space creation.	Create an inventory of public assets that are suitable for potential child care centres	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	5-10 years
	Share the inventory with the CCRR to distribute with the local child care and business community	City of Salmon Arm Development Services/CCRR/Economic Development Society	5-10 years
	Identify and consider other under-utilized spaces within the community that could be used for child care	City of Salmon Arm Development Services/CCRR/Economic Development Society	3-10 years
Continue to convene meetings of the Child Care Planning Committee to facilitate plan implementation.	Establish the Child Care Planning Committee as a Committee of City Council and convene twice a year to support and monitor implementation of Child Care Action Plan	City of Salmon Arm City Council, Child Care Planning Committee	Ongoing
Meet with industry employers in community to consider in-house employee provided child care.	Identify potential industry partners and meet to discuss community child care needs and workforce opportunities in support of in-house employee provided child care	Child Care Planning Committee, Economic Development Society	1-5 years

ADVOCACY

The provincial government is key to providing funding for child care providers, supports for children with higher needs and families requiring financial relief. Therefore, advocating on behalf of communities and families in need of stable and affordable child care is critical to increasing child care spaces and improving the overall state of child care in Salmon Arm.

Key recommendations related to advocacy include:

- » Advocate to provincial government through UBCM for enhanced funding to support child development programs.
- » Advocate to the Ministry for Children and Families for additional supports for ECEs (wage enhancements, bursaries, professional development opportunities and educational supports) to support recruitment and retention in Salmon Arm.
- » Ensure that the City of Salmon Arm (including Council and management) through the Child Care Planning Committee are aware of child care issues and opportunities to advocate on behalf of the City and local organizations.
- » Advocate to the Ministry of Children and Family Development, Ministry of Education and School District 83 for permanent child care spaces to be included in elementary schools, either as purpose built facilities or as classrooms in new school infrastructure.
- » Advocate to the Ministry of Children and Family Development, Ministry of Health, Interior Health, and Okanagan College to make child care space available at the location of any large public institution or government employer, such as at Shuswap Lake General Hospital or the Okanagan College Salmon Arm Campus.
- » Request through the Ministry for Children and Family Development the creation of a Universal Child Care Prototype Site in Salmon Arm.

Table 14: Recommendations & Actions – Advocacy

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
<p>Advocate to provincial government through UBCM for enhanced funding to support child development programs.</p>	<p>Engage with Ministry leaders at UBCM Convention requesting increased access to funding for child care supports</p>	<p>City of Salmon Arm City Council, Child Care Planning Committee (support)</p>	<p>1-5 years</p>
<p>Advocate to the MCFD for additional supports for ECEs (wage enhancements, bursaries, professional development opportunities and educational supports) to support recruitment and retention in Salmon Arm.</p>	<p>Engage with the Ministry of Children and Family Development on the importance of fair wages for child care employees to improve retention and quality of life for workers</p>	<p>City of Salmon Arm City Council, Child Care Planning Committee, Chamber of Commerce</p>	<p>1-5 years</p>
<p>Ensure that the City (including Council and management) through the Child Care Planning Committee are aware of child care issues and opportunities to advocate on behalf of the City and local organizations.</p>	<p>Host a special meeting of the Child Care Planning Committee ahead of UBCM Convention to support City staff and Council to understand current issues and opportunities for investment in child care</p>	<p>Child Care Planning Committee, City of Salmon Arm Corporate Services and City Council</p>	<p>1-2 years</p>
<p>Advocate to the Ministry of Education and SD83 for permanent child care spaces to be included in elementary schools, either as purpose built facilities or as classrooms in new school infrastructure.</p>	<p>Identify local space opportunities and meet with decision makers to assess the potential for child care in publicly owned buildings</p>	<p>City of Salmon Arm Development Services, Child Care Planning Committee, School District 83</p>	<p>1-5 years</p>
<p>Advocate to the MCFD to develop guidelines and policy change to support CCRRs in licensing recommendations to providers.</p>	<p>Convene conversations between licensing, the MCFD and the CCRR to determine a meaningful way the CCRR can better help child care providers in their licensing journey</p>	<p>CCRR</p>	<p>3-5 years</p>

<p>Advocate to the MCFD, Ministry of Health, Interior Health, and Okanagan College to make child care space available at any large public institution or government employer, such as at Shuswap Lake General Hospital or the Okanagan College Salmon Arm Campus.</p>	<p>Meet with public institution partners to identify the needs and establish partnership opportunities to plan and develop child care in public facilities to support employees and community</p>	<p>City of Salmon Arm City Council and Corporate Services, Okanagan College, Interior Health</p>	<p>5-10 years</p>
<p>Request through the MCFD the creation of a Universal Child Care Prototype Site in Salmon Arm.</p>	<p>Meet with the Ministry for Children and Family Development to request participation in the Universal Child Care Prototype program</p>	<p>Child Care Planning Committee</p>	<p>1-2 years</p>

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Item 22.1

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor

Seconded: Councillor

THAT: Development Variance Permit No. VP-516 be authorized for issuance for Lot A, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 12703 Except Plans KAP71482 and EPP5318 to vary the provisions of Zoning Bylaw No. 2303 as follows:

1. Section 6.10.2. - R-1 Single Family Residential Zone - reduce the minimum setback to a rear parcel line from 6.0 m (19.7 ft) to 5.0 m (16.4 ft) to allow for the siting of a new single family dwelling.

[The Canada Trust Company Inc.; CND Framing/Skjerpen, M.; 941 - 8 Avenue NE; Setbacks]

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
- Carried
- Defeated
- Defeated Unanimously

Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

**CITY OF
SALMON ARM**

To: His Worship Mayor Harrison and Members of Council

Date: June 5, 2020

Subject: Development Variance Permit Application No. 516

Legal: Lot A, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 12703 Except Plans KAP71482 and EPP5318

Civic: 941 – 8 Avenue NE

Applicant: CDN Framing / Skjerpen, M.

MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION

THAT: Development Variance Permit No. 516 be authorized for issuance for Lot A, Section 14, Township 20, Range 10, W6M, KDYD, Plan 12703 Except Plans KAP71482 and EPP5318 (941 8 Avenue NE) to vary the provisions of Zoning Bylaw No. 2303 as follows:

- 1. Section 6.10.2 – R-1 Single Family Residential Zone – reduce the minimum setback to a rear parcel line from 6.0 m (19.7 ft) to 5.0 m (16.4 ft) to allow for the siting of a new single family dwelling.**
-

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT: The motion for consideration be adopted.

PROPOSAL

The subject parcel is located in the residential portion of the city centre at 941 8 Avenue NE (Appendix 1 and 2), is approximately 530 square metres in area, and is presently vacant. The subject parcel is designated High Density Residential in the City's Official Community Plan (OCP) and currently zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential) in the Zoning Bylaw (Appendix 3).

BACKGROUND

The proposed variance has been requested to support the development of a new single family dwelling, similar to surrounding development (Appendix 4). A 1.5 metre easement restricting any buildings is in place along the north parcel line, while a 3 m easement is in place restricting development along the east parcel line (Appendix 5).

In terms of consideration for future development scenarios, staff note that the parcel has potential to meet the conditions for the development of a *secondary suite* within the home (but not *detached suite*), including sufficient space for an additional off-street parking stall, subject to a rezoning application.

COMMENTS**Engineering Department**

No concerns.

Building Department

No concerns.

Fire Department

No concerns.

Planning Department

The proposal involves a parcel within an established residential area which is somewhat restricted by the presence of two easements. The proposed single family dwelling is reasonable in size (with a 170 square metre footprint), with the proposed siting reasonably aligning with development existing on the adjacent parcels to the east and west, maintaining a consistency in the development pattern along the 8 Avenue NE streetscape. The proposed development achieves the minimum setbacks required to the interior side parcel lines, as well as the front parcel line allowing sufficient space for on-site parking.


As shown in site plan attached as Appendix 5, it is the opinion of staff that the 1 m variance requested is reasonable in size. With a depth of 22.75 m at the narrowest point, the parcel is relatively shallow, but meets the other zone requirements, including front and side yard setbacks, as well as on-site parking. The easements in place limit potential conflicts between the proposed development and existing development on the adjacent parcels to the north and east. It is the opinion of staff that the proposed development variance will not unreasonably or significantly impact existing development in the area.

Staff note that the adjacent parcel to the north was recently considered under application VP-508 by Council for a rear parcel setback reduction from 3m to 1m for a detached suite to be constructed within an existing accessory building which is clearly visible in the attached site photos (Appendix 6). This variance request was approved in February 2020.


CONCLUSION

Considering current OCP policy including the High Density land use designation, the layout of the parcel and easements in place, as well as the relative small size of the variance requested, Staff support the requested variance.



Staff note that the variance is only in regards to the siting of a proposed single family dwelling and does not permit any new or additional use other than what is permitted the Zoning Bylaw under the current R-1 zone regulations.





Prepared by: Chris Larson, MCP
Senior Planner






Reviewed by: Kevin Pearson, MCIP, RPP
Director of Development Services



 Subject Parcel






 Subject Parcel


CDN SPEC HOUSE

941 8 AVE NE SALMON ARM, BC V1E 4A8


KHM DESIGN
 3200 28 ST NE
 SALMON ARM, BC
 V1E 3Y7
 TEL: (250) 517-7131
 www.khmdesign.ca
 kh@khmdesign.ca



2 AXO VIEW FRONT
 SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"



1 SITE PLAN
 SCALE: 1:100



3 AXO VIEW REAR
 SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

AREA SCHEDULE	
AREA NAME	SQFT
1 MAIN FLOOR	1,307
2 GARAGE & STAIR	303
3 PATIO	180
4 BUILDING FOOTPRINT	1,810
5 LOT	3,755

DRAWING LIST	
#	SHEET NAME
ADD	COVER SHEET, SITE PLAN
A0.1	GENERAL NOTES, BUILDING CODE
A0.2	BUILDING CODE
A1.0	MAIN FLOOR PLAN
A1.1	LOWER FLOOR PLAN
A2.0	ELEVATIONS 1
A3.0	FOUNDATION PLAN
A3.1	FOUNDATION DETAILS
A4.0	MAIN FLOOR FRAMING PLAN
A4.1	ROOF FRAMING PLAN
ADD	SECTIONS 1
A5.1	SECTIONS 2

PROJECT
 CDN SPEC HOUSE

941 8 AVE NE
 SALMON ARM, BC
 V1E 4A8

SHEET NAME
 COVER SHEET, SITE PLAN

THESE CONDITIONS AND DRAWINGS ARE THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF KHM DESIGN AND MAY NOT BE USED OR REPRODUCED WITHOUT CONSENT.


DATE 5/10/2010
 DRAW KHM
 JOB #

A0.0


KHM DESIGN

3200 28 ST NE
SALMON ARB, BC
V1E 3C2


TEL: (604) 517-7131
WWW.KHMDESIGN.CO
KHM@KHMDESIGN.CO




W WEST ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



E EAST ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



S SOUTH ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



N NORTH ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

ELEVATION NOTES

- WALL FINISHES -
- MADE TO BE EXPOSED
- MADE TO BE EXPOSED
- ROOF FINISH -
- ASPHALT SHINGLES
- RAILING -
- ALUMINUM 1 1/2"

PROJECT
CDN SPEC HOUSE

9411 8 AVE NE
SALMON ARB, BC
V1E 4A8

SEE DRAWING
ELEVATIONS 1

DATE 5/10/2010
DRAWN KHM
JOB #

A2.0




Appendix 4: Building Elevations



Plan Showing Proposed Building
 on Lot A, Sec 14, Tp 20, R 10,
 W6M, KDYD, Plan 12703 Except Plans KAP71482 and EPP5318


Scale 1:250



May 9, 2013

List of Documents on title which may affect
 the location of improvements:
 Covenants KT73181 & KT73182
 Easements KT73185 & KT80680
 Right of Way KT73186

BROWNE JOHNSON LAND SURVEYORS
 B.C. AND CANADA LANDS
 SALMON ARM, B.C. Ph.250-832-9701
 File: 137-13



View of subject parcel looking north from 8 Avenue NE, showing adjacent development (the dark brown accessory building on the subject property will be removed).



View of subject parcel looking northwest from 8 Avenue NE, showing adjacent development.

Item 26.

CITY OF SALMON ARM

Date: June 22, 2020

Moved: Councillor Lindgren

Seconded: Councillor Cannon

THAT: the Regular Council Meeting of June 22, 2020, be adjourned.

Vote Record

- Carried Unanimously
 - Carried
 - Defeated
 - Defeated Unanimously
- Opposed:

- Harrison
- Cannon
- Eliason
- Flynn
- Lavery
- Lindgren
- Wallace Richmond

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

A photograph of children's legs and feet wearing various styles of rain boots (purple, blue, green, red) and pants, standing on a wet surface. The image is overlaid with a teal gradient.

CHILD CARE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & ACTION PLAN

CITY OF
SALMON ARM

Prepared By:

Jen Casorso
Community Well-Being Lead
T. 250-374-8311
E. jcasorso@urbanmatters.ca

Urban Matters CCC

May 22, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	4
GENERAL CHILD CARE CONTEXT	6
METHODOLOGY	8
STATE OF CHILD CARE IN SALMON ARM	11
IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY	18
ROLE OF COMMUNITY IN CHILD CARE	23
ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN CHILD CARE	25
COMMUNITY PROFILE	33
CHILD CARE SUPPLY, DEMAND & TARGETS	38
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS & ACTIONS.....	43

APPENDIX A: WHAT WE HEARD ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY (separate document)

APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINING ACCESS RATES & TARGETS

TABLES

Table 1: Number of child care spaces and programs for each category of care in Salmon Arm.....	12
Table 2: Universal Child Care Facility Requirements in British Columbia	27
Table 3: Provincial Regulations for Child Care Facilities in British Columbia by Type of Child Care	28
Table 4: EDI Wave 7 Data for Salmon Arm East and Salmon Arm West Neighbourhoods (2017 - 2019) ..	36
Table 5: Child Care by Type.....	39
Table 6: Child population, spaces and access rate (Ages 0 – 5 and 6 – 12)	41
Table 7: Average Annual Space Creation Targets (2020 – 2030)	42
Table 8: City of Salmon Arm Space Creation Targets - Ages 0 – 5	42
Table 9: City of Salmon Arm Space Creation Targets: Ages 6 – 12	42
Table 10: Recommendations & Actions – Education & Training	45
Table 11: Recommendations & Actions – Policy.....	46
Table 12: Recommendations & Actions – Process.....	47
Table 13: Recommendations & Actions – Partnerships.....	48
Table 14: Recommendations & Actions – Advocacy.....	50

FIGURES

Figure 1: What kind of child care service do you use / need? (from the Parent Survey)	14
Figure 2: Snapshot of Parent Survey Results	17
Figure 3: Child Population Age Breakdown (2016)	34
Figure 4: Households with Children (2016)	35
Figure 5: Children Vulnerable in one or more scales of the Wave 7 EDI (2017 - 2019) for SD 83.....	37

A young boy with curly hair, wearing a blue Superman t-shirt, is running in a race. He is holding a green ribbon. In the background, other children and adults are visible, some wearing green headbands. The scene is outdoors in a grassy area with trees.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge that we are gathering here on the traditional territory of the Secwépemc people, with whom we share these lands and where we live and work together.

The strength of this action plan is built on not only the information collected through engagement and available quantitative data but also from the Child Care Planning Committee. Their input throughout the process continued to provide context and perspective on the child care issues experienced in Salmon Arm amongst educators and families. This committee comprised the following members organizations:

Shuswap Children's Association (Child Care Resource and Referral, Supported Child Development and staff)
Shuswap Daycare Society
Ladybug Landing Child Care Centre
Okanagan College
School District 83
Interior Health
City staff

The City gratefully acknowledges the time and commitment provided by committee members as they demonstrated their passion and commitment to children and families in the community.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **Salmon Arm Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan** was informed through a child care inventory that cataloged licensed and registered license-not-required child care in the City, a community profile to provide family and community context, background policy research, a community engagement process and guidance by the Child Care Planning Committee.

Although there are programs in place to support child care within Salmon Arm – be it in supported child development, family supports or supports for child care providers – and that 70% of parent survey respondents are satisfied with the care they receive, the community is still faced with many challenges, some of which include:


- » Unmet needs for licensed group child care for 0 to 18 months and flexible care (drop-in, weekend, part-time)
- » 0% immediate access to full-time care (licensed and registered licensed-not-required child care experiences 100% utilization)
- » 6 months to 2-year waitlist timeframe to be accepted into a program
- » Roughly 50% of parents accessing their top choice provider
- » Limited qualified staff, many of whom are leaving the field due to low wages, limited benefits, lack of recognition and burnout
- » Limited local training opportunities to encourage recruitment and retention and to increase the quality of care

This project catalogued a total of 514 licensed and registered licensed not-required child care spaces in Salmon Arm offered through 29 program locations:

Total licensed and registered licensed-not-required child care spaces: **514**

	Group Child Care (birth - 36 months)	Group Child Care (30 months - school age)	Licensed Preschool	Group Child Care (school age)	Multi-Age Child Care	Family Child Care	In-Home Multi-Age Child Care	TOTAL Child Care Spaces
Child Care Spaces	68	119	80	183	48	16	0	514
Child Care Programs	6	5	4	7	4	3	0	29

Over a 10-year horizon with an ideal scenario of 30% coverage for non-school-aged children (0 – 5) and 80% coverage for school-aged children (6 – 12), the average annual space creation targets over the next ten years include:



To help reach these annual space creation targets, the follow report proposes several recommendations and actions that the community can consider improving the state of child care in Salmon Arm.

The main recommendations have been grouped under the following categories: Education & Training, Policy, Process, Partnerships and Advocacy.

- » **Education & Training:** Improve the accessibility of information or parents trying to access care and for providers looking to start-up or expand
- » **Policy:** Develop or refine local government plans and policies with child care in mind
- » **Process:** Improve or streamline municipal processes to ease the start-up and expansion experience
- » **Partnerships:** Leverage partnerships to access funding to “unlock” underutilized assets through multi-purposing or to develop new spaces
- » **Advocacy:** Advocate to higher levels of government for enhanced local funding



What follows is a narrative that describes the state of child care in Salmon Arm, a snapshot of the current inventory and future demand for child care based on child population projections and benchmark space creation targets provided by the Ministry of Children & Family Development.



INTRODUCTION

THE SALMON ARM CHILD CARE NEEDS ASSESSMENT & ACTION PLAN

Access to affordable and available child care is one of several indicators of well-being in communities. To help understand the state of child care across British Columbia, the BC Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD) has introduced a space creation program to better understand specific community child care needs, which is administered through the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM).

Child care in the City of Salmon Arm is a considerable concern for families and the agencies supporting families and children. As a result, the City submitted a successful application to the Community Child Care Planning Program to shed light on the child care situation in Salmon Arm and how the community can collectively move forward to increase space creation and advance the child care system at a local level.

This needs assessment and action plan identifies space creation targets over the next ten years and outlines recommendations and actions to meet space creation needs. The results of this study will be an important tool to advocate to the ministry for additional community investment through programs such as the Child Care BC New Spaces Fund and the Community Child Care Space Creation program.

City staff have reviewed the report (plan) and recommendations. This plan is one of many currently underway by the City that identifies key recommendations for local government consideration. As a result, there will be additional staffing impacts to support implementation. It will be up to City Council and administration to decide on the allocation of resources to respond to these recommendations through separate staff reports and future partnership opportunities.

In terms of development, City staff can look proudly to a positive track record of supporting new child care facilities throughout the City with flexible Official Community Plan policies and zoning regulations, levying relatively low Development Cost Charges, and presenting City Council with options to lower servicing standards and costs.



GENERAL CHILD CARE CONTEXT

Child care is provincially-legislated under the Child Care BC Act, the Child Care Act, and Child Care Subsidy Regulation within the Ministry of Children and Family Development. Local government also plays a key role in space creation land use and development.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT

Child care is provincially-legislated under the Child Care BC Act, the Child Care Subsidy Act, and Child Care Subsidy Regulation within the Ministry of Children and Family Development. There are two types of recognized child care in British Columbia -- Licensed and Registered License-Not-Required. The following illustrates the difference in care types:

Licensed Child Care

Licensed child care is monitored regularly and inspected by regional health authorities (Interior Health in Salmon Arm). Child care operators must meet specific requirements with regards to health and safety, staffing, programming and more. There are several child care licensing categories within licensed child care:

Group Child Care: Offered in a community-based facility or centre that services three different age categories:

- » Infant / Toddler Program (birth to 36 months)
- » 3 to 5-year-old Program (30 months to school age)
- » Before and After School Program (school age)

Family Child Care: Offered in the child care provider's own home and services a maximum of seven children from birth to age 12.

Multi-Age Child Care: Offered in a community-based facility and services a maximum of eight children from birth to age 12.

In-Home Multi-Age Child Care: Offered in the child care provider's own home and services a maximum of eight children from birth to age 12.

Preschool: Serves children from 30 months to school entry. Preschools are part-day programs, typically operating during the school year, September to June.

Registered Licensed-Not-Required

These providers are unlicensed, but legally allowed to operate in British Columbia.

Registered License-Not-Required (RLNR) Child Care: This type of child care has been registered with a Child Care Resource and Referral Centre (CCRR). The registration process includes criminal record checks, references, a home-seeking review and first aid. Registered care providers have access to support, training, resources and group liability insurance. Families are eligible for a higher subsidy rate if they use RLNR care. Operators can care for up to two children (or a sibling group) who are not related to them.

It should be noted that while this report focuses on licensed or registered licensed-not-required care, many families use license-not-required or unlicensed care arrangements.

Other Care Types

License-Not-Required (LNR) Child Care: Providers are not required to meet any standards for health or safety. LNR providers are not monitored or inspected. Parents and guardians are responsible for overseeing the care of their child in these arrangements. Legally, these child care providers can care for up to two children (or a sibling group) who are not related to them.

In-child's-own-home care: Unlicensed care when parents arrange for child care at home – for example, a nanny or a baby-sitter.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Although child care is overseen provincially, municipalities play a key role in land use and development decisions with respect to child care. They can also play a role through plans and policies where local government can set child care as a priority for long-range community planning processes like Official Community Plans. To better understand the needs of child care from a local perspective, the Province of British Columbia has announced a number of funding programs for local governments:

Through the Union of BC Municipalities:¹

- » **Community Child Care Planning Program:** Provides funding for local government to develop a space creation action plan. This project falls under this funding stream.
- » **Community Child Care Space Creation Program:** Provides funding to local governments to create new licensed child care spaces, with a focus on infants and toddlers.

Through the Ministry of Child and Family Development:²

- » **Childcare BC New Spaces Fund:** Provides funding to public sector organizations, Indigenous governments, non-profit societies and corporate companies to create, expand or relocate new licensed child care spaces.

¹ Source: Child Care, Union of BC Municipalities: <https://www.ubcm.ca/EN/main/funding/lgps/child-care.html>

² Source: Childcare BC New Spaces Fund: Create New Spaces, Province of British Columbia: <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/family-social-supports/caring-for-young-children/running-daycare-preschool/childcare-new-spaces-fund>



METHODOLOGY

The Salmon Arm Child Care Needs Assessment & Action Plan was informed through a child care inventory, community profile analysis, policy analysis and an engagement process that included both quantitative and qualitative feedback. A complete 'What We Heard Report' from engagement can be found in Appendix A.

INVENTORY

A number of sources were used to inform the inventory of child care spaces in the City of Salmon Arm. Baseline data was provided by MCFD and represented provincial child care provider information as of January 2019 and reflected those receiving Childcare Operating Funding (CCOF) support from the province. The inventory was cross-referenced with Interior Health's licensed data set, the BC Child Care Map available through MCFD and information provided through the CCRR. Providers were also contacted directly to verify information. An online Child Care Provider survey also helped to inform the inventory.

COMMUNITY PROFILE ANALYSIS

To provide greater insight into the community and family makeup within the area, an analysis of population data was conducted for the City of Salmon Arm. Data was gathered from Statistics Canada and BC Stats. This data, combined with inventory data, helped to define the gap in access to care and to provide context surrounding the composition of families in the community and some of the additional basic needs impacting their well-being.

BACKGROUND POLICY RESEARCH

Background research on relevant policies, plans and bylaws was conducted for the City of Salmon Arm. An analysis of Official Community Plans, Zoning Bylaws and Business Licensing identified municipal processes and policies that may impact the creation of licensed child care spaces in the City.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Parent Survey

A parent survey was distributed throughout the community from September 4th to September 30th, 2019. A total of 123 parents responded, which provided insight into how child care is currently used, the challenges that families experience and opportunities for improvement.

Child Care Provider Survey

An online child care provider survey was offered from October 7th to October 19th, 2019. A total of four providers completed the survey, which mostly helped to inform the inventory.

Employee Survey

An online employee survey was offered from October 7th to October 19th, 2019. A total of 10 responses were received from individuals who work within child care in Salmon Arm.

Focus Groups

Focus groups were organized to connect with parents of different social and economic backgrounds. They were coordinated around existing child-related activities to help increase the number of attendees. The project team dropped into the following programs:

- » Strong Start at the District Education Support Centre
- » Immigrant Parent Event at the Shuswap Immigrant Services Society
- » Healthiest Babies Group at the Shuswap Family Centre
- » Shuswap Children's Association Event at the District Education Support Centre

One-on-One Interviews

To better understand the state of child care in Salmon Arm, one-on-one interviews were conducted with organizations who regularly work with children:

- » Shuswap Children's Association
- » School District 83
- » Shuswap Family Centre
- » WorkBC Committee Workshop

Committee Workshop

To collaborate on actions to support this action plan, a joint committee workshop was held with the Child Care Planning Committee of Salmon Arm, a representative of the Sicamous Child Care Planning Committee (which was simultaneously carrying out a similar project) and key agency representatives from Interior Health licensing and School District 83.



STATE OF CHILD CARE IN SALMON ARM

Project engagement and an inventory helped to shed light on the child care narrative within Salmon Arm from the perspective of providers, parents and community supports.

CHILD CARE SPACES & PROGRAM LOCATIONS

As of March 2020, there were total of 514 licensed or registered licensed-not-required child care spaces in the City of Salmon Arm offered by 29 program locations (Table 1).

It should be noted that other child care offerings exist within the City that are unlicensed or unregistered with the Child Care Resource & Referral. This may include, for example, care provided by a stay-at-home parent, nannies or family members providing care. These care types are difficult to quantify and are fluid. As such, they have not been accounted for in this inventory.

Table 1: Number of child care spaces and programs for each category of care in Salmon Arm

	Group Child Care (birth – 36 months)	Group Child Care (30 months – school age)	Licensed Preschool	Group Child Care (school age)	Multi-Age Child Care	Family Child Care	In-Home Multi-Age Child Care	TOTAL Child Care Spaces
Child Care Spaces	68	119	80	183	48	16	0	514
Child Care Programs	6	5	4	7	4	3	0	29

- » There is one child care program location in Salmon Arm offering bilingual programming in Spanish.
- » There is currently no Francophone programming available in licensed daycares or preschools in Salmon Arm.
- » There is a child care centre opening in the Salmon Arm area, which will be run by the Neskonlith Indian Band and is set to offer Indigenous programming.

ACCESS TO CARE

Ministry of Children and Family Development early years performance indicators show that City of Salmon Arm is an area with “Significant difficulty in finding care” for the infant / toddler age group and with “Some difficulty in finding care” for ages 3-5.³

Parent and provider survey data and engagement feedback support the MCFD’s findings and further illustrate that there is not enough space to meet demand. 58% of respondents indicated that they are looking for full-time care, while 84% indicated that they would like access to part-time care. Engagement feedback from focus groups also indicated that the largest unmet demand was for children under two years of age.

Parent survey respondents also indicated that the child care categories that have the largest unmet demand include (Figure 1):

- » Licensed group child care (0 – 18 months) (94%)
- » Licensed group child care (19 – 36 months) (73%)
- » Licensed multi-age child care (80%)
- » Registered licensed-not-required child care (60%)

In addition, parents are also looking for more options that address the following:

- » On-call care (76%)
- » Care on statutory holidays (84%)
- » Overnight care (91%)
- » Drop-in (97%) and weekend care (89%)
- » Care during school closures (78%)
- » Extended care before 6 am (91%) and after 7 pm (82%)
- » Pick-up (64%) and drop-off (78%)

“It is nearly impossible to find child care in Salmon Arm.”


- PARENT

“I called every single childcare center and private care, and everyone was full”

- PARENT

³ Source: Province of BC, Early Years Performance Indicators: <https://mcfcd.gov.bc.ca/reporting/services/early-years/performance-indicators>

Figure 1: What kind of child care service do you use / need? (from the Parent Survey)



Accessing Care – Immigrant Families

Access to child care is necessary for immigrant families looking to do training or take language courses to gain employment within the community. Some parents have found part-time care at formal child care centres, while others have taken advantage of the low cost or free child care associated with the Shuswap Immigrant Services Centre. Demand appears to be more for part-time care to prepare young ones for kindergarten, help teach them English and to provide parents with extra time for courses.

FINDING ALTERNATIVES

When families are unable to access care, they often look for solutions through family and friends; 88% of parent survey respondents indicated that they currently use a family or friend for care. Also, when regular child care is not available, parents will: take time off from work, use sick days to care for their child / children, make the decision for one parent to not work, bring their child / children to work or use a nanny service.

PREFERRED CHILD CARE TYPES

56% of parent survey respondents indicated that they are receiving care from their first-choice facility. The top factors influencing child care preference include:

- » Education or certification of child care provider (87%)
- » Flexible operating hours (86%)
- » License or registration of child care provider (85%)
- » Accommodation of siblings (82%)
- » Convenience of location (79%)

Level of Satisfaction

When looking at levels of satisfaction, 70% of parent respondents indicated that they are satisfied with the care they receive. Services to improve on could include: greater flexibility in operating hours (18% unsatisfied), access to subsidy or fee reduction (18% unsatisfied), specialized supports for children with behavioural, physical or developmental needs (13% unsatisfied) or education / certification of child care providers (13% unsatisfied).

“When we first moved here, we were desperate for care of any sort. Our RLNR daycare turned out to be amazing, and even though spots opened up in licensed daycares we chose to stay with our RLNR.”

PARENT

HOURS & LOCATION

Hours

There is a critical lack of child care with flexible hours in the City of Salmon Arm – especially for families who work shift work or 12-hour shifts. As a result of this lack of flexibility, some parents have had to turn down employment opportunities to care for their children (focus groups comment).

Location

Through engagement feedback, parents indicated that their child care program locations were mostly close to home (61%), work (37%) or close to family or family-like support (26%). At present, child care is available in most areas of the city, although to a lesser extent in Canoe and in the Neskonlith Indian Band communities. In both of these communities, there are child care providers working through the application and licensing approval process. In Canoe, an application has been made to Interior Health for 20 new spaces and a separate child care is looking to provide flexible hours. Additionally, Neskonlith Indian Band is working to develop a new child care centre that will provide up to 39 new child care spaces.

DISTANCE

38% of parent survey respondents indicated that they travel between 1 and 5 kilometers to their child care program location, followed by 22% who travel less than 1 km to access care. This demonstrates that care is either close to home or work but with relative ease of access due to the short distance required to travel.

WAITLISTS

Licensed and registered licensed-not-required child care experience 100% utilization in Salmon Arm. According to the parent survey, waitlists are between six months and two years and almost half (48%) of parents put themselves on between 2 and 5 waitlists to secure care. Some families indicated that to secure a space, they put themselves on waitlists once they've realized they are expecting – something that they recommend other families to do as well.

A snapshot of the parent survey responses that helped to create the above narrative on the state of child care in Salmon Arm can be on the following page in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Snapshot of Parent Survey Results





IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY

How has a high demand child care system impacted child care providers, parents and children?

CHILD CARE PROVIDER EXPERIENCE

Through engagement, we learned that child care providers enter the field because they are deeply passionate about children and child development. It is also an opportunity for educators to work with their own children in addition to caring for others. Despite the joy that this profession brings, 31% of respondents to the staff survey indicated that the lack of qualified staff is the major challenge facing the industry in Salmon Arm.

Recruitment & Retention

One of the main issues facing Early Childhood Educators in the area is that they are often not well compensated for the important and demanding service they provide. In Salmon Arm, they often make between \$17 - \$20 per hour, which is not a livable wage for the area. As a result, many ECEs or caregivers are feeling burnt out and not being paid a high enough wage to compensate for this demanding line of work. 44% of respondents to the staff survey indicated that higher wages (44%) recognition (22%) and benefits (22%) would encourage them to stay within the field.

“Children are wonderful, watching them grow, learn and discover new things is rewarding”

- CHILD CARE PROVIDER

Education & Training

There are several ways to enter the field of child care and to provide care across British Columbia. The following training types are offered across the province:

- » **Responsible Adult Training (RAT):** 20-hr training program
- » **Early Childhood Educator Assistant (ECEA):** Certification allows one to work with young children in an early childhood setting (ages birth to 5 years), under the supervision of a qualified Early Childhood Educator. Students must complete one of three courses approved by MCFD.
- » **Early Childhood Education (ECE) Certification:** 2-year training program with unpaid practicum
- » **Early Childhood Education – Infant Toddler Certification:** 2+ year training program with unpaid practicum that provides the highest level of certification to care for the infant toddler age category.

Tuition for the ECE program can be up to \$12,000, a high cost considering the level of pay an individual has once they have entered the workforce (although provincial bursaries have helped with education costs). There is an ECE and ECE – Infant Toddler Certificate program offered within Salmon Arm at Okanagan College and because of this, there is some incentive to complete the training and then continue working locally.

However, despite the local opportunity to become a certified ECE, providers indicated throughout engagement, their desire to have training and professional development opportunities offered within Salmon Arm instead of in larger city centres such as Kelowna or Vancouver. A more consistent offering of educational programs would help with local retention.

Unlicensed Care

Through engagement, it was found that unlicensed providers feel there are no incentives for them to become licensed because child care is in high demand and the process for licensing is cumbersome. As a result, there are many unlicensed care operators providing care for the community. For some families, this may play a role in the quality of care that a child receives.

Government Support for ECE Training

The province currently supports ECE students with a bursary for their training program. As of late 2019, that funding was fully allocated.

Perception of Child Care Providers

Through feedback received from engagement, several child care providers indicated that they would have increased job satisfaction with more recognition of the profession; just as teachers are recognized for the service they provide, child care providers play a vital role in early childhood development

Impact of Sporadic, Local Training Opportunities on Space Creation

While there are many points of entry into the child care field, local opportunities appear to be offered sporadically and often through a one time grant that has been offered to the community to deliver the training. The inconsistent opportunities to provide professional development and increase the capacity of the sector impacts the community's ability to increase the number of child care spaces; sporadic training opportunities leads to a lack of staff to provide, which prevents programs from expanding or starting up.

IMPACT ON PARENTS

The well-being of parents directly influences family dynamics and the well-being of the children that they care for and love. Although 70% of those receiving care indicated that they are satisfied with their child care provider, there are several challenges that parents face that may influence the overall mental health of the family.

Family Stressors

There are a several financial stressors that child care can bring to a family. The high cost of child care, particularly for those who have more than one child in care, can lead to families spending less on other essential items, such as food. As a result, there is increased demand at charitable food programs such as the food bank. In addition, for those who have not or cannot access care, families must often make the choice for one parent to stay home to care for their children, which puts strain on family resources. As an alternative, stress can be placed on a family who has had to make the decision to work opposite shifts as an alternative to finding care.

Due to the lack of space in Salmon Arm, child care programs are also able to limit their space offerings to full-time, year-round spots only. This means that parents are often paying for more care than they may need, and subsequently holding a space from another child who cannot access care.

Engagement feedback at focus groups also indicated that some parents are feeling pressure to attend a group child care setting or preschool to prepare their child for kindergarten. When there is difficulty accessing care, families may feel as though they are not providing the best experience for their child.

Unique Concerns for Parents of Children with Additional Challenges

For parents who have children with additional challenges – be it behavioural, developmental or cognitive – several concerns surfaced through engagement. For those who have secured a space, there are some concerns about knowledge and awareness amongst all staff to support the needs of their child.

There is some concern that children with higher needs may not be able to maintain their space or not accepted initially to a program because of the increased effort required to care for their child. The lack of local child development supports may also prevent children from accessing child care in the community at all.

IMPACT ON CHILDREN

The impacts of a high demand child care system can inevitably trickle-down to the children that this system serves. In addition to the parent stressors outlined above, which can impact how one may interact with their child, there are other examples identified through the focus groups that illustrate this trickle-down impact. Parents indicated that there are added pressures put on their children to reach milestones that they are not yet ready for (for example, developmental milestones such as potty training).

High Demand for Child Support Programs, Too

In addition to the high demand for child care spaces in Salmon Arm, there is also a high demand for added classroom supports, in the form of a program assistant, for children with higher needs. Currently, the Shuswap Children's Association, who provides developmental supports to children in need, has a waitlist that exceeds 50 children.

Engagement with parents and organization representatives utilizing Supported Child Development Programming indicated that limited access to resources is due to funding limitations. Therefore, when children are unable to access the support they need, it may lead to undiagnosed behavioural challenges and the possibility of slipping through the cracks.



ROLE OF COMMUNITY IN CHILD CARE

Community Support Services in Salmon Arm

- » Shuswap Family Centre
- » Shuswap Children's Association
- » Shuswap Child Care Resource and Referral
- » School District No. 83 North Okanagan – Shuswap
- » Shuswap Food Action
- » Shuswap Immigrant Services Society
- » BC211.ca
- » S.A.F.E (Shuswap Family Emergency Society)
- » Splatsin Tsm7aksaltn Teaching Society
- » Canadian Mental Health Association
- » Okanagan Regional Library
- » Aspiral Youth Partners Association
- » Ministry of Children and Family Development
- » Second Harvest Food Bank
- » The Salvation Army – The Lighthouse Community Ministries
- » Interior Health



ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN CHILD CARE

All levels of government can play a key role in improving the state of child care in the City of Salmon Arm.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT

Licensing

An important aspect of any licensed child care is to ensure compliance with the Community Care and Assisted Living Act Child Care Licensing Regulation. This ensures that child care providers meet provincial government requirements for:

- » Health and Safety
- » Staffing Qualifications
- » Staff-to-child ratios
- » Space and Equipment
- » Program Standards

The child care provider typically works with the provincial government licensing officer to ensure all conditions are met. In expanding or creating new space, it is recommended to work with the licensing officer and child care provider at the start of the project to support co-designing the necessary spaces.

Each age group that care is licensed for has separate requirements related to the categories identified above to ensure their safety. The [Child Care Licensing Regulation](#) should always be referred to and is only presented in this report for information purposes.

Table 2 outlines the requirements applicable to all child care facilities, while Table 3 provides a breakdown of regulations pertaining to each type of child care program.

Child care providers must apply for a license to operate through their local health authority, who will ensure that provincial requirements are met prior to granting the provider a license to operate. Interior Health has a [guide posted on their website](#) that outlines all of the necessary steps associated with applying for a child care licence within their jurisdiction.

It is strongly recommended that child care providers connect with their local health authority at the start of their planning to establish a relationship and ensure that they understand all the regulatory requirements needed to become a licensed child care facility.

Table 2: Universal Child Care Facility Requirements in British Columbia

Usable Floor Area	3.7 sq. m., excluding hallways, built in storage areas, bathrooms, and fixed appliances.
Bathrooms	One toilet and wash basin for every 10 children or less must be on the same floor of the child care facility.
Diaper Change Stations	Must be located outside of food preparation areas, next to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Covered container for soiled clothing » Wash basin
Sleeping Area	Must be located away from any activity area
Outdoor Area	Must be enclosed to ensure that children are free of harm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Must have 6 square meters of outdoor play area for each child, or if providing more than one type of care, an outdoor play area that meets the requirement of the various groups care is being provided for.

For information purposes only, refer to provincial Child Care Licensing Regulations for the most up to date and accurate regulation requirements.

Table 3: Provincial Regulations for Child Care Facilities in British Columbia by Type of Child Care

Licensing	Child Care Type	Age	Maximum Group Size	Child-to-staff Ratio	Staff Qualifications	Setting
Yes	Under 3 years	From birth to 36 months	12 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 4 children: 1 Infant Toddler Educator (ITE) » 5-8 children: 1 ITE, 1 Early Childhood Educator (ECE) » 9-12 children: 1 ITE, 1 ECE, 1 Early Childhood Educator Assistant (ECEA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » ITE: 1300 hrs of training » ECE: 900 hrs of training » ECEA: completion of one ECE course 	Community-based facility or centre
	2.5 years to school age	From 30 months to Kindergarten age	25 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 1-8 children: 1 ECE » 9-16 children: 1 ECE, ECEA » 17-25 children: 1 ECE, 2 ECEAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » ECE: 900 hrs of training » ECEA: completion of one ECE course 	Community-based facility or centre
	School age (before- and after-school care)	Kindergarten age and up	24 children from K and G1 OR G2 and older with no K or G1 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 1 adult for each 12 children from K and G1 » 1 adult for each 15 children from G2 and older 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 20 hours of child care training » Relevant work experience » Valid first aid certificate » Clear criminal record check 	Community-based facility or centre
	Multi-age	From birth to 12 years	8 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 1 ECE for 8 children 	ECE Certificate: 900 hrs of training	Community-based facility or centre
	In-home multi-age child care	From birth to 12 years	8 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 1 ECE (who is also the licensee) for 8 children 	ECE Certificate: 900 hrs of training	In the provider's home
	Family child care	From birth to 12 years	7 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 1 adult for 7 children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 20 hours of child care training » Relevant work experience » Valid first aid certificate 	In the provider's home

					» Clear criminal record check	
	Preschool	From 2.5 years to school age	20 children	» 1-10 children: 1 ECE » 11-20 children: 1 ECE and 1 ECEA	» ECE Certificate: 900 hrs of training » ECEA: completion of one ECE course	Community-based facility or centre
	Occasional child care	18 months old and up	16 children (if there are children under 36 months) or 20 children (if no children under 36 months)	» Every 4 children (if children under 36 months are present): 1 adult » Every 8 children (if no children under 36 months are present): 1 adult	» 20 hours of child care training » Relevant work experience » Valid first aid certificate » Clear criminal record check	Community-based facility or centre
No	Registered License-Not-Required	From birth to age 12	Two children or a sibling group who are not related to them	Every 2 children: 1 adult	» 20 hours of child care training » Relevant work experience » Valid first aid certificate » Clear criminal record check	In the provider's home
	Unregistered	From birth to any age	Two children or a sibling group who are not related to them	Every 2 children: 1 adult	» No qualifications required	In the provider's home

For information purposes only, refer to provincial Child Care Licensing Regulations for the most up to date and accurate regulation requirements.

Funding

The Province of British Columbia also plays a role in funding for child care providers and operators, support services and families in need.

The provincial government has recently developed programs to support ECE training (bursaries) in addition to several capital and operating grants, space creation grants, child care planning grants and more.

The province also provides funding supports for programs that support child development and financial support to families through the Affordable Child Care Benefit, the Fee Reduction Initiative, the Young Parent Program and Universal Prototype Sites offering low-cost quality child care.

Provincial Government Funding Supports to Operate Licensed Child Care:

- » Child Care BC Maintenance Fund
- » Child Care BC New Spaces Fund
- » Child Care Operating Fund (includes the Child Care Fee Reduction Initiative)
- » Community Child Care Planning Program (UBCM)
- » Community Child Care Space Creation Program for Local Governments (UBCM)
- » Startup Grants
- » Early Childhood Educator Wage Enhancement

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The type and location of a child care facility in a municipality will depend on the permitted uses in a given zone. Before a child care facility is opened, it is important that the business owner determine if the property where they wish to open their facility allows such uses as per the municipal Zoning Bylaw. If the business owner finds that child care facilities are not listed as a permitted use under their property zoning, they will be required to undertake a Zoning Bylaw Amendment process to legally permit the child care facility on the property.

Undertaking these municipal application processes can sometimes be time-consuming and complex, especially if the applicant is not familiar with the processes. It is highly recommended that child care providers connect with their local government at the earliest point possible in their decision-making process to open a child care facility. The information presented here is for information purposes only and does not replace the City's regulation.

In the City of Salmon Arm, child care is addressed in the *Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4000 (OCP)*, and to a lesser extent in *Zoning Bylaw No. 2303*.

Official Community Plan & Child Care

In the OCP, there are three child care definitions. These are:

- » **COMMERCIAL DAYCARE FACILITY** means any type of facility that provides group daycare programs for eight or more children in accordance with the Provincial Child Care Facilities Regulations as amended from time to time. This type of care facility is permitted in the following zones:

R4 – Medium Density Residential

R5 – High Density Residential

- » **FAMILY CHILDCARE FACILITY** means daycare facilities for a maximum of seven (7) children (including child family members) in accordance with the Provincial Child Care Facilities Regulations as amended from time to time and may include a maximum of three (3) employees. This type of care facility is permitted in the following zones:

R1 - Single Family
Residential

R2 - Single Family/Duplex
Residential

R4 - Medium Density
Residential

R6 - Mobile Home Park
Residential

R7 - Large Lot Single Family
Residential

R8 - Residential Suite

R9 - Estate Residential

M6 - Industrial Holding

A1 - Agriculture

A2 - Rural Holding

A3 - Small Holding

- » **GROUP CHILDCARE** means a child care facility for up to a maximum of eight (8) children, ages for which must be grouped from 0-3 years, 3-6 years and 6-12 years. The childcare provider does not have to reside in the home in which the group childcare is operated. This type of facility is permitted in the following zones:

R1 - Single Family
Residential

R2 - Single Family/Duplex
Residential

R4 - Medium Density
Residential

R6 - Mobile Home Park
Residential

R7 - Large Lot Single Family
Residential

R8 - Residential Suite

R9 - Estate Residential

M6 - Industrial Holding

A1 - Agriculture

A2 - Rural Holding

A3 - Small Holding

Additional policies in the OCP which impact child care are the following:

- » **8.3.9** High Density Residential areas may accommodate all forms of residential housing up to and including multiple family apartment buildings. High Density Residential developments may be permitted to a density of 100 units per hectare. Density may be increased to a maximum of 200 units per hectare for Assisted Living housing, or 130 units per hectare for multiple family housing, subject to the provision of special social or public amenities (e.g., commercial childcare facility, fully accessible dwelling units and suites, rental housing, affordable rental housing, below grade or parkade style parking, parkland, greenways or trails, green building and site design) in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw.
- » **8.3.11** Medium Density Residential areas may accommodate all forms of residential housing including small scale multiple family apartment buildings. Medium Density Residential areas may be permitted to a density of 40 units per hectare. Density may be increased to a maximum of 80 units per hectare for Assisted Living Housing, or 50 units per hectare for multiple family housing subject to the provision of special social and/or public amenities (e.g., commercial childcare facility, fully accessible dwelling units and suites, rental housing, affordable rental housing, below grade or parkade style parking, additional parkland, greenways or trails, green building and site design) in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw.
- » **9.3.19** New Neighbourhood Commercial areas may be located within High, Medium and Low Density Residential areas subject to the following:
 - a. the development is intended to service the local convenience shopping needs of the surrounding residential area; and
 - b. permitted uses may include but are not limited to:
 - convenience or small scale food retail store,
 - neighbourhood pub, restaurant or café,
 - commercial child care,
 - office,
 - personal service establishment, and
 - upper floor residential.
- » **15.3.22** d. Encourage and facilitate child care facilities and services, e.g., in new developments, places of employment, education and cultural facilities;
 - g. Work with regional partners, encourage social issues to be considered in new development proposals where appropriate, recognizing that social issues may include affordable and accessible housing; daycare; transit, access to schools, recreation and government services, healthy, safe and violence-free communities;

Zoning Bylaws & Child Care

Zoning Bylaw regulations which would affect child care include:

- » One parking space is required for every 35 square metres of gross floor area
- » Business licensing fees for child care are \$135




COMMUNITY PROFILE

The community profile provides insight and context surrounding the population in Salmon Arm and the community characteristics that support the different types of child care that are needed in the community.

Population⁴

The total population of the City of Salmon arm is 17,705. The total number of children from zero to 12 years old is 2,230. Within the zero to 12 age group, children between the ages of six and 12 account for 59%. Children between three and five years old, and up to two years account for 22% and 19% of the child population, respectively (**Figure 3**). These age categories best align with child care age regulations (e.g. infant-toddler, preschool age, school age).

Figure 3: Child Population Age Breakdown (2016)



Households

In Salmon Arm, there are 5,145 census families, which are households with a minimum of two people forming a social and economic relationship. There is a total of 2,405 households comprised of either a couple (married or common-law) with children or a lone parent with children.


The greatest proportion of these households are couples with one and two children. Lone parents with one child account for the next greatest proportion of households. In total, lone parents with one, two or three children account for 705 (29%) of households with children in Salmon Arm.

Lone parent households typically have much lower income than couple family households and rely on one income earner who, in most cases, has no choice but to work. This has considerable implications on the need for child care in Salmon Arm. It should be noted that “children,” according to the census, can be of any age as long as they live with the parents/caregivers and do not have their own child or spouse/partner.

⁴ All information in this section, unless otherwise stated, has been sourced from 2016 census data.

Figure 4 indicates the households in Salmon Arm with children by couple status and number of children.

Figure 4: Households with Children (2016)



Income

In Salmon Arm, the median pre-tax income is \$63,646. Couple families with children are typically high-earning households. In Salmon Arm, these households earn \$110,196, which is on par with their counterparts across B.C. Lone parent families earn \$49,920, which is close to the median amount for this household group in British Columbia.

Early Development Index (EDI)

It is known that the quality of children’s experiences and environments across every aspect of their lives influences their lifelong health and well-being. Decades of research reinforces the importance of investing more robustly in early development, such as quality child care.⁵ This information provides further insight into the community context and illustrates the importance of accessible, affordable and quality child care for all ages and stages.

The **Early Development Index (EDI)** is administered provincially by the Human Early Learning partnership at UBC and is delivered through all school districts at the kindergarten level each year. The data provides insight into the social, emotional, physical health and well-being, communication, language and cognitive

⁵ Human Early Learning Partnership. Early Development Instrument [EDI] report. Wave 7 Community Profile, 2019. North Okanagan - Shuswap School District (SD83): University of British Columbia, Faculty of Medicine, School of Population and Public Health; February 2020. Available from: http://earlylearning.ubc.ca/media/edi_w7_communityprofiles/edi_w7_communityprofile_sd_83.pdf

development of children in B.C. and how they have changed over time. These insights support evidence-based decision making to improve investments in children and therefore improve early child development outcomes.

EDI in Salmon Arm


EDI data is available at the neighbourhood level for both Salmon Arm East and West. This data is part of the “Wave 7” EDI, which means that that it is the seventh time frame that data has been collected since 2001 and represents data gathered from 2017 to 2019.

EDI data shows that there is a distinct difference for those children living in Salmon Arm West compared to Salmon Arm East. Forty-nine percent (49%) of children living in the West are vulnerable on one or more scales of the EDI. This is compared to 32% of children in Salmon Arm East (**Table 4**).

Table 4: EDI Wave 7 Data for Salmon Arm East and Salmon Arm West Neighbourhoods (2017 - 2019)

	% of children in Salmon Arm East	% of children in Salmon Arm West
Vulnerable on one of more scale	32%	49%
Physical health and well-being	13%	31%
Social Competence	13%	24%
Emotional Maturity	19%	23%
Language and Cognitive Development	5%	15%
Communication Skills	8%	15%

Figure 5: Children Vulnerable in one or more scales of the Wave 7 EDI (2017 - 2019) for School District 83



Across all EDI measures, children in Salmon Arm West are significantly more vulnerable than those in the East. The category of “vulnerable on one or more scales” is a summary measure that reports the percentage of children who are vulnerable on at least one or more of the five scales of the EDI. Children captured by this measure may be vulnerable on only one scale, or may be experiencing vulnerabilities on two, three, four or all five scales of the EDI. Vulnerable children are those who, without additional support and care, are more likely to experience future challenges in their school years and beyond.

As a comparison the overall percentage of children in B.C. who are vulnerable on one or more scale of the EDI is 33%.

These neighbourhood level disparities indicate that provisioning of high-quality child care may be particularly important in the Salmon Arm West neighbourhood as research shows that these types of supports can drastically improve outcomes for children in all areas outlined by the EDI. They also indicate the need for greater supports in the community to address child vulnerabilities.



CHILD CARE SUPPLY, DEMAND & TARGETS

CHILD CARE SUPPLY

As of March 2020, the City of Salmon Arm has 514 licensed and registered licensed-not-required child care spaces made available through 29 program locations (**Table 5**).

Table 5: Child Care by Type

Type of Child Care	Number of Programs	Number of Spaces
Group Child Care (Birth to 36 months)	6	68
Group Child Care (30 months to school age)	5	119
Licensed Preschool Spaces	4	80
Group Child Care (School Age) Spaces	7	183
Multi Age Child Care Spaces	4	48
Family Child Care Spaces	3	16
In-Home Multi Age Child Care Spaces	0	0
Total	29	514

In addition to these licensed and registered licensed-not-required child care programs, there are a large number of casual babysitters advertising on Facebook and unregistered or unlicensed child care programs that were not accounted for in this inventory.


The following map shows the child care program location distribution for various categories of care.

Pending Space Creation

There are several new spaces that will be opening soon within Salmon Arm and the surrounding area.

This space creation brings excitement to the community as additional program offerings are desperately needed. According to Interior Health licensing as of February 2020 there were:

- » 67 new spaces approved in the community
- » Applications for another 53 spaces in Salmon Arm awaiting approval



CHILD CARE ACCESS RATE

The current child care access rate (number of spaces per 100 children) was determined from child population data from Statistics Canada (2016) and the number of spaces for a given age category as determined by the inventory (Table 6). Categories of care and age categories were grouped based on non-school-aged children (ages 0 – 5) and school-aged children (ages 6 – 12). Multi-age, in-home multi-age and family child care spaces were split evenly between the 0 – 5 and 6 – 12 age categories, respectfully. A full description of this methodology can be found in Appendix B.

Table 6: Child population, spaces and access rate (Ages 0 – 5 and 6 – 12)

Age Category	Child Population (current) ⁶	Number of Spaces (2019)*	Access Rate (spaces per 100 children)
0 – 5 years	915	219	23.9
6 – 12 years	1,315	215	16.0

**A complete outline of the methodology for allocating inventory counts to each of the age categories can be found in Appendix B. Licensed preschool spaces were not used to determine access rates as programs are typically part-time and families may still require additional care to meet their needs.*

It should be noted that these access rates are impacted by out of town residents from the region also accessing care within Salmon Arm; anecdotally, parents in the region work in Salmon Arm and are securing care near their place of work.

CHILD CARE DEMAND & SPACE CREATION TARGETS

City of Salmon Arm licensed space creation targets are based on population projections from BC Statistics⁷ based on the Local Health Area (region 142, Salmon Arm) and the current child care inventory within this study (licensed and registered licensed-not-required child care spaces only). To align with census age data, targets have been separated into 0 – 5 and 6 – 12 age categories. For each age group, the following space creation targets were determined:

- » Total spaces needed to maintain a municipality's current **access rate**
- » Total spaces need to maintain a municipality's **target access rate**

Target access rates have been provided by MCFD and correspond to 30 (or 30% coverage) for ages 0 – 5 and 80 (or 80% coverage) for ages 6 – 12.

⁶ Source: Statistics Canada, 2016 Census of Population, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X2016003

⁷ Source: BC Stats P.E.O.P.L.E Population Projections : <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/data/statistics/people-population-community/population/population-projections>

Table 7 summarizes the average annual space creation targets for the City of Salmon Arm over a ten-year horizon. **Tables 8 and 9** show the number of spaces needed in 2020 (1 year), 2022 (2 years), 2025 (5 years) and 2030 (10 years) to meet current or target access rates. The complete methodology for calculating space creations targets can also be found in Appendix B. It should be noted that space creation is reliant on support and funding from the province.

Table 7: Average Annual Space Creation Targets (2020 – 2030)

	Ages 0 – 5	Ages 6 – 12
Salmon Arm	13	116

Table 8: City of Salmon Arm Space Creation Targets - Ages 0 – 5

Year	Projected Children	Total Spaces Needed to Maintain Current Access Rate (23.9)	Total Spaces Needed to Maintain Target Access Rate (30.0)
2019	915	219	275
2020	928	224	281
2022	909	217	273
2025	897	214	269
2030	1,157	276	347 ⁸

To meet a 30% access rate or a target of 347 spaces for children ages 0 – 5 by 2030, Salmon Arm will need an average of 13 new spaces per year over the next 10 years.

Table 9: City of Salmon Arm Space Creation Targets: Ages 6 – 12

Year	Projected Children	Total Spaces Needed to Maintain Current Access Rate (16.0)	Total Spaces Needed to Maintain Target Access Rate (80.0)
2019	1,315	215	1,052
2020	1,267	203	1,013
2022	1,278	204	1,022
2025	1,749	280	1,399
2030	1,715	274	1,372*

To meet a 80% access rate or a target of 1372 spaces for children ages 6 – 12 by 2030, Salmon Arm will need an average of 116 new spaces per year over the next 10 years.

⁸ This number reflects the total number of spaces in the community for this age category, which includes the current number of spaces that have been determined by the inventory. This also applies to Table 9.



KEY RECOMMENDATIONS & ACTIONS

Given the complex nature of child care, a multi-faceted approach is required to support a systems change within the City of Salmon Arm. We have proposed five recommendation areas that will help the City move towards a more sustainable, community system:

- Education & Training
- Policy
- Process
- Partnerships
- Advocacy

The recommendations set out in this plan are grounded in the province’s goal to move towards Universal Child Care, a model that encourages licensed child care that offers inclusive and culturally-appropriate programming and programming for children with diverse needs.

A more detailed action plan can be found in **Table 10**.

EDUCATION & TRAINING

Providing educational opportunities for child care providers and operators in Salmon Arm – particularly around transitioning to or creating licensed child care programs – will lead to greater knowledge around high-quality space creation. Education is key to retaining ECEs locally and helping to understand how to navigate the system within Salmon Arm.

Key recommendations related to education and training include:

- » Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage unlicensed providers to pursue licensing.
- » Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage those starting new child care programs to pursue licensed programming.
- » Provide professional development opportunities in the area of basic business training to support licensed child care operators with running their business.
- » Expand the level of service of licensed child care operators by providing local education and professional development opportunities.

Table 10: Recommendations & Actions – Education & Training

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
<p>Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage unlicensed providers to pursue licensing.</p> <p>Provide navigation supports and consultation services to encourage those starting new child care programs to pursue licensed programming.</p>	Continue to hold child care start-up workshops for individuals interested in starting a child care program	CCRR/Okanagan College	1-2 years
	Secure local, ongoing and consistent training opportunities to support new child care providers entering the community and existing child care providers with professional development opportunities.	Okanagan College	1-2 years
	Create opportunities for mentorship or job shadowing for prospective child care providers	CCRR	1-2 years
	Hold workshops for unregistered/unlicensed child care providers interested in pursuing registration/licensing	Okanagan College/ CCRR	3-5 years
	Revisit results of workshops and explore next steps, changes in strategy	Child Care Planning Committee	5-10 years
Provide professional development opportunities in the area of basic business training to support licensed child care operators.	Hold workshops or training for child care providers on business planning and systems/policy development	Okanagan College/ CCRR	3-5 years
Expand the level of service of licensed child care operators by providing local education and professional development opportunities.	Seek to align educational opportunities with current community child care needs (i.e. flexible child care, infant toddler, school age care)	Okanagan College/ CCRR	3-5 years
	Establish communication between licensing, Child Care Resource and Referral, and those providing education to ensure alignment with current needs	Child Care Planning Committee	1-2 years
	Reach out to Indigenous and immigrant organizations to help deliver cultural education and programming to child care providers	CCRR /Child Care Planning Committee	1-2 years

POLICY

Improvements to municipal plans and policies related to child care is within the role of local government. It helps to ensure that child care is identified as a priority. Updating definitions, permitted land use zones, and strategic goals within municipal plans can facilitate additional investment in child care from the provincial government through supports and funding to both public and private entities. Additionally, clear policies and guidelines from local government assists the development community to provide opportunities for partnering with local child care organizations to create new spaces to meet the demand.

Key recommendations related to policy include:

- » Review and update municipal plans and policies to incorporate child care space priorities as part of growth management, neighbourhood planning, and well-being priorities
- » Review existing child care definitions to ensure they are aligned with the province’s definitions
- » Consider establishing municipal incentives for child care providers

Table 11: Recommendations & Actions – Policy

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Review and update municipal plans and policies to incorporate child care space priorities as part of growth management, neighbourhood planning, and well-being priorities.	Identify municipal plans and policies where child care can be incorporated	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
	Establish a schedule to update/amend municipal policies or plans to include child care priorities and guidance	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
	Prioritize and implement schedule as identified and expediate specific policy updates where appropriate to meet annual child care space needs	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-5 years
Review existing child care definitions to ensure they are in alignment with provincial government definitions.	Identify child care definitions within existing policies and update, where applicable, to meet provincial government definitions	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
Consider establishing municipal incentives to minimize the financial impacts of operating a licensed child care centre.	Amend Permissive Tax Exemption Policy No. 715 to include licensed, non-profit child care providers and licensed private child care operators	City of Salmon Arm Financial Services	3-5 years
	Provide incentives (e.g. first year free business license fees, site or neighbourhood specific property tax exemptions, etc.) to child care providers who start-up licensed child care in underserved neighbourhoods in the community	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	5-10 years

PROCESS

Lowering the barrier to licensed space creation in Salmon Arm can be achieved by streamlining regulatory processes for child care start-up and expansion.

- » Streamline the municipal processes for child care provider space creation and ensure alignment with licensing procedures.
- » Pursue an expedited criminal record checks process for ECEs to speed the process of entering the workforce.

Table 12: Recommendations & Actions – Process

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Streamline the municipal process for child care provider space creation and ensure alignment with licensing procedures.	Create easy to follow checklist and/or infographic to assist prospective child care providers in navigating municipal government processes	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	1-2 years
	Establish partnership between the City of Salmon Arm Development Services and Interior Health licensing to support processing and approving child care applications in a coordinated and timely manner	City of Salmon Arm Development Services, Interior Health Community Care Licensing Division	1-2 years
Pursue an expedited criminal record checks for ECEs to speed the process of entering the workforce	Engage with the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General to discuss delay issues and possible solutions.	CCRR	1-2 years

PARTNERSHIPS

Child care is provided and supported by a number of organizations in Salmon Arm. Improving child care and adding spaces to the community will depend on enhancing existing partnerships and/or encouraging new ones. Building partnerships to create linkages to resources across the city will be key to finding solutions to meet the child care space demand in Salmon Arm.

Key recommendations related to partnerships include:

- » Consider joint-use agreements between public institutions to help facilitate the creation of additional child care spaces.
- » Consider opportunities to leverage public assets and underutilized space to facilitate child care space creation.
- » Continue to convene meetings of the Child Care Planning Committee to facilitate Child Care Action Plan implementation.
- » Meet with industry employers in community to consider in-house employee provided child care.

Table 13: Recommendations & Actions – Partnerships

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Consider joint use agreements between public institutions to help facilitate the creation of additional child care spaces.	Convene meetings between School District 83 and the City to discuss joint use opportunities for child care and ways to facilitate in current or new public facilities	City of Salmon Arm/School District 83	1-2 years
Consider opportunities to leverage public assets and underutilized space to facilitate child care space creation.	Create an inventory of public assets that are suitable for potential child care centres	City of Salmon Arm Development Services	5-10 years
	Share the inventory with the CCRR to distribute with the local child care and business community	City of Salmon Arm Development Services/CCRR/Economic Development Society	5-10 years
	Identify and consider other under-utilized spaces within the community that could be used for child care	City of Salmon Arm Development Services/CCRR/Economic Development Society	3-10 years
Continue to convene meetings of the Child Care Planning Committee to facilitate plan implementation.	Establish the Child Care Planning Committee as a Committee of City Council and convene twice a year to support and monitor implementation of Child Care Action Plan	City of Salmon Arm City Council, Child Care Planning Committee	Ongoing
Meet with industry employers in community to consider in-house employee provided child care.	Identify potential industry partners and meet to discuss community child care needs and workforce opportunities in support of in-house employee provided child care	Child Care Planning Committee, Economic Development Society	1-5 years

ADVOCACY

The provincial government is key to providing funding for child care providers, supports for children with higher needs and families requiring financial relief. Therefore, advocating on behalf of communities and families in need of stable and affordable child care is critical to increasing child care spaces and improving the overall state of child care in Salmon Arm.

Key recommendations related to advocacy include:

- » Advocate to provincial government through UBCM for enhanced funding to support child development programs.
- » Advocate to the Ministry for Children and Families for additional supports for ECEs (wage enhancements, bursaries, professional development opportunities and educational supports) to support recruitment and retention in Salmon Arm.
- » Ensure that the City of Salmon Arm (including Council and management) through the Child Care Planning Committee are aware of child care issues and opportunities to advocate on behalf of the City and local organizations.
- » Advocate to the Ministry of Children and Family Development, Ministry of Education and School District 83 for permanent child care spaces to be included in elementary schools, either as purpose built facilities or as classrooms in new school infrastructure.
- » Advocate to the Ministry of Children and Family Development, Ministry of Health, Interior Health, and Okanagan College to make child care space available at the location of any large public institution or government employer, such as at Shuswap Lake General Hospital or the Okanagan College Salmon Arm Campus.
- » Request through the Ministry for Children and Family Development the creation of a Universal Child Care Prototype Site in Salmon Arm.

Table 14: Recommendations & Actions – Advocacy

Recommendation	Actions	Lead	Timeline
Advocate to provincial government through UBCM for enhanced funding to support child development programs.	Engage with Ministry leaders at UBCM Convention requesting increased access to funding for child care supports	City of Salmon Arm City Council, Child Care Planning Committee (support)	1-5 years
Advocate to the MCFD for additional supports for ECEs (wage enhancements, bursaries, professional development opportunities and educational supports) to support recruitment and retention in Salmon Arm.	Engage with the Ministry of Children and Family Development on the importance of fair wages for child care employees to improve retention and quality of life for workers	City of Salmon Arm City Council, Child Care Planning Committee, Chamber of Commerce	1-5 years
Ensure that the City (including Council and management) through the Child Care Planning Committee are aware of child care issues and opportunities to advocate on behalf of the City and local organizations.	Host a special meeting of the Child Care Planning Committee ahead of UBCM Convention to support City staff and Council to understand current issues and opportunities for investment in child care	Child Care Planning Committee, City of Salmon Arm Corporate Services and City Council	1-2 years
Advocate to the Ministry of Education and SD83 for permanent child care spaces to be included in elementary schools, either as purpose built facilities or as classrooms in new school infrastructure.	Identify local space opportunities and meet with decision makers to assess the potential for child care in publicly owned buildings	City of Salmon Arm Development Services, Child Care Planning Committee, School District 83	1-5 years
Advocate to the MCFD to develop guidelines and policy change to support CCRRs in licensing recommendations to providers.	Convene conversations between licensing, the MCFD and the CCRR to determine a meaningful way the CCRR can better help child care providers in their licensing journey	CCRR	3-5 years

<p>Advocate to the MCFD, Ministry of Health, Interior Health, and Okanagan College to make child care space available at any large public institution or government employer, such as at Shuswap Lake General Hospital or the Okanagan College Salmon Arm Campus.</p>	<p>Meet with public institution partners to identify the needs and establish partnership opportunities to plan and develop child care in public facilities to support employees and community</p>	<p>City of Salmon Arm City Council and Corporate Services, Okanagan College, Interior Health</p>	<p>5-10 years</p>
<p>Request through the MCFD the creation of a Universal Child Care Prototype Site in Salmon Arm.</p>	<p>Meet with the Ministry for Children and Family Development to request participation in the Universal Child Care Prototype program</p>	<p>Child Care Planning Committee</p>	<p>1-2 years</p>

Appendix A: WHAT WE HEARD ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

See separate attachment for What We Heard Engagement Summary.

Appendix B: METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINING ACCESS RATES & TARGETS

Determining Access Rates

To determine access rates, two numbers are required: 1) the child population values for a given year and; 2) the number of spaces for each age category.

Current Child Populations

Current child population data was sourced from 2016 census data:

Table B1: Base child population values (Statistics Canada, 2016)

	0 to 2 years	3 to 5 years	6 to 12 years	0 to 12 years
Salmon Arm	425	490	1315	2230

Projected Child Populations

For each age category, child population projection values were provided by BC Stats P.E.O.P.L.E Population Projections for the target years specified through the UBCM funding guidelines: 1 year, 2 years, 5 years and 10 years. The projection values are documented in **Tables 8** and **9** in the report and the percent change can be found in **Table B2**. A percent increase or decrease was calculated between each year category. These percent changes were then used for determining space creation targets.

Table B2: Child population growth rates

Population growth in Salmon Arm	Ages 0 – 5	Ages 6 – 12
2019	-	-
2020 (year 1)	2%	-4%
2022 (year 2)	-3%	1%
2025 (year 5)	-1%	37%
2030 (year 10)	29%	-2%

Number of Spaces

The number of spaces per age category of 0 to 5 years and 6 to 12 years were determined by allocating the number of spaces in each care type to the appropriate age category. In the case of multi-age or family child care, where the age of children is not specified, the sum of total spaces was divided by two whereby half were allocated to 0 to 5 years and half were allocated to 6 to 12 years. Licensed preschool was removed from the count as programs tend to be part-time and some other care arrangement is often still required.

Table B3: Number of child care spaces and allocation for space creation target calculations

	Group Child Care (birth – 36 months)	Group Child Care (30 months – school age)	Licensed Preschool	Group Child Care (school age)	Multi-Age Child Care	Family Child Care	In-Home Multi-Age Child Care	TOTAL Child Care Spaces
Child Care Spaces	68	119	80	183	48	16	0	514
Space Allocation	0 to 5 years	removed	6 to 12 years	32 spaces: 0 to 5 years 32 spaces: 6 to 12 years				-
				Sum = 64 / 2 = 32				

Table B4: Space allocation summary per age category

	0 to 5 years	6 to 12 years
Group Child Care (birth – 36 months)	68	0
Group Child Care (30 months – school age)	119	0
Licensed Preschool	0	0
Group Child Care (school age)	0	183
Multi-Age Child Care	24	24
Family Child Care	8	8
In-Home Multi-Age Child Care	0	0
TOTAL SPACE COUNT	219	215

Access Rate

Current access rates were then determined by taking the number of spaces in each age category, 219 and 215, and dividing it by 100.

Determining Space Creation Targets

As outlined in **Table B2**, a percent increase or decrease was calculated between each year category. These percent changes were then applied to the current and target access rates for each time category.

Table B5: Determining space creation targets

Year	% child population growth (0 to 5 years)	Projected Children (population growth in brackets)	Total Spaces Needed to Maintain Current Access Rate (23.9)	Total Spaces Needed to Maintain Target Access Rate (30.0)
2019	-	915	219	275
2020	+2%	938	224	281
2022	-3%	909	217	273
2025	-1%	897	214	269
2030	+39%	1157	276	347

Therefore, as a result of these calculations, a total of 347 spaces are needed within the community by the year 2030. 219 spaces already exist; therefore 128 more spaces are required over a 10-year period. To determine the average number of spaces to be created each year over 10 years, 128 was divided by 10 and then rounded up. The same methodology was applied to children ages 6 to 12.

INFORMATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE - JUNE 22, 2020

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | M. Croft-Steen – letter dated June 6, 2020 – Mt. Ida Cemetery | A |
| 2. | S. Ridout – email dated June 14, 2020 – 5G What you need to know | A |
| 3. | Salmon Arm Roots and Blues – email dated June 16, 2020 – ROOTSandBLUES Online Festival Experience | N |
| 4. | M. Regier, Festival Co-ordinator, Shuswap Immigrant Services Society – letter dated June 17, 2020 – Revised Plan for the Multicultural Festival | A |
| 5. | S. Seale, Shuswap Naturalist Club – email dated June 17, 2020 – Shuswap Naturalist Club Project - Removing Burdock Plants from Peter Jannink Park | A |
| 6. | Interior Health – newsletter dated June 2020 – Healthy Communities | N |
| 7. | Interior Health – news release dated June 17, 2020 – IH progress update in renewing surgeries | N |
| 8. | Senator N. Greene Raine – letter received May 2020 – National Health & Fitness Day | A |
| 9. | euroProductions Entertainment Services – email dated June 16, 2020 – Event support for your community... | N |

N = No Action Required
A = Action Requested

S = Staff has Responded
R = Response Required

From: Maureen Croft-Steen
Sent: June-07-20 4:49 PM
To: Barb Puddifant
Subject: Mt. Ida Cemetery

23 - 2550 Golf Course Drive
Blind Bay BC V0E 1H1

June 6th, 2020

Mayor and Council
City of Salmon Arm
Box 40, 500 -2 Avenue NE
Salmon Arm BC V1E 4N2

Re: Mt. Ida Cemetery

Dear Mayor and Council:

This letter is to ask that the By-Law restricting decorations at the above cemetery be changed.

My mother, father and husband are all buried in this cemetery and for over ten years now I have visited the grave sites and on special occasions left flowers. Just recently I was informed that this was no longer allowed. Though I understand that leaving flowers in containers would cause extra work for the groundskeeper I feel that the benefits to the families of the people interned are of great importance.

I do understand that glass/ pottery containers and mementos are of a particular concern but the use of the special plastic container (equipped with a stabilization spike) could be an option. In the cemeteries in Vancouver they work well and they can be purchased here in Salmon Arm at Fimmy's Flowers. This would have the effect of unifying the appearance and avoid glass and pottery breakage.

If limits were set as to the months that flowers in containers were allowed, for example May through September, and that all containers were to be removed when not in use this would make the groundskeeper's job easier. In the past I have always used the plastic vases taking them home along with the withered flowers. While I personally would prefer a longer period in the year, due to special anniversaries and birthdays, I could live with the months mentioned above as it takes in Mother's Day, Father's Day and the summer period.

I respectfully request that Council revisit this By-Law and consider the feelings of people who have loved ones buried in Mt. Ida Cemetery. For some of us this is a very emotional matter.

Yours truly,

Maureen Croft-Steen

From: Sherry Ridout
Sent: June-14-20 2:47 PM
To: Alan Harrison
Cc: Caylee Simmons
Subject: 5G ~ What you Need to Know

Subject: 5G ~ What you Need to Know

Dear Mayor Harrison & Councillors,

Parliament has been remote. School has been virtual. Work has been online. Recent events have shown us how important safe and affordable high-speed broadband is.

In response, telecommunication providers are racing to install 5G. Is this the best connectivity option? What rights do local governments have when it comes to 5G? And why are the limited rights municipalities *do* have now under threat?

5G and You

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) recently published *Getting it right: Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality*. Although the FCM guide accurately answers the regulatory questions linked to 5G, including the potential loss of local input, it does not offer municipal governments the critical big picture information needed to understand the practical, policy and logistical implications of 5G.

To support you in making well-informed telecommunication decisions, we have prepared [Getting it Wrong in Getting it Right](#), a preamble and supplement to the FCM guide.

Action Item:

- Please take a moment to read the guide by clicking [Here](#). It is also attached.

Untying Your Hands

Perhaps you would like to create local 5G and small cell siting policies that reflect and protect community interests, but believe your hands are tied.

The second document we have prepared and attached, [Creating a Proactive Antenna Siting Protocol and Small Cell Licensing Agreement](#), shows you how to create the most protective policies possible given our regulatory landscape. It also covers critical liability issues which every local government should know about.

Action Item:

- Please read the document's *Overview* and share the document with your legal team. It is found [Here](#) and is also attached.

A Better Way

The infrastructure investments we make today will shape how the Internet will be provided and how it will impact our security, well-being, resilience, and sustainability for generations to come. **We encourage you to choose the fastest, safest, most energy-efficient and cyber-secure data delivery system for your community - fiber optics** connected directly to each premise.

Action Item:

- Visit this site to learn more:

[Connected Communities ~ Wired fiber for Sustainable Last-Mile Solutions](#)

Who are We?

We represent an umbrella group of organizations and individuals advocating for safe and responsible technology.

For more information, you may reach us at cst.citizensforsafetechnology@gmail.com ,

With Warm Regards,

Sherry Ridout

On Behalf of Citizens for Safe Technology

Creating a Proactive Antenna Siting Protocol & Small Cell Licensing Agreement

Overview

If your municipality does not have its own antenna siting procedure in place, when a telecom wants to install an antenna in your community the default antenna siting policy created by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (found [here](#)) will apply.

In some instances, telecommunication providers are not required to consult with land use authorities before they install small cells. For example, if a telecom is installing 4G or 5G small cell transmitters on existing structures, and its equipment does not increase the height of that structure by more than 25%, the proponent is only required to request a local government's permission if the town owns the property it wants to put the antennas on.

Clearly, it is prudent for local governments to create antenna siting protocols that include small cells, and to protect local interests in all antenna siting matters to the degree that federal telecommunication regulations permit. To draft a siting protocol for your town, use the template found [here](#) as a guide. Be sure to add the elements below to insure your protocol is as protective as possible.

The suggestions in this document may also be included in small cell licensing agreements made between telecoms and local governments.

DISCLAIMER: *The content below is provided for informational purposes only and is not intended to substitute for legal advice regarding compliance with local, provincial, or federal law. CALM makes no assurances or guarantees regarding the applicability or suitability of this language for any municipality, and shall not be held responsible for any legal action arising from the use of language or concepts contained herein.*

General Examples of Areas to Address

LOCATION

- Prohibiting small cell installations in residential areas, in certain districts
- Requiring installations to be a certain distance away from residences, schools, hospitals, and/or other installations

AESTHETICS / ENVIRONMENT

- Aesthetic, design, and noise requirements such as co-location, camouflage, height and light limits, and more

ADMINISTRATIVE / LEGAL

- Requiring that residents within a certain distance of an installation be notified
- Requiring annual recertification fees
- Requiring permittees to defend and indemnify the city from any liabilities arising from permits and the installation, operation and maintenance of small cell installations
- Requiring the proponent to have insurance that includes pollution liability with no electromagnetic field exclusions as well as cyber-security and data privacy protection
- Reserving the right to hire independent consultants at the applicant's expense
- Reserving the right to employ a qualified RF engineer to conduct an annual random and unannounced test of the Permittee's small cell wireless installations located within the Town to certify compliance with all Safety Code 6 radio-frequency emission limits

POLICY

- Appointing a committee to study the viability of a community-owned fiber optic network

Fiber networks wired directly to the premise are *always* faster, safer and more energy efficient and secure than wireless networks. To learn more about the many benefits of community-owned fiber please visit [Connected Communities ~ Wired fiber for Sustainable Last-Mile Solutions](#)

Specific Content Suggestions

Section 1: PERMITTING PROCESS

1.1 Permit Required. No small cell installation shall be constructed, erected, modified, mounted, attached, operated or maintained within the Town on or within any public right-of-way without the issuance of a permit. No approval granted under this chapter shall confer any exclusive right, privilege, license or franchise to occupy or use the public right-of-way of the Town for delivery of telecommunications services or any other purpose.

1.2 Application Content. All permit applications must include:

- A. Detailed site and engineering plans for each proposed small cell installation, including full address, GIS coordinates, a list of all associated equipment necessary for its operation, as well as a proposed schedule for the completion of each small cell installation covered by the application.
- B. A master plan showing the geographic service area for the proposed small cell installation(s), and all of applicant's existing, proposed and anticipated installations in the Town.
- C. Certification that the proposed small cell installation(s) addresses an existing and significant gap in coverage in the service area, such certification to include a detailed map of the "gap areas" and documentation of such gaps causing an inability for a user to connect with the land-based national telephone network or maintain a connection capable of supporting a reasonably uninterrupted communication.
- D. Photographs of proposed facility equipment.
- E. Visual impact analyses with photo simulations including both "before" and "after" appearances, including simulations of the appearance of the equipment from the perspective of any property owner within 250 feet.

F. Certification by a certified radio-frequency engineer that the small cell installation will be in compliance with Safety Code 6 RF emissions as they relate to the general public, including aggregate emissions for all co-located equipment.

G. Certification that the applicant has a right under federal law to install wireless telecommunications facilities in the public right-of-way.

H. Documentation demonstrating a good faith effort to locate the small cell installation in accordance with the preferred provisions of this protocol.

I. Documentation that owners of all properties within 500 feet of the proposed small cell installation have been notified in writing via certified mail of the proposed installation, including its exact location.

J. An executed indemnification agreement as set forth in section 1.7 below.

K. A disclosure of all related third parties on whose behalf the applicant is acting, including contracting parties and co-locaters.

L. If the small cell installation is proposed to be attached to an existing utility pole or wireless support structure owned by an entity other than the Town, sufficient evidence of the consent of the owner of such pole or wireless support structure to the proposed collocation.

M. Performance specifications and data that identify the maximum and minimum amount or level of radio-frequency emissions that are produced by the equipment when it is in full operating mode, and a monitoring plan for the Applicant's equipment capable of tracking and recording the daily amounts or levels of radio-frequency emissions that are produced by the equipment in order to verify that the average and peak emissions do not exceed the levels permitted by Safety Code 6.

1.3 Application Fee. The Town shall assess a per-installation fee of _____ to cover the Town's costs of processing, reviewing, evaluating, conducting a public hearing, and other activities involved in consideration of the application, and conducting oversight of the construction of the small cell installation to ensure compliance with zoning requirements.

1.4 Consultant Fee. The Town shall have the right to retain an independent technical consultant to assist the Town in its review of the application. The reasonable cost of the review shall be paid by the applicant.

1.5 Hydro Fees. Permittee shall pay to the Municipality an annual hydro consumption surcharge of two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) per Structure. This amount is due on January 2 of each year and is not proratable or refundable.

1.6 Compliance Bond. Upon approval of the application, the Permittee shall be required to post a bond in the amount of \$50,000 for each small cell installation, such bond to be held and maintained during the entire period of Permittee's operation of each small cell installation in the Town as a guarantee that no such installation, including any co-located equipment, exceeds or will exceed the allowable Safety Code 6 limits for RF radiation exposure to the general public as determined by a qualified independent RF engineer under Section 1.11.2 below.

1.7 Indemnification. Permittee shall provide an executed agreement in the form provided by the Town, pursuant to which Permittee agrees to defend, hold harmless and fully indemnify the Town, its officers, employees, agents, attorneys, and volunteers, from (i) any claim, action or proceeding brought against the Town or its officers, employees, agents, or attorneys to attack, set aside, void, or annul any such approval of the Town or (ii) a successful legal action brought against the Town for loss of property value or other harm caused by the placement or operation of a small cell installation. This indemnification agreement shall be in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney and shall include, but not be limited to, damages, fees and/or costs awarded against the Town, if any, and cost of suit, attorney's fees, and other costs, liabilities and expenses incurred in connection with such proceeding whether incurred by the Permittee, the Town and/or the parties initiating or bringing such proceeding. The

agreement shall also include a provision obligating the Permittee to indemnify the Town for all of the Town's costs, fees and damages which the Town incurs in enforcing the indemnification provisions of this Section.

1.8 Hazardous Substances. Permittee specifically acknowledges that the Town is not responsible for the escape, discharge or release of any hazardous substances from the Equipment, and specifically agrees to indemnify, protect and save the Town harmless from any and all actions, causes of actions, claims and demands regarding any such hazardous substance that has escaped, been discharged or released from the Equipment unless caused by the gross negligence or willful misconduct of the Town, its elected officials, appointed officers, employees, agents, contractors or any person the Town is responsible for in law.

"Hazardous Substance" means any hazardous or toxic substance, and includes radiofrequency electromagnetic energy, or other radiation, petroleum products and byproducts, industrial wastes, contaminants, pollutants, dangerous substances, and toxic substances, as defined in or pursuant to any law, ordinance, rule, regulation, bylaw or code, whether federal, provincial or municipal.

1.9 Environmental Liability. Permittee agrees to assume all environmental liability under federal, provincial and local government laws in Canada, as a responsible person or otherwise, relating to its occupancy and use of the Facilities, including but not limited to any liability for clean-up of any Hazardous Substance in, on, under, along, across and around the Facilities, which are proven to result directly from:

(a) the installation, occupation, operation and removal by Permittee of the Equipment;

(b) any materials or goods brought to the Facilities by Permittee, or by any other person with the express or implied consent of Permittee.

Permittee shall not be responsible for, or required to remove or remediate any Hazardous Substances that have migrated onto or into a Facility or which existed at a Facility prior to Permittee's occupation or use of such Facility.

1.10 Insurance: For the duration of the Term:

(a) Permittee shall maintain comprehensive general liability insurance with coverage up to five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00), per occurrence and in the annual aggregate for products and completed operations, to protect Permittee from claims for personal injury, bodily injury or property damage arising out of Permittee's Work and/or operation of the Equipment. In addition, Permittee agrees that:

(i) the Town shall be added as an additional insured but only with respect to Permittee's legal liabilities arising out of Permittee's operations under this Agreement; and

(ii) the insurance shall include coverage for: products and completed operations; blanket contractual liability; cross-liability; non-owned automobile liability; pollution liability with no electromagnetic field exclusions, cyber-security and data privacy protection, and broad form property damage.

(b) Permittee shall also maintain automobile liability insurance, with coverage for bodily injury and property damage, for any Permittee owned or leased vehicles used in the performance of the Work in the amount of two million dollars (\$2,000,000.00) per accident.

(c) The comprehensive general liability insurance policy shall contain a provision whereby the insurers will endeavour to provide the Town with sixty (60) days' notice of cancellation.

(d) Upon execution of this Agreement, Permittee shall file with the Town a certificate of insurance of each insurance policy required. Permittee shall also provide a certificate of insurance at any time upon reasonable written

request by the Town . Failure to maintain the insurance policies as required by this Agreement is a material breach of contract.

(e) Excess (umbrella) liability insurance may be used to achieve the required insured limits.

1.11 Annual Re-certification.

1.11.1 Each year, commencing on the first anniversary of the issuance of the permit, the Permittee shall submit to the Town an affidavit which shall list all active small cell wireless installations it owns within the Town by location, certifying that

(1) each active small cell installation is covered by liability insurance with no electromagnetic field exclusions in the amount of \$5,000,000 per installation, naming the Town as additional insured; and

(2) each active installation has been inspected for safety and found to be in sound working condition and in compliance with all federal safety regulations concerning RF exposure limits.

1.11.2 The Town shall have the right to employ a qualified RF engineer to conduct an annual random and unannounced test of the Permittee's small cell wireless installations located within the Town to certify their compliance with all Safety Code 6 radio-frequency emission limits as they pertain to exposure to the general public. The reasonable cost of such tests shall be paid by the Permittee.

1.11.3 In the event that such independent tests reveal that any small cell installation or installations owned or operated by Permittee or its Lessees, singularly or in the aggregate, is emitting RF radiation in excess of Safety Code 6 exposure guidelines as they pertain to the general public, the Town shall notify the Permittee and all residents living within 1500 feet of the small cell installation(s) of the violation, and the Permittee shall have forty-eight (48) hours to bring the small cell installation(s) into compliance. Failure to bring the small cell installation(s) into compliance shall result in the forfeiture of all or part of the Compliance Bond, and the Town shall

have the right to require the removal of such installation(s), as the Town in its sole discretion may determine is in the public interest.

1.11.4 Any small cell wireless installation which is no longer in use shall be removed by the Permittee within 30 days of being taken out of use.

1.11.5 Any small cell wireless installation which is not removed within 30 days after being listed as no longer in use in the annual re-certification affidavit shall be subject to a fine of \$100/day until such installation is removed.

1.11.6 Where such annual re-certification has not been properly or timely submitted, or equipment no longer in use has not been removed within the required 30-day period, no further applications for small cell wireless installations will be accepted by the Town until such time as the annual re-certification has been submitted and all fees and fines paid.

1.12 Non-Permitted Installations Any small cell installation constructed, erected, modified or enhanced prior to the issuance of a site-specific permit from the Town shall be removed prior to the submission of any other application. No application for a small cell installation shall be considered while such unauthorized installations remain.

1.13 Notice of Permit Filing. Notice of the filing of any permit submitted pursuant to this protocol shall be sent to all property owners within 500 feet of each and every proposed small cell installation within five (5) days of such filing, such notice to be sent by certified mail at the expense of the Permittee.

1.14 Public Availability of Permit Applications. All permit applications submitted pursuant to this protocol, including all related documents, shall be made available for viewing and/or copying by any member of the public during normal business hours at the relevant office of the Town. Any charge for copies shall be limited to the Town's actual cost. No additional charges may be assessed against any member of the public for access to the entire permit and all of its related documents.

Section 2: LOCATION AND CONFIGURATION PREFERENCES

2.1 Siting Guidelines. The purpose of this section is to provide guidelines to applicants and the reviewing authority regarding the preferred locations and configurations for small cell installations in the Town, provided that nothing in this section shall be construed to permit a small cell installation in any location that is otherwise prohibited by the Town code.

2.2 Order of preference - Location. The order of preference for the location of small cell installations in the Town, from most preferred to least preferred is:

1. Industrial zone
2. Commercial zone
3. Mixed commercial and residential zone
4. Residential zone

Discouraged Locations:

1. Land use
 - Medium and high density residential areas
 - Schools, daycare facilities, playgrounds and similar facilities
 - Areas that adversely impact view corridors
 - Heritage areas (unless visibly unobtrusive) or on heritage structures unless it forms an integrated part of the structure's overall design (i.e. through the use of stealth structures).
 - Nature protection areas
 - Environmentally sensitive ecosystems
2. Other considerations, irrespective of land use designation
 - Locations directly in front of doors, windows, balconies or residential frontages
 - Community gathering places such as community halls, churches, commercial eating & drinking establishments
 - Sites of topographical and geographic prominence

(See Note 1)

Section 3: INSTALLATION SPECIFICATIONS

3.1. The Permittee must construct, install and operate the small cell installation in strict compliance with the plans and specifications included in the application.

3.2. Where feasible, as new technology becomes available, the Permittee shall replace larger, more visually intrusive facilities with smaller, less visually intrusive facilities, after receiving all necessary permits and approval required by the Town.

3.3. The Permittee shall submit and maintain current at all times basic contact and site information on a form to be supplied by the Town. The Permittee shall notify the Town of any changes to the information submitted within seven days of any change, including the name or legal status of the owner or operator.

3.4. At all times, all required notices and signs shall be posted on the site as required by ISED and federal law, and as approved by the Town. The location and dimensions of a sign bearing the emergency contact name and telephone numbers shall be posted pursuant to the approved plans.

3.5. The Permittee shall maintain current at all times liability and property insurance including pollution liability with no electromagnetic field exclusions for each small cell installation in the Public Right of Way in the amount of \$5,000,000 (Five Million dollars) naming the Town as additional insureds.

3.6. The proposed small cell installation shall have an adequate fall zone to minimize the possibility of damage or injury resulting from pole collapse or failure, icefall or debris fall, and to avoid or minimize all other impacts upon adjoining properties.

3.7. Every effort shall be made to locate small cell installations no less than 2000 feet away from the Permittee's or any Lessee's nearest other small cell installation, or within 1500 feet of any school (nursery, elementary, junior high, and high school), trail, park or outdoor recreation area, sporting venues, and residential zones. (*See Note 2*)

3.8. A single or co-located small cell installation must be mounted on an existing structure such as a utility or lighting pole that can support its weight and the weight of any existing co-located equipment. All new wires needed to service the small cell installation must be located within the width of the existing structure so as to not exceed the diameter and height of the existing utility pole.

3.9. All equipment not to be installed on or inside the pole must be located underground, flush to the ground, within three (3) feet of the utility pole. Each installation is to have its own dedicated power source to be installed and metered separately.

3.10 If a Permittee proposes to replace a pole in order to accommodate a small cell installation, the pole shall match the appearance of the original pole to the extent feasible, unless another design better accomplishes the objectives of this section. Such replacement pole shall not exceed the height of the pole it is replacing by more than seven feet.

3.11 Each small cell installation facility shall be designed to be resistant to, and minimize opportunities for, unauthorized access, climbing, vandalism, graffiti and other conditions that would result in hazardous situations, visual blight, or attractive nuisances. The Town may require the provision of warning signs, fencing, anti-climbing devices, or other techniques to prevent unauthorized access and vandalism when, because of their location or accessibility, a small cell installation has the potential to become an attractive nuisance.

3.12 The Permittee shall repair, at its sole cost and expense, any damage including, but not limited to, subsidence, cracking, erosion, collapse, weakening, or loss of lateral support to Town streets, sidewalks, walks, curbs, gutters, trees, parkways, street lights, traffic signals, improvements of any kind or nature, or utility lines and systems, underground utility line and systems, or sewer systems and sewer lines that result from any activities performed in connection with the installation or maintenance of a small cell installation in the public right-of-way. The Permittee shall restore such areas, structures and systems to the condition in which they existed prior to the installation or maintenance that necessitated the repairs. In the event the Permittee fails to complete such repair within the number of days stated on a written notice by the permitting authority, the

permitting authority shall cause such repair to be completed at Permittee's sole cost and expense.

3.13 Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall obtain the permitting authority's approval of a tree protection plan prepared by a certified arborist if the small cell installation will be located within the canopy of a street tree, or a protected tree on private property, or within a 10-foot radius of the base of such a tree. Depending on site-specific criteria (e.g., location of tree, size, and type of tree, etc.), a radius greater than 10 feet may be required by the permitting authority.

3.14 Applicant shall abide by all local, provincial and federal laws regarding design, construction and operation of the small cell installation, including all provincial and federal Occupational Health and Safety Regulations for worker safety in, around and above power lines and near radiation-emitting devices.

Note 1: The town may also wish to include preference for the *configuration* of small cell installations, from most preferred to least preferred. Configuration preferences might be:

- (1) Co-located with existing wireless facilities,
- (2) Mounted on existing utility poles,
- (3) Mounted on new poles or towers.

Considerations include the structural integrity of existing utility poles, the fact that mandating co-located equipment could result in an unfair aesthetic burden on some residents or neighborhoods, and the possibility that new poles might be bigger, heavier and more obtrusive.

Note 2: Every effort should be made to avoid placing small cell installations in close proximity to residences. Viable and defensible setbacks will vary based on zoning.

This content of this document was produced by Grassroots Communications, 52 Main Street, Port Washington NY 11050 and has been edited to be made relevant to Canada with the author's permission.

© 2020 Grassroots Communications, Inc. and CALM. All rights reserved. Permission to copy is hereby granted to municipalities, their elected officials, legal counsel, employees, contractors and residents.

Getting it wrong in “Getting it right: Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality”

In February 2020, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) published [Getting it Right: Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality](#), a guide designed to help municipalities deal with the practical, policy and logistical implications of 5G technology in local communities.

This FCM document contains several half-truths, mistruths and framing tactics – listed below – which result in a biased, misleading and generally inaccurate guide.

The document did, however, get *some* things right. Part 2 of this summary outlines those points.

Part 1: Getting it Wrong

Misconception 1 The fifth generation of wireless technology (is) a necessity if Canada is to remain competitive on the world stage. (p.4)

Fact The benefits of 5G are dubious at best, and are they worth the costs?

There has been no cost-benefit analysis of 5G to see if its consequences and risks, including the costs stemming from security and data breaches, environmental damage, liability claims, lost productivity due to radiofrequency radiation-induced illness, and increased healthcare requirements, outweigh its benefits.

Driven by the belief that digital technology is neutral and therefore carries no unintended consequences or risks, politicians, policy makers, and society are ignoring the science-backed evidence that urges us to exercise precaution when investing in infrastructure that is wireless-dependent.

Learn more here:

1. Women’s College Hospital, Toronto, [Impacts of Wireless Technology on Health: A symposium for Ontario’s medical community](#), 31 May 2019
Video of Presentation by Dr. Magda Havas: [Impacts of EMFs on health in the community](#)
2. Schneier, B. (2019, September 25). [Essays: Every Part of the Supply Chain Can Be Attacked – Schneier on Security](#) – as published in the New York Times
3. Zarrett, David. (2020, February 19). [Threats to security, health, public infrastructure and other potential costs of Canada’s 5G rollout](#). Macleans

Misconception 2 5G is key to profiting and benefiting from enhanced connectivity and “Smart Cities.”

“Connectivity has become essential for any community’s economic, cultural and social development.” President’s Message (p.4)

“For municipal officials, the IoT translates into “smart cities” where countless data points generated by citizens, sensors and assets allow you to monitor traffic and parking, water, wastewater, storm water, bus and rail stops, etc. This would also allow municipalities to make adjustments, or allow systems to make adjustments on their own, as needed.” (p.8)

Fact 5G is not the pinnacle of connectivity; wired fiber optic networks are.

From resource and energy monitoring and management to improved emergency, educational and health care services, most of the smart city applications 5G promises can be provided by fiber optic cables connected directly to each premise - without the threats wireless 5G poses to privacy, national security, energy consumption, the environment and public health. A few of 5G’s perks - like autonomous vehicles - cannot be delivered by wired fiber networks. However, experts warn that self-driving cars are risk and liability laden, and that 5G will likely not be able to support them.

Learn more here:

1. The Benefits of [Wired Smart Cities](#), Connected Communities
2. Schoechle, Timothy. (2018). [Reinventing Wires: The Future of Landlines and Networks](#). The National Institute of Law and Public Policy
3. Dawson, Doug. (2019). [The Myth of 5G and Driverless Cars](#). CircleID
4. Jones Day law firm. (2017, November). [Legal issues Related to the Development of Automated, Autonomous and Connected Cars](#). A White Paper

Misconception 3 5G is the wireless industry’s solution to our ever-increasing wireless data consumption.

“The trend toward greater connectivity will only accelerate. The use of wireless Internet connected devices in our communities is exploding. The advent of fifth generation (5G) wireless networks is the industry’s response to this growth and the desire to further leverage the potential of the Internet.” (p.6)

Fact The main industry drivers behind 5G – Huawei, Ericsson and Qualcomm – admit they developed 5G by recognizing trends and opportunities. Consumers would not be consuming more and more data if an endless stream of wireless products were not being marketed and sold. Our growing wireless data consumption has serious environmental implications.

Which came first – our skyrocketing data usage or industry’s plan to sell us a wireless world that is dependent upon us consuming more and more data? Wireless technology uses 10 times more energy than wired technology does. Experts warn our environment cannot support unlimited digital consumption.

Industry is not providing 5G as a public service. When asked about the motivation driving 5G at a December 2016 meeting of *The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers* (IEEE), respected industry expert and Senior Huawei Researcher Dr. H. Anthony Chan stated: “...if technology does not change, the company will die...it is about more jobs...engineering and manufacturing... People must buy a new phone.”

Learn more here:

1. A GSA Executive Report from Ericsson, Huawei and Qualcomm. (2015, November). [The Road to 5G: Drivers, Applications, Requirements and Technical Development](#)
2. The Shift Project. (2019, March). [Lean ICT: Towards “Digital Sobriety”: Our New Report on the Environmental Impact of ICT](#)
3. The Shift Project. (2019, July). [Climate Crisis: The Unsustainable use of Online Video: Our new Report on the Environmental Impact of ICT](#)

Misconception 4 5G will bring us the fastest Internet possible.

“Once fully deployed, 5G technology promises maximum theoretical speeds in the 10 Gbps range, at least 100 times faster than top theoretical speeds for existing 4G technology (up to 1,000 times faster than actual speeds in some circumstances). To get a sense of this change, downloading a two-hour movie will take less than four seconds versus approximately six minutes on existing 4G networks. (Note that consumer technology will also have to catch up as many existing devices are not 5G capable.) (p.7)

Fact New breakthroughs in fiber optics offers real-time transmission of 200 Gbps. *This is 20 times faster than the maximum theoretical speed of wireless 5G.*

Learn more here:

Brown, Mike. (2020, January 2). [A Fiber Optic Breakthrough Could Beat 5G for Rural Internet Access](#). Inverse

Misconception 5 “5G technology will outperform traditional land connections in some cases, making home routers a thing of the past.” (p.7)

Fact 5G may be faster than Internet provided through copper wires or coaxial cable, but it will never be faster than fiber wired directly to the premises.

Wireless signals can never be as fast as the fiber cables that transport data to antennas.

Learn more here:

Schoechele, Timothy. (2018). [Reinventing Wires: The Future of Landlines and Networks](#). The National Institute of Law and Public Policy

Misconception 6 “More significantly, 5G networks are key to opening up the potential of the “Internet of Things” (IoT). (p.7)

Fact A balanced and informed discussion of the IoT will include its potential, as well as its pitfalls. This discussion would include:

Privacy and National Security issues related to the IoT:

- Smart devices are easily hacked and controlled,
- They allow for increased surveillance, and potentially nefarious military and paramilitary capabilities such as “swarming” and robotic attack missions,
- They permit our personal data to be tracked and sold.

Environmental and Social Costs of the IoT:

- Powering , manufacturing and storing the data from trillions of sensor-equipped and chipped devices demands huge amounts of energy and resources,
- Massive amounts of e-waste will be generated due to planned obsolescence,
- An increasingly automated world threatens job security and heightens tech addiction,
- Mining for the rare minerals needed to make these devices is causing untold human suffering.

Learn more here:

1. Halpern, Sue. (2019, April 26). [The Terrifying Potential of the 5G Network](#). The New Yorker
2. Congressional Research Service. (2020, May 22). [National Security Implications of 5th Generation \(5G\) Mobile Technologies](#). A Report from the U.S. Congressional Research Service
3. Bordage, Frederic. (2019, October). [The Environmental Footprint of the Digital World Summary](#). A Report from Green IT.fr
4. McLelland, Callum. (2020, January 15). [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence - Widespread Job Losses](#). Retrieved from IoT for all
5. Annie Kelley. (2019, December 16). [Apple and Google named in US lawsuit over Congolese child cobalt mining deaths](#). The Guardian

Misconception 7 There are no Health Risks associated with 5G.

“Health Canada ensures that 5G installations comply with all existing safety regulations, including Safety Code 6 (SC6), which determines exposure limits for wireless devices and their associated infrastructure. Canada’s limits are consistent with the science-based standards used in other countries. Large safety margins have been incorporated into these limits to provide a significant level of protection for the general public and personnel working near radio frequency sources.” (p.23)

Fact There is ample peer-reviewed science linking non-thermal radio frequency radiation (RFR) to biological harm. Countries such as Italy, Switzerland and Russia have radiation exposure limits many times more protective than ours.

In 1976, the [US Naval Medical Research Institute](#) published a [bibliography of 3,700 scientific papers](#) on the thermal and non-thermal biological effects of RFR. The body of scientific evidence on the health implications of the non-thermal effects of RFR has grown exponentially since.

“Health Canada’s 2015 guidelines for human exposure to non-ionizing radiation (Safety Code 6) were out of date before they were published, and the review process was flawed,” says Dr. Meg Sears, PhD, Chair of Ottawa-based *Prevent Cancer Now*. “Hundreds of peer-reviewed, published studies show that radiofrequency (RF) radiation can cause cancers, damage sperm and DNA, impair reproduction, learning and memory, and more. We should be limiting public exposure, not increasing it.”

“We have sufficient data to classify RF radiation as a Group 1, known human carcinogen, along with, for example, asbestos and tobacco smoke,” states Dr. Anthony Miller MD, Professor Emeritus of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, who worked with the International Agency for Research on Cancer on the 2011 scientific review.

When the U.S. Naval Medical Research Institute identified the risks in 1976, governments should have limited the scope of technological change, and created radiation exposure standards that protected the public from harm. Instead, the evidence was hidden and ignored, and industry-influenced bodies like ICNIRP created the standards that Health Canada still emulates today.

Learn more here:

1. [Peer Reviewed Scientific Research on Wireless Health Effects](#) ~ Environmental Health Trust
2. [5G Telecommunications Science](#) - Physicians for Safe Technology
3. Lai, Henry. (2019). [Research Summaries of RFR scientific Literature](#). Retrieved from Bioinitiative.org

Misconception 8 Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) regularly audits antenna sites to make sure they are safe.

“ISED’s regulatory framework, including market surveillance and compliance audits, provides safeguards to protect Canadians against overexposure from wireless devices and antenna installations.” (p. 23)

Fact ISED relies on cell tower operators to make sure their sites comply with Safety Code 6. Given how 5G and the IoT work, operators cannot accurately measure citizens radiofrequency radiation exposure.

Much like the fox watching the henhouse, ISED asks cell tower operators to self-monitor how much radiofrequency radiation their antenna sites are emitting. The tests these telecoms do are often software generated, and prone to inaccuracies.

ISED requires operators to “consider, in addition to their own radio system, the contributions of all existing radiocommunication installations within the local radio environment”. Given that 5G requires potentially dozens of small cell antennas on one street, and that millimetre wave 5G works “on demand”, it is impossible for an operator to take an accurate and consistent field measurement of the RF exposure residents are receiving on a daily basis.

For software-generated audits of 5G RF exposure to be accurate, operators would need to assess an ever-changing IoT “smart” landscape that includes multiple antenna sites owned by multiple operators as well as the RF-emitting smart infrastructure that 5G is purportedly there to support.

For the past six years, academics have been preparing for the increase in radiofrequency radiation exposure inherent to smart cities, and have been developing potential measurement tools. These measurement systems are much more involved and complex than what ISED now requires, and would likely put the onus on municipalities to monitor and regulate emissions and protect residents’ health.

Learn more here:

1. ISED. (2015, March 19). TN-261 [Safety Code 6 Radio Frequency Exposure Compliance Evaluation Template](#)
2. Diez, L., Agüero, R. and Muñoz, L. (2017, June) [Electromagnetic Field Assessment as a Smart City Service: The SmartSantander Use-Case](#). Retrieved from [Sensors \(Basel\)](#). 17(6): 1250

Part 2: Getting it Right

The FCM’s “Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality” outlines several 5G-related planning and regulatory issues that all municipal governments in Canada should be aware of.

Planning Concerns

“Clusters of small cells can be visually unappealing and create unique safety concerns. They can, in particular, detract from the qualities and integrity of areas such as historical or heritage districts as well as some planned urban environments.” (p.24)

Regulatory Concerns

“For stand-alone tower structures, regardless of height, the procedure provides for formal consultations with the municipality as the local land-use planning authority. However, 5G small cell installations on existing structures (towers and non-tower structures such as a building or power pole) are excluded from this requirement as long as the height of the structure is not increased by more than 25 percent.” (p.14)

“In practical terms, this means that if the power poles are owned by the provincial utility in your jurisdiction, a carrier could enter into an agreement to install 5G small cell antennas on these poles and not even have to notify your municipality (even if the small cell is added at the top of the pole, as long as the addition is less than 25% of the existing height).” (p.14)

“A grey zone exists with respect to pre-emptive pole replacements by utilities. If a utility were to replace a pole with a much taller one, and then add antennas to it, it would likely fall outside the consultation requirements.” (p.16)

Liability Concerns

“... a number of municipalities, even those with comprehensive MAAs in place, are reporting the installation of 5G small cell antennas without their knowledge. Even if they are affixed to someone else’s asset—like a power pole—if the antenna is located within the ROW space, it could raise issues of interest to the municipality such as safety concerns for the public and municipal workers.” (p.14)

Municipal Rights in Jeopardy

Current Rights

“If a carrier has identified municipal assets (light poles, traffic lights, transit shelters, etc.) as one of its preferred options to install small cell antennas, it has to negotiate with the municipality and come to an agreement. As asset owners, municipalities have the right to refuse access.” (p.24)

“Municipalities can refuse antennas on their property, but they cannot refuse the installation of equipment required to connect antennas located on other assets. Municipalities cannot charge occupancy fees for the connecting cables and other equipment installed within the ROW, but they can charge market value for an antenna located on their assets.” (p.25)

“Some municipalities have been misinformed by carriers into believing that small cells deployment is already covered in MAA’s and that, as a result, carriers enjoy the same conditional right of access for antennas as they do for their cables, etc. This is not the case.” (p.25)

Potential Loss of Rights

Telecommunications in Canada is currently under two review processes:

1. The Report of the Broadcasting and Telecommunications Legislative Review Panel

In its January 2020 report, the Panel reviewed the governance framework for antennas and the issue of access to municipal infrastructure for network deployment.

2. The CRTC Telecom Notice 2019-57 – Review of Wireless Services

In this national consultation regarding the future of wireless services in Canada, access to municipal infrastructure is an important theme.

How These Two Review Processes May Affect Municipal Governments in Canada:

1) If Recommendations 22, and 34-37 of the Legislative Review Panel’s Report are passed:

- Jurisdiction over antenna siting—including small cells for 5G—will be transferred from ISED to the CRTC. (p.11)
- The right of access that carriers currently enjoy within the right-of-way will be extended to encompass all potential support structures. These structures are referred to as “passive infrastructure” in the report, terminology that inaccurately portrays the functionality of a municipality’s assets. (p.11)
- Local governments’ current ability to refuse telecoms access to municipal assets and property would be lost. (p.11)

2) If the recommendations made by telecommunication carriers to the CRTC Wireless Review are adopted:

- The CRTC will have absolute authority over siting small cells antennas (p.26)
- The CRTC will impose time limits for municipalities to process 5G applications, as well as fee caps, and more. (p.26)

Note on Cost Recovery:

“To date, municipalities have been identifying direct costs (related to the deployment of 5G) such as engineering studies, electricity supply and workforce time, and billing them back to carriers. This seems to be the accepted best practice in Canada for the moment, a practice based in the sound public policy principle that **taxpayers should not be subsidizing the for-profit ventures of the carriers**”. (p.23)

From: 28th Annual ROOTSandBLUES Festival on behalf of 28th Annual ROOTSandBLUES Festival
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 11:13 AM
To: Debbie Cannon
Subject: ROOTSandBLUES Online Festival Experience

Where Musicians Go to Play!

Having trouble viewing this email? [Click here](#)



MUSICIANS GO TO PLAY!

The logo for Salmon Arm Roots & Blues. The text 'SALMON ARM' is stacked vertically on the left. 'ROOTS &' is in a large, bold, serif font, and 'BLUES' is in a larger, bold, serif font below it. The website address 'www.rootsandblues.ca' is written in a smaller, lowercase, sans-serif font below the main text. The background of the logo features a hand pointing upwards against a bright, sunlit sky.

ROOTSandBLUES Presents a Free Online Festival Experience, August 14-16, 2020

Pass it along, pass it along

May it land in careful hands when we're gone

You carry it for a moment

But time won't loan it to you for long

You don't own it, pass it along

- Scott Cook

Finally some good news... You don't have to wait until 2021 for more ROOTSandBLUES!

The cancellation of the traditional 2020 Salmon Arm ROOTSandBLUES music festival, has generated the opportunity for an online festival experience to be hosted across Black Press Media website platforms, August 14th - 16th, 2020. The online festival experience will present programming utilizing new material shot specifically for the online festival broadcast, new to our ROOTSandBLUES audience, alongside previous year's archival footage and highlights.

While nothing is going to replace one's physical presence at a festival and the interaction that drives such an event, organizers at ROOTSandBLUES felt an online presence would shine a light on some of the artistic highlights of the last nearly three decades, and capture the unique identity that ROOTSandBLUES has created and is known for. This online programming will hopefully act as a reminder to long time ROOTSandBLUES patrons that they've experienced many memorable musical moments in a terrific, safe and family friendly environment.


ROOTSandBLUES organizers were once again excited about the line-up of talent slated to perform on multiple stages around the Salmon Arm Fairgrounds the weekend of August 14-16. When the pandemic dictated that there would be no festivals in Canada this summer, a number of artists who had been booked at ROOTSandBLUES were asked if they'd like to submit new material for the broadcast. Artists were excited about the opportunity to showcase in this manner and audiences will be treated to recently captured performances from across Canada and abroad.

Peter North, the long time Artistic Director of ROOTSandBLUES, will produce the show, utilizing footage of headliners documented over years from multiple camera shoots that have previously captured the essence of sets that were fueled by the amazing interaction between the artists and audiences. The patrons and musicians just feed off each other and we've got an abundance of material to choose from, ranging from your favourite Canadian roots, blues and world musicians to those from south of the border and around the globe.

A preliminary list of artists pulling together new material for this special edition of ROOTS and BLUES includes; Bill Henderson, the guitar player and vocalist of the legendary Canadian band, Chilliwack; Tom and Kalissa Landa of The Paperboys; Locarno and the B.C. World Music Collective; Steve Marriner of Monkeyjunk; Irish Mythen; Nashville singer-songwriter Sam Lewis; American harmonica ace Mark Hummel; and Bill Bourne of Tri-Continental. Organizers are expecting many more acts to be announced in the coming months including those booked for this year's festival, as well as headliners from years past.


[Click Here to Register Today](#)

For more information regarding how you can be a part of this inaugural online festival experience, look for updates at www.rootsandblues.com in the coming weeks.

 Like us on Facebook

Follow us on **twitter**

View our videos on **You Tube**

 View on Instagram

[Visit Our Website](#)

Salmon Arm Folk Music Society | 250-833-4096 | www.rootsandblues.ca

Salmon Arm Roots and Blues Festival, 490 - 5th Ave. S.W., Salmon Arm, British Columbia V1E 4N2 Canada

[SafeUnsubscribe™ dcannon@salmonarm.ca](mailto:SafeUnsubscribe%20dcannon@salmonarm.ca)

[Forward this email](#) | [Update Profile](#) | [About our service provider](#)

Sent by info@rootsandblues.ca in collaboration with

Constant Contact 

[Try email marketing for free today!](#)



Rob Niewenhuizen
City of Salmon Arm
Box 40
Salmon Arm, BC V1E 4N2

June 17, 2020

Re: Revised Plan for the Multicultural Festival

Dear Rob:

Shuswap Immigrant Services Society in partnership with Downtown Salmon Arm is planning on hosting a revised version (due to Covid 19) of our third annual Multicultural Festival on Saturday August 22, 2020, from 11:00 am to 4:00pm.

We are once again working in partnership with Downtown Salmon Arm to offer a scaled down version of the festival. We would like to "piggy back" off of the Farmer's Market and the street closure of Alexander Street.

Our plan includes the following:

1. A Cultural Film Presentation at the Salmar Classic (maximum 50 people at a showing)
2. The appropriate number of display booths on Alexander Street
3. An entertainment schedule of buskers
4. Local cultural restaurants offering a take-out food option on a table on the sidewalk in front of their restaurant.

We would like to request the following approval from the city.

1. Downtown restaurants have a table in the front of their restaurant on the sidewalk to be able to sell a cultural food offering.
2. In addition to the closure of Alexander, we would like to request the closure of Hudson Ave, from Ross St. to Mcleod St SE. to local traffic from 10am to 4:00pm. This would allow for people to walk the downtown area in a safe and socially distant manner.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Should you have any further questions please feel free to contact me at 250-833-8975 or email at maryhregier@gmail.com.

Regards,

Mary Regier
Festival Co-ordinator
Shuswap Immigrant Services Society

From: Sandra Seale

Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2020, 7:05 AM

To: Darin Gerow

Cc: Ed & Marlene McDonald; CSISS; Jen Bellhouse;

Subject: Shuswap Naturalist Club Project -- Removing Burdock Plants from Peter Jannink Park

Dear Sirs and Mesdames,

I'm writing on behalf of the Shuswap Naturalist Club to ask for City Council's permission to undertake a project to try to remove the invasive burdock plants from Peter Jannink Park, to make the park more user friendly for people walking there.

The park isn't yet overrun with bur plants, so this would be a good time to get on top of the problem. It is envisioned that -- depending on the success of this year's effort and our ability to fund-raise -- this would be a multi-year project, as burdock plants tend to live for about four years.

The proposed methodology to be used would be that devised with input from Robyn Hooper of the Columbia Shuswap Invasive Species Society and Jen Bellhouse of the Shuswap Trail Alliance -- by using tree planting shovels to dig up the tap root of the plants at a depth of at least 4". The plants would then be bagged and taken to the landfill. No weed killers would be used.

The Shuswap Trail Alliance has agreed to supply the workers for this project, and subject to Council approval, the work could begin in July, 2020.

Thank you for considering our request for approval of this project.

Shuswap Naturalist Club

Per: Sandra Seale

Healthy Communities

Monthly Newsletter



Interior Health
Every person matters

June 2020

Community Recognition

City of Nelson City-Wide Bike Financing Program

Earlier this month, the City of Nelson Council approved a [city-wide electric bike financing program](#) expected to begin in late July. The program will give Nelson homeowners low-interest financing to purchase a commuter bike including electric bikes, do-it-yourself conversion kits and non-electric bikes. A good step to help the transition to active transportation in a city known for steep streets and hills! You can also read about the program in the [Nelson Star](#).



District of Peachland Completes Rainbow Sidewalk

Just in time for Pride Month, the District of Peachland completed a new rainbow sidewalk on Beach Avenue. Data has long demonstrated a link between marginalized populations and poorer health outcomes, because oppression is hard on our mental and physical health. We celebrate all efforts towards inclusion and diversity in our communities. See [the story here](#).

City of Kamloops Economic Recovery Includes Food Security

Mayor Ken Christian recently launched a task force on economic recovery, leading the Kamloops Food Policy Council to submit a list of recommendations aimed at creating business opportunities and providing better food-growing infrastructure. More locally grown food is good for business and good for healthy communities! [Read the story here](#).

Events & Learning Opportunities

COVID, Climate Change & Equity Webinar

COVID-19 has been called the 'great revealer,' illuminating the ways in which the systems we have in place have not been/are not supporting equity or wellbeing. As communities and society respond to this pandemic, we are being called to address this current health crisis and a pending economic crisis, all within a climate crisis. Now, more than ever, a multi-solving lens is critical to ensure that we can create future pathways that acknowledge the interconnections between the climate, health, equity, and social and economic systems.

Tuesday, June 23, 10 - 11:30am pacific time [Register here](#)

Adapting B.C. Sport, Parks & Recreation During COVID-19 & Beyond

From the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, B.C. residents have been encouraged to stay as active as possible while remaining physically distant. The sport, parks and recreation sectors have done their part by closing facilities and programs. Now, it's time to re-open safely and responsibly. But how should we be adapting? And what can we learn from others around the province at this uncertain time?

Attend this free webinar from PlanH on **Tuesday, June 23 from 10:30 am - 12:00 pm pacific time**. [Register here](#)

Spotlight on Anti- Racism Resources

Anti-Racism Virtual Townhall

In recent months we've seen a rise in racism and hate-related incidents in BC, Canada and beyond our borders. This virtual townhall focused on ways people, organizations, and communities can fight racism and make sure BC is a safe and welcoming place for everyone. We're placing a special focus on ways to take action and address systemic racism. [Watch it here](#).


Let's Talk: Racism and Health Equity

This [handy resource](#) discusses racism as a critical factor that impacts health and wellbeing. It describes the concepts of race, racism and racialization and emphasizes settler colonialism and structural racism as the root causes of health and social inequities experienced by Indigenous and racialized peoples in Canada.

Advancing Healthy Public Policy Resources

Food Security and COVID-19

Recognizing the challenges that communities are facing during the global COVID-19 pandemic, First Nations Health Authority has created a toolkit to support communities to take more control over the community-level food system. [This toolkit](#) helps to make short-, medium- and long-term plans for food security using a food systems approach. This toolkit includes ideas, templates, tools and information to support planning.



Additionally, check out the advocacy work [Food Secure Canada](#) is doing at the federal level for a food policy action plan in the context of COVID-19.

Integrating Health in Urban and Territorial Planning

The World Health Organization (WHO) has released a [new sourcebook](#) for planners, city managers, health professionals and others interested in how an integrated approach to health and city planning can influence decisions on sectors such as housing, transport, energy, and water and sanitation.



Community Engagement & Physical Distancing: A List of Resources

Like we mentioned last month, as communities across our province weather these times of physical distancing, it's never been more important to ensure that community members are involved in the decisions we make as to what we want to see in a post-COVID future, including—vitaly—those who are seldom-heard-from, or who face barriers to participation. Luckily, many organizations are working to make physically-distant community engagement a reality. Here is [a list](#) of some free resources from BC Healthy Communities to get you started.



Overdose Prevention: Lifeguard App

The overdose crisis is an unprecedented public health emergency that has touched the lives of everyone in British Columbia. Stigma around addiction results in many people who use drugs to use alone and that's a reality we must address.

Lifeguard Digital Health has partnered with the BC Ministry of Mental Health and Addictions and the Provincial Health Services Authority to launch the opioid overdose prevention app Lifeguard. Check out the [press release](#), [app website](#) and [instructional video](#).

Funding News

Community Housing Fund - Program and Proposal Process

The Government of BC is inviting non-profit and Indigenous housing societies, First Nations, housing co-operatives and municipalities to propose new affordable housing projects for the second intake of the Building BC: Community Housing Fund.

Organizations are invited to submit project proposals to BC Housing beginning on May 27, 2020. The RFP will remain open until mid-January 2021; however, organizations are encouraged to apply early as an initial round of projects will be approved in fall 2020. Read the [media release here](#) and check out all the [information on their website](#)

PlanH Healthy Community Grants- Last Call!

BC Healthy Communities has made adjustments to the [2020 PlanH Healthy Communities Grant](#) program in response to COVID-19 and is currently accepting applications. If you are planning to apply for a PlanH grant, here's what you need to know:



- Application due dates are extended until July 15 for both streams.
- In response to the ongoing situation, the existing Social Connectedness stream has been retitled the [Community Connectedness](#) stream. The objective of this stream remains to enhance a sense of belonging within local communities. BC Healthy Communities now welcomes project proposals which support people to be connected even if they are physically distanced, and project proposals in which local governments start developing strategies and plans to address the [mental health](#) implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.

To find more information, check out the [updated FAQs](#) or email grants@planh.ca


Sincerely,

Your Healthy Communities Team

[**healthycommunities@interiorhealth.ca**](mailto:healthycommunities@interiorhealth.ca)

To subscribe, send a blank email with [Subscribe to Monthly e-newsletters](#) in the subject line.

To unsubscribe, send a blank email with [Unsubscribe to Monthly e-newsletters](#) in the subject line.



June 17, 2020

Op/Ed Submission

IH progress update in renewing surgeries

Submitted by: Doug Cochrane, Board Chair, Interior Health

The patients in Interior Health who had their surgeries postponed due to COVID-19 have not been forgotten and through the surgery renewal commitment announced by the Minister of Health on May 7th, scheduled surgeries are once again being delivered.

Across Interior Health, 16 facilities are delivering scheduled surgeries in addition to emergency and urgent procedures. Interior Health has a contract with one private facility to deliver surgeries, and that site is also now running at full contracted capacity.

We started to call patients on the wait list in early May to see if they wished to proceed with their surgery, and since then, we have reached out to 7,303 patients. Scheduled surgeries resumed on May 18th, and by June 7th we completed 2,018 scheduled surgeries and 777 unscheduled surgeries, for a total of 2,795 surgeries. We performed 149 more surgeries than the previous week, an increase of 15.3 percent. In Interior Health, surgery renewal is well underway.

The first phase of the surgery renewal is focused on patients needing urgent surgeries: patients whose operations must occur in fewer than four weeks; patients who have had their surgery postponed; and patients who have waited longer than twice their accepted clinical wait time benchmarks. Surgeries that can be safely conducted as day procedures or outside of the main operating room, such as cataract surgeries, are also part of this first phase.

Although we are moving forward with renewal, the impact of pausing scheduled surgeries this spring is ongoing. We know there were already patients waiting for the dental, hip, knee and other surgeries that we had hoped to provide. We also know that COVID-19 has further extended their wait which is difficult news for patients and their surgeons.

At this time, we will be addressing patient needs based on urgency, prior postponement and time waiting for surgery. As we move forward, we are committed to restoring timely access to all surgeries.

Part of our surgery renewal commitment to patients means that over the summer we'll be identifying and implementing strategies to increase operating room hours with the goal to support more procedures. This will take creativity and new thinking. With these efforts, we believe we can keep up with ongoing and new demands for surgery and, over the next 17 to 24 months, complete the surgeries that were postponed due to COVID-19 in March, April and May.

It's a demanding timeline, and we need to recognize that surgery renewal is highly vulnerable to external forces, such as the second wave of COVID-19 this fall that Provincial Health Officer Dr. Bonnie Henry and health officials around the world have indicated could happen. Subsequent waves or surges in new COVID-19 cases may impact our hospitals and the number of surgeries that can be safely performed. Even as we are resuming surgeries now, we are also preparing for the potential challenges ahead.

Each one of us must continue to use the skills that Dr. Henry and Interior Health public health leaders have taught us to stop the spread of COVID-19. By working together we have flattened our curve and brought our province to the point where we were able to resume scheduled surgeries. Our sustained commitment will enable the doctors, nurses and all healthcare workers to continue to provide surgeries for patients in need.

Everyone across Interior Health is 100 per cent all-in on surgery renewal. And to help them, at home and in our communities, we all need to stay 100 per cent committed to stopping the spread.

– 30 –



Dear Citizen,

Please approach your own Mayor and Councillors in an important effort to increase the health and fitness of your community and make Canada the fittest nation on earth.

National Health & Fitness Day is designed as a cohesive response to our alarming rates of childhood obesity and the resultant diabetes, heart and other chronic diseases. The initiative encourages local governments, non-government organizations, the private sector, and all Canadians to recognize **the first Saturday in June as National Health and Fitness Day**. It calls upon participants to **mark the day** with local events celebrating and promoting the use of local recreational, sports and fitness facilities, in order to boost participation in healthy physical activity.

To enable you to get directly involved, I attach these documents:

- a draft letter to local governments for your use.
- a draft resolution for adoption by local governments.

Bill S-211: An Act to establish a national day to promote health and fitness for all Canadians was recently passed by the House of Parliament and proclaimed as law. It is expected to act as a catalyst to increase the number of proclaiming cities and towns from the current 240 to the goal of 500.

Please call the Mayor in your town or city today to invite them to endorse National Health & Fitness Day!

Best regards,

Nancy Raine

Senator Nancy Greene Raine

Draft resolution to proclaim:

NATIONAL HEALTH AND FITNESS DAY

WHEREAS:

- the Parliament of Canada wishes to increase awareness among Canadians of the significant benefits of physical activity and to encourage Canadians to increase their level of physical activity and their participation in recreational sports and fitness activities;
- it is in Canada's interest to improve the health of all Canadians and to reduce the burden of illness on Canadian families and on the Canadian health care system;
- many local governments in Canada have public facilities to promote the health and fitness of their citizens;
- the Government of Canada wishes to encourage local governments to facilitate Canadian's participation in healthy physical activities;
- the Government of Canada wishes to encourage the country's local governments, non-government organizations, the private sector and all Canadians to recognize the first Saturday in June as National Health and Fitness Day and to mark the day with local events and initiatives celebrating and promoting the importance and use of local health, recreational, sports and fitness facilities;
- Canada's mountains, oceans, lakes, forest, parks and wilderness also offer recreational and fitness opportunities;
- Canadian Environment Week is observed throughout the country in early June, and walking and cycling are great ways to reduce vehicle pollution and improve physical fitness;
- declaring the first Saturday in June to be National Health and Fitness Day will further encourage Canadians to participate in physical activities and contribute to their own health and well-being;

THEREFORE:

We proclaim National Health & Fitness Day in our municipality/district /regional district as the first Saturday in June;

(Optional) As a step to increase participation and enhance the health of all Canadians, we commit to mark the day with local events and initiatives celebrating and promoting the importance and use of local health, recreational, sports, and fitness facilities on National Health and Fitness Day.

Sample Letter to Municipalities for Citizen's use

His/Her Worship _____

DATE _____ 2015

Mayor, City of _____

Insert address

Dear Mayor _____:

Re: National Health & Fitness Day

I write to ask that your Council pass a resolution in support of this new national day to enhance the health and fitness of your constituents and all Canadians. I enclose a draft resolution that can be adapted or used by Council to commit to a national program that unites you with other local governments in the promotion of increased participation in physical activities in communities across Canada.

Councils that have endorsed the concept have taken different approaches. Some have simply proclaimed the day (the first Saturday in June) to raise awareness of the importance of increasing physical activity; others have marked the day with local events and initiatives celebrating and promoting the importance and use of local health, recreational, sports and fitness facilities, in order to boost participation in healthy physical activity. Endorsement of the concept should ultimately drive up participation rates and help promote our common interest in encouraging Canadians to live healthier lifestyles.

If you support National Health and Fitness Day, please send a copy of your resolution to the office of Senator Nancy Greene Raine via nancy.raine@sen.parl.gc.ca to facilitate monitoring of the progress of this initiative.

Thank you in anticipation of your Council helping to promote health and fitness in Canada.

With best regards,

YOUR NAME

Enclosures: Draft resolution

From: euroPRODUCTIONS <info@voxboxstudios.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2020 12:44 PM

To: info@europroductions.ca

Subject: Event support for your community...

Importance: High

To Whom This May Concern, (please confirm you received this email...thank you)

I have attached information that outlines an event concept of safely and virtually, pulling the community together at this time, when they probably need it the most. Even if things are starting to open up, there are many people who would prefer an event opportunity such as this. We have polled many people who said they still aren't going to be able to afford or even want to go outside for a while so this may be the perfect way to bring those community members together in their own homes now and even into the future.

I am willing to offer my time, energy, expertise and services for **FREE**, if we can't find companies to sponsor the event, and if I can get some cooperation from the Community Counsel, to help promote the event to the community and assist me in finding influential businesses in the area who will also help us promote and engage in this, which in turn, will help them promote themselves as a caring community partner and a business people should consider supporting and purchasing from.

Please take a quick look/read and let me know what you think.

Thanks

David Gale

PS - The EXAMPLE Proposal.pdf is for an event we did in Calgary. It gives you an idea of what is being sent to potential partners / sponsors. It was never meant to speak directly to an event we would potentially be doing for your community. It's just an example.

Important Golden Rule: Never Forget: Please treat others as you wish others to treat you.

David Gale
Owner/Operator/DJ
Mobile/Text: 403-589-8269

euroPRODUCTIONS entertainment services
www.europroductions.ca

VOXBOX Studios DJ Skool
www.voxboxstudios.com

Facebook: @calgarydeejay
@voxboxstudiosdjskool

Instagram: @europroductions_dj_services
@voxboxstudiosdjskool

Twitter: @calgarydeejay

a
EURO
PRODUCTIONS
creation



FREE VIRTUAL COMMUNITY DANCE PARTY

CLICK ON EACH TOWN TO SEE THE EVENTS
WE HOSTED

NANTON
HIGH RIVER
CLARESHOLM

**CONTACT US TO BOOK YOUR
COMMUNITY NOW!**

• info@europroductions.ca

ARE YOU NEXT?!



Households in 9 communities engaged by sharing photos and experiences on the Facebook event



Contests during each event for participants to engage and win!



Families need a pick-me up during this time and, along with having a safe space to have fun, were able to win fabulous prize packages

9
EVENTS

1200
HOUSEHOLDS

30
SPONSORS

200
PRIZES

145
LOCAL
BUSINESSES
SUPPORTED

\$14,000
VALUE IN
PRIZES
GIVEN AWAY

500
REQUESTS
MADE



Virtual Dance Parties in the comfort of your home with audio (only) stream of music and fun



Sponsors including businesses that help us organize or donate



Prizes were collected in each community to support their local businesses



Participants downloaded our free APP and requested the songs they wanted to hear and made dedications to friends tuned in

Connecting Canada – McKenzie Towne vs. Mahogany - Prize and Sponsorship Proposal

We are asking for your help at a time when we all need it the most.

On Friday May 22nd, 2020, we will be producing...



This is a family friendly virtual dance party, in support of local businesses in your area.

Produced by:
[euroPRODUCTIONS Entertainment Services](#), [Mike Burton Home Team](#) and [Calgary Mortgages by Tim](#)

(Click the company name to learn more about and the company)

Three ways to participate...

Cost - \$0.00 (zero dollars)

- *Donate a prize for us to give away during the dance party to a lucky winner.*

Cost - \$25.00

- *Sponsor a Contest - We will name a contest after your company and, with your help, design the contest so that it is relevant to your specific industry.*

Cost - \$200.00

- *Become the title sponsor of the show. 9 mentions throughout the show. "Tonight's Dance Party Is Brought To You By (your company name here). (your one line message here)"*

Deadline for confirmation is Wednesday May 20th, 2020 @ 6:00 PM.

Contact: Dave @ 403-589-8269 (via text or voice); info@europroductions.ca to donate or reserve your mentions.

Getting it wrong in “Getting it right: Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality”

In February 2020, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) published [Getting it Right: Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality](#), a guide designed to help municipalities deal with the practical, policy and logistical implications of 5G technology in local communities.

This FCM document contains several half-truths, mistruths and framing tactics – listed below – which result in a biased, misleading and generally inaccurate guide.

The document did, however, get *some* things right. Part 2 of this summary outlines those points.

Part 1: Getting it Wrong

Misconception 1 The fifth generation of wireless technology (is) a necessity if Canada is to remain competitive on the world stage. (p.4)

Fact The benefits of 5G are dubious at best, and are they worth the costs?

There has been no cost-benefit analysis of 5G to see if its consequences and risks, including the costs stemming from security and data breaches, environmental damage, liability claims, lost productivity due to radiofrequency radiation-induced illness, and increased healthcare requirements, outweigh its benefits.

Driven by the belief that digital technology is neutral and therefore carries no unintended consequences or risks, politicians, policy makers, and society are ignoring the science-backed evidence that urges us to exercise precaution when investing in infrastructure that is wireless-dependent.

Learn more here:

1. Women’s College Hospital, Toronto, [Impacts of Wireless Technology on Health: A symposium for Ontario’s medical community](#), 31 May 2019
Video of Presentation by Dr. Magda Havas: [Impacts of EMFs on health in the community](#)
2. Schneier, B. (2019, September 25). [Essays: Every Part of the Supply Chain Can Be Attacked – Schneier on Security](#) – as published in the New York Times
3. Zarrett, David. (2020, February 19). [Threats to security, health, public infrastructure and other potential costs of Canada’s 5G rollout](#). Macleans

Misconception 2 5G is key to profiting and benefiting from enhanced connectivity and “Smart Cities.”

“Connectivity has become essential for any community’s economic, cultural and social development.” President’s Message (p.4)

“For municipal officials, the IoT translates into “smart cities” where countless data points generated by citizens, sensors and assets allow you to monitor traffic and parking, water, wastewater, storm water, bus and rail stops, etc. This would also allow municipalities to make adjustments, or allow systems to make adjustments on their own, as needed.” (p.8)

Fact 5G is not the pinnacle of connectivity; wired fiber optic networks are.

From resource and energy monitoring and management to improved emergency, educational and health care services, most of the smart city applications 5G promises can be provided by fiber optic cables connected directly to each premise - without the threats wireless 5G poses to privacy, national security, energy consumption, the environment and public health. A few of 5G’s perks - like autonomous vehicles - cannot be delivered by wired fiber networks. However, experts warn that self-driving cars are risk and liability laden, and that 5G will likely not be able to support them.

Learn more here:

1. The Benefits of [Wired Smart Cities](#), Connected Communities
2. Schoechele, Timothy. (2018). [Reinventing Wires: The Future of Landlines and Networks](#). The National Institute of Law and Public Policy
3. Dawson, Doug. (2019). [The Myth of 5G and Driverless Cars](#). CircleID
4. Jones Day law firm. (2017, November). [Legal issues Related to the Development of Automated, Autonomous and Connected Cars](#). A White Paper

Misconception 3 5G is the wireless industry’s solution to our ever-increasing wireless data consumption.

“The trend toward greater connectivity will only accelerate. The use of wireless Internet connected devices in our communities is exploding. The advent of fifth generation (5G) wireless networks is the industry’s response to this growth and the desire to further leverage the potential of the Internet.” (p.6)

Fact The main industry drivers behind 5G – Huawei, Ericsson and Qualcomm – admit they developed 5G by recognizing trends and opportunities. Consumers would not be consuming more and more data if an endless stream of wireless products were not being marketed and sold. Our growing wireless data consumption has serious environmental implications.

Which came first – our skyrocketing data usage or industry’s plan to sell us a wireless world that is dependent upon us consuming more and more data? Wireless technology uses 10 times more energy than wired technology does. Experts warn our environment cannot support unlimited digital consumption.

Industry is not providing 5G as a public service. When asked about the motivation driving 5G at a December 2016 meeting of *The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers* (IEEE), respected industry expert and Senior Huawei Researcher Dr. H. Anthony Chan stated: “...if technology does not change, the company will die...it is about more jobs...engineering and manufacturing... People must buy a new phone.”

Learn more here:

1. A GSA Executive Report from Ericsson, Huawei and Qualcomm. (2015, November). [The Road to 5G: Drivers, Applications, Requirements and Technical Development](#)
2. The Shift Project. (2019, March). [Lean ICT: Towards “Digital Sobriety”: Our New Report on the Environmental Impact of ICT](#)
3. The Shift Project. (2019, July). [Climate Crisis: The Unsustainable use of Online Video: Our new Report on the Environmental Impact of ICT](#)

Misconception 4 5G will bring us the fastest Internet possible.

“Once fully deployed, 5G technology promises maximum theoretical speeds in the 10 Gbps range, at least 100 times faster than top theoretical speeds for existing 4G technology (up to 1,000 times faster than actual speeds in some circumstances). To get a sense of this change, downloading a two-hour movie will take less than four seconds versus approximately six minutes on existing 4G networks. (Note that consumer technology will also have to catch up as many existing devices are not 5G capable.) (p.7)

Fact New breakthroughs in fiber optics offers real-time transmission of 200 Gbps. *This is 20 times faster* than the maximum theoretical speed of wireless 5G.

Learn more here:

Brown, Mike. (2020, January 2). [A Fiber Optic Breakthrough Could Beat 5G for Rural Internet Access](#). Inverse

Misconception 5 “5G technology will outperform traditional land connections in some cases, making home routers a thing of the past.” (p.7)

Fact 5G may be faster than Internet provided through copper wires or coaxial cable, but it will never be faster than fiber wired directly to the premises.

Wireless signals can never be as fast as the fiber cables that transport data to antennas.

Learn more here:

Schoechle, Timothy. (2018). [Reinventing Wires: The Future of Landlines and Networks](#). The National Institute of Law and Public Policy

Misconception 6 “More significantly, 5G networks are key to opening up the potential of the “Internet of Things” (IoT). (p.7)

Fact A balanced and informed discussion of the IoT will include its potential, as well as its pitfalls. This discussion would include:

Privacy and National Security issues related to the IoT:

- Smart devices are easily hacked and controlled,
- They allow for increased surveillance, and potentially nefarious military and paramilitary capabilities such as “swarming” and robotic attack missions,
- They permit our personal data to be tracked and sold.

Environmental and Social Costs of the IoT:

- Powering , manufacturing and storing the data from trillions of sensor-equipped and chipped devices demands huge amounts of energy and resources,
- Massive amounts of e-waste will be generated due to planned obsolescence,
- An increasingly automated world threatens job security and heightens tech addiction,
- Mining for the rare minerals needed to make these devices is causing untold human suffering.

Learn more here:

1. Halpern, Sue. (2019, April 26). [The Terrifying Potential of the 5G Network](#). The New Yorker
2. Congressional Research Service. (2020, May 22). [National Security Implications of 5th Generation \(5G\) Mobile Technologies](#). A Report from the U.S. Congressional Research Service
3. Bordage, Frederic. (2019, October). [The Environmental Footprint of the Digital World Summary](#). A Report from Green IT.fr
4. McLelland, Callum. (2020, January 15). [The Impact of Artificial Intelligence - Widespread Job Losses](#). Retrieved from IoT for all
5. Annie Kelley. (2019, December 16). [Apple and Google named in US lawsuit over Congolese child cobalt mining deaths](#). The Guardian

Misconception 7 There are no Health Risks associated with 5G.

“Health Canada ensures that 5G installations comply with all existing safety regulations, including Safety Code 6 (SC6), which determines exposure limits for wireless devices and their associated infrastructure. Canada’s limits are consistent with the science-based standards used in other countries. Large safety margins have been incorporated into these limits to provide a significant level of protection for the general public and personnel working near radio frequency sources.” (p.23)

Fact There is ample peer-reviewed science linking non-thermal radio frequency radiation (RFR) to biological harm. Countries such as Italy, Switzerland and Russia have radiation exposure limits many times more protective than ours.

In 1976, the [US Naval Medical Research Institute](#) published a [bibliography of 3,700 scientific papers](#) on the thermal and non-thermal biological effects of RFR. The body of scientific evidence on the health implications of the non-thermal effects of RFR has grown exponentially since.

“Health Canada’s 2015 guidelines for human exposure to non-ionizing radiation (Safety Code 6) were out of date before they were published, and the review process was flawed,” says Dr. Meg Sears, PhD, Chair of Ottawa-based *Prevent Cancer Now*. “Hundreds of peer-reviewed, published studies show that radiofrequency (RF) radiation can cause cancers, damage sperm and DNA, impair reproduction, learning and memory, and more. We should be limiting public exposure, not increasing it.”

“We have sufficient data to classify RF radiation as a Group 1, known human carcinogen, along with, for example, asbestos and tobacco smoke,” states Dr. Anthony Miller MD, Professor Emeritus of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, who worked with the International Agency for Research on Cancer on the 2011 scientific review.

When the U.S. Naval Medical Research Institute identified the risks in 1976, governments should have limited the scope of technological change, and created radiation exposure standards that protected the public from harm. Instead, the evidence was hidden and ignored, and industry-influenced bodies like ICNIRP created the standards that Health Canada still emulates today.

Learn more here:

1. [Peer Reviewed Scientific Research on Wireless Health Effects](#) ~ Environmental Health Trust
2. [5G Telecommunications Science](#) - Physicians for Safe Technology
3. Lai, Henry. (2019). [Research Summaries of RFR scientific Literature](#). Retrieved from Bioinitiative.org

Misconception 8 Innovation Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) regularly audits antenna sites to make sure they are safe.

“ISED’s regulatory framework, including market surveillance and compliance audits, provides safeguards to protect Canadians against overexposure from wireless devices and antenna installations.” (p. 23)

Fact ISED relies on cell tower operators to make sure their sites comply with Safety Code 6. Given how 5G and the IoT work, operators cannot accurately measure citizens radiofrequency radiation exposure.

Much like the fox watching the henhouse, ISED asks cell tower operators to self-monitor how much radiofrequency radiation their antenna sites are emitting. The tests these telecoms do are often software generated, and prone to inaccuracies.

ISED requires operators to “consider, in addition to their own radio system, the contributions of all existing radiocommunication installations within the local radio environment”. Given that 5G requires potentially dozens of small cell antennas on one street, and that millimetre wave 5G works “on demand”, it is impossible for an operator to take an accurate and consistent field measurement of the RF exposure residents are receiving on a daily basis.

For software-generated audits of 5G RF exposure to be accurate, operators would need to assess an ever-changing IoT “smart” landscape that includes multiple antenna sites owned by multiple operators as well as the RF-emitting smart infrastructure that 5G is purportedly there to support.

For the past six years, academics have been preparing for the increase in radiofrequency radiation exposure inherent to smart cities, and have been developing potential measurement tools. These measurement systems are much more involved and complex than what ISED now requires, and would likely put the onus on municipalities to monitor and regulate emissions and protect residents’ health.

Learn more here:

1. ISED. (2015, March 19). TN-261 [Safety Code 6 Radio Frequency Exposure Compliance Evaluation Template](#)
2. Diez, L., Agüero, R. and Muñoz, L. (2017, June) [Electromagnetic Field Assessment as a Smart City Service: The SmartSantander Use-Case](#). Retrieved from [Sensors \(Basel\)](#). 17(6): 1250

Part 2: Getting it Right

The FCM’s “Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality” outlines several 5G-related planning and regulatory issues that all municipal governments in Canada should be aware of.

Planning Concerns

“Clusters of small cells can be visually unappealing and create unique safety concerns. They can, in particular, detract from the qualities and integrity of areas such as historical or heritage districts as well as some planned urban environments.” (p.24)

Regulatory Concerns

“For stand-alone tower structures, regardless of height, the procedure provides for formal consultations with the municipality as the local land-use planning authority. However, 5G small cell installations on existing structures (towers and non-tower structures such as a building or power pole) are excluded from this requirement as long as the height of the structure is not increased by more than 25 percent.” (p.14)

“In practical terms, this means that if the power poles are owned by the provincial utility in your jurisdiction, a carrier could enter into an agreement to install 5G small cell antennas on these poles and not even have to notify your municipality (even if the small cell is added at the top of the pole, as long as the addition is less than 25% of the existing height).” (p.14)

“A grey zone exists with respect to pre-emptive pole replacements by utilities. If a utility were to replace a pole with a much taller one, and then add antennas to it, it would likely fall outside the consultation requirements.” (p.16)

Liability Concerns

“... a number of municipalities, even those with comprehensive MAAs in place, are reporting the installation of 5G small cell antennas without their knowledge. Even if they are affixed to someone else’s asset—like a power pole—if the antenna is located within the ROW space, it could raise issues of interest to the municipality such as safety concerns for the public and municipal workers.” (p.14)

Municipal Rights in Jeopardy

Current Rights

“If a carrier has identified municipal assets (light poles, traffic lights, transit shelters, etc.) as one of its preferred options to install small cell antennas, it has to negotiate with the municipality and come to an agreement. As asset owners, municipalities have the right to refuse access.” (p.24)

“Municipalities can refuse antennas on their property, but they cannot refuse the installation of equipment required to connect antennas located on other assets. Municipalities cannot charge occupancy fees for the connecting cables and other equipment installed within the ROW, but they can charge market value for an antenna located on their assets.” (p.25)

“Some municipalities have been misinformed by carriers into believing that small cells deployment is already covered in MAA’s and that, as a result, carriers enjoy the same conditional right of access for antennas as they do for their cables, etc. This is not the case.” (p.25)

Potential Loss of Rights

Telecommunications in Canada is currently under two review processes:

1. The Report of the Broadcasting and Telecommunications Legislative Review Panel

In its January 2020 report, the Panel reviewed the governance framework for antennas and the issue of access to municipal infrastructure for network deployment.

2. The CRTC Telecom Notice 2019-57 – Review of Wireless Services

In this national consultation regarding the future of wireless services in Canada, access to municipal infrastructure is an important theme.

How These Two Review Processes May Affect Municipal Governments in Canada:

1) If Recommendations 22, and 34-37 of the Legislative Review Panel’s Report are passed:

- Jurisdiction over antenna siting—including small cells for 5G—will be transferred from ISED to the CRTC. (p.11)
- The right of access that carriers currently enjoy within the right-of-way will be extended to encompass all potential support structures. These structures are referred to as “passive infrastructure” in the report, terminology that inaccurately portrays the functionality of a municipality’s assets. (p.11)
- Local governments’ current ability to refuse telecoms access to municipal assets and property would be lost. (p.11)

2) If the recommendations made by telecommunication carriers to the CRTC Wireless Review are adopted:

- The CRTC will have absolute authority over siting small cells antennas (p.26)
- The CRTC will impose time limits for municipalities to process 5G applications, as well as fee caps, and more. (p.26)

Note on Cost Recovery:

“To date, municipalities have been identifying direct costs (related to the deployment of 5G) such as engineering studies, electricity supply and workforce time, and billing them back to carriers. This seems to be the accepted best practice in Canada for the moment, a practice based in the sound public policy principle that **taxpayers should not be subsidizing the for-profit ventures of the carriers**”. (p.23)



Getting it right: Preparing for 5G deployment in your municipality

GUIDE



FEDERATION
OF CANADIAN
MUNICIPALITIES

FÉDÉRATION
CANADIENNE DES
MUNICIPALITÉS

Disclaimer

This guide has been developed for FCM's municipal members. Information contained within the guide reflects FCM's best understanding and is believed to be accurate at the time of preparation. The material contained in this document is for informational purposes only and is not intended to provide legal advice and should not be relied upon in that regard. Municipalities are encouraged to seek professional legal advice specific to the realities of each municipality. FCM accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this document.

Acknowledgements

This guide was developed by Professor Stéphane Énard-Chabot, University of Ottawa, under the guidance and review of the FCM Technical Committee on Telecommunications and Rights-of-Way. Review was also provided by the FCM Legal Advisory Committee, and this project was supported by FCM members nationwide through contributions to FCM's Legal Defense Fund.

© **Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2020**

Federation of Canadian Municipalities
24 Clarence Street Ottawa, Ontario K1N 5P3

An electronic copy of this handbook is available on fcm.ca

Contents

4

President's message

6

Connectivity: a new challenge

What is 5G?	7
How does 5G work?	8

10

What are small cells?

How is the deployment of small cells regulated in Canada?	11
An evolving landscape	11
The current legislative backdrop	12
Wires, cables, and municipal rights of way	13
Transmission antennas: towers and small cells	14

15

5G deployment: where wirelines and antennas meet

18

Key considerations and emerging best practices

GETTING STARTED	
Administrative and stakeholder considerations	18
Technical and engineering considerations	21
Financial considerations	23
Public opinion considerations	23
Framework and legal considerations	24

26

The future

28

APPENDIX A: Photos

33

APPENDIX B: The U.S. context

Huntington Beach, California	34
Denver, Colorado	35

37

APPENDIX C: FCM submissions

Broadcasting and telecommunications legislative review process	37
CRTC Telecom Notice 2019-57 – Review of Wireless Services	38

39

APPENDIX D: Canadian case study

Edmonton, Alberta	39
-------------------	----

41

APPENDIX E: References for further reading

President's message



Connectivity has become essential for any community's economic, cultural and social development. Even though important challenges remain in terms of access to basic broadband and wireless services in many smaller and rural municipalities—challenges which FCM continues to address in its work—the next wave of innovation is upon us. Telecommunications carriers, the federal government and the CRTC are gearing up for the deployment of the first components of the fifth generation of wireless technology (or “5G”)—a necessity if Canada is to remain competitive on the world stage.

Everyone has heard of 5G, but it is important for municipal officials to grasp and prepare for its practical, policy and logistical implications. From a practical perspective, this technology will revolutionize the place of the Internet in our professional and personal lives, including how municipalities provide services to the public.

5G will also pose challenges in that the infrastructure required is different from anything currently on the ground. In order to achieve its full potential, 5G will rely on vast numbers of small antennas—hundreds of thousands of them—that will become ubiquitous in our environment, each antenna requiring its own power and broadband connections. Furthermore, under the current legislative framework, the antenna and wireline components fall under different regulatory schemes, although this could evolve in the coming years.

Carriers have already stated that, for 5G to be fully deployed, they will require access to various municipal assets: traffic lights, light posts, bus shelters, etc. As with previous waves of communications innovation, municipalities will therefore be key in managing and supporting this deployment for the benefit of their residents and businesses. And FCM will play a leading role in advocating for the municipal sector and assisting municipalities in developing best practices.

This guide is the first practical tool developed by FCM to assist municipal officials as they prepare for 5G deployment in their communities. I wish to thank those who have contributed to this project, in particular the volunteer members of the Technical Committee on Rights-of-Way and the Small Cell Working Group.

As with other FCM resources, this guide provides members with a thorough overview of the information they need and the concrete steps they can take to adapt their individual relationships with carriers, as well as their own internal processes, in order to meet the challenge of 5G. FCM will continue to update this resource as the collective experience and the regulatory framework evolves.



Bill Karsten

FCM President and Councillor,
Halifax Regional Municipality

Connectivity: a new challenge

Connectivity is a crucial factor in ensuring a community's development and prosperity. For this reason, FCM has played a leading role in developing policies, programs, and tools that advocate for universal connectivity. Municipal officials also need help to protect their communities' interest while ensuring the efficient and timely deployment of technology within their jurisdiction. Thanks to the work of its Technical Committee on Rights-of-Way and, more recently, the work of the Small Cell Working Group, FCM has been instrumental in shaping best practices and defending municipal interests.

The trend toward greater connectivity will only accelerate. The use of wireless Internet-connected devices in our communities is exploding. Research shows that our current wireless data consumption has reached approximately 1.8 exabytes (one exabyte is one quintillion bytes) per month in North America alone, and this number is projected to grow six-fold by 2022. The advent of fifth generation (5G) wireless networks is the industry's response to this growth and the desire to further leverage the potential of the Internet. The Government of Canada is also encouraging the deployment of telecommunications infrastructure to meet its broadband and broader connectivity targets, both in urban settings and in rural areas.

5G technology requires entirely new networks comprised of great numbers of small, short-range antennas—"small cells"—to be deployed in order to provide effective coverage. Unless incentives (or even restrictions) to share infrastructure are put in place federally, each carrier will want to deploy its own network of small cells, which means that in some neighbourhoods there will be one small cell per carrier company every few hundred metres. Multiply this by the number of carriers operating in that neighbourhood and you get a sense of the magnitude of the undertaking. Estimates for 5G coverage in Canada set the number of installations at over 275,000 small cells.

The scope of this next wave of technological evolution makes it necessary for both the public and private sector to work closely together to ensure that the benefits of 5G technology become available to residents and businesses in a timely and cost-effective way. As the owners and managers of the right-of-way (ROW) space, as well as many other types of municipal or utility infrastructure (such as elevated tanks, buildings, posts and other possible supporting structures) where carriers want to install their 5G infrastructure, municipalities will have a pivotal role to play in balancing the need to provide connectivity to their communities with the protection of legitimate municipal interests such as safety and cost-recovery.

To assist municipal officials in their work and in tackling the new challenges posed by 5G, this guide seeks to provide readers with a basic understanding of 5G technology, of the current regulatory framework within which the deployment of the new networks will take place, as well as key considerations and emerging best practices municipal officials can take into account in preparing locally.

What is 5G?

5G, quite simply, refers to the “fifth-generation” of industry standards for wireless technology, the next wave in the evolution of mobile networks. While current 4G/LTE (fourth-generation/Long Term Evolution) technology revolutionized the capabilities of mobile handsets and other devices through faster connectivity and enhanced data capability, 5G will take wireless possibilities to a whole new level.

Once fully deployed, 5G technology promises maximum theoretical speeds in the 10 Gbps range, at least 100 times faster than top theoretical speeds for existing 4G technology (up to 1,000 times faster than actual speeds in some circumstances). To get a sense of this change, downloading a two-hour movie will take less than four seconds versus approximately six minutes on existing 4G networks. (Note that consumer technology will also have to catch up as many existing devices are not 5G capable.)

However, 5G is about much more than boosting speeds on your mobile phone. It is ultimately about enabling faster Internet connectivity everywhere and for everyone. In terms of coverage, 5G technology will outperform traditional land connections in some cases, making home routers a thing of the past. More significantly, 5G networks are key to opening up the potential of the “Internet of Things” (IoT), another popular term.

At the moment, most of the data that circulates on the Internet comes from human beings. In order for a news story, a research article, or a photo to find its way onto the web, someone has to create that content and upload it. To make a piece of data available on the Internet, by and large a person has to collect that data, then enter it into a computer. The IoT would allow countless devices, objects and even living beings—people, plants and animals—to be connected and provide accessible data in real time without the need for a human intermediary.

Imagine you own a dairy farm. You currently monitor the health of your cows by observing them and if you feel there is problem, by making certain tests. Now imagine if each cow

had a medical implant wirelessly connected to the Internet. You could consult, in real time on your mobile phone, any number of vital signs for each cow in your herd over the life of each animal. Each component in your car could report its own status, allowing you to make repairs before any real harm is done. Or imagine an implant monitoring your blood-sugar levels and informing you when you actually need a dose of insulin, as well as the size of the dose. Or a chip warning you that the blood markers of an imminent heart attack are present before you notice any symptoms. Smart home devices already on the market are just the tip of this technological iceberg and its potential.

For municipal officials, the IoT translates into “smart cities” where countless data points generated by citizens, sensors and assets allow you to monitor traffic and parking, water, wastewater, storm water, bus and rail stops, etc. This would also allow municipalities to make adjustments, or allow systems to make adjustments on their own, as needed. There are currently pilot projects across the country testing Smart City implementation and how to make use of the data that will flow from 5G to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of services and to respond to emerging needs.

Transportation and computer industry experts suggest the 5G deployments may also be crucial to the eventual use of autonomous vehicles or semi-autonomous driving. New pilot projects on provincial highways are exploring this possibility now.

In short, 5G opens the door to giving more and more things an IP address and connecting them to the Internet using some sort of sensor, allowing them to communicate with us and with each other, without the need for human interaction. This technology will bring new commercial opportunities, new services to residents, and open the door to innovation in the way municipal services are provided and managed.

How does 5G work?

In order to deliver on its promise to connect millions of densely packed devices and sensors, 5G relies on new technical standards as well as new infrastructure.

Without getting into too many technical details, 5G standards rely on a few key changes to achieve the new network’s full potential:

- ▶ **Greater bandwidth:** the ability to flow more data faster.
- ▶ **A different band of the radio spectrum:** different frequencies from current 4G networks.
- ▶ **Reduced latency:** the time it takes a device to connect to the network (measured in milliseconds).
- ▶ **Full duplex capabilities:** the ability to transmit and receive at the same time, instead of doing one, then the other, sequentially.
- ▶ **The ability to “speak” to large numbers of devices at the same time,** instead of switching very quickly between devices as is currently the case.

Of central importance to municipal officials is the fact that these new standards cannot be delivered with existing 4G wireless infrastructure. The larger antennas now found in most neighbourhoods do not operate in the right frequency range. 5G will therefore require an entirely new network of its own, gradually replacing existing mobile networks. The most significant change within the municipal realm is the advent of small cell installations. Although this equipment is relatively small, its range is also limited.

A study by Accenture estimates that achieving the full deployment of 5G in Canada will require the installation of somewhere in the order of 275,000 of these devices and, as you might expect, carriers will want to install these on any number of public assets. Developing business processes and technical parameters for the installation of thousands of these devices within your jurisdiction poses a challenge for municipalities and carriers alike.

The deployment of 5G networks will also require a number of new cell towers (“macro towers”), but the extent of that deployment is not known at this time, nor whether existing sites can accommodate these structures.

What are small cells?

Small cells are low-powered antennas (or “wireless base stations”, to use industry language) that function like cells in existing mobile wireless networks, typically covering targeted indoor or localized outdoor areas. It is essential to remember that “wireless” communications are only wireless for the end user. Small cells rely on a number of physical connections to function. In order for the data to flow into or from the Internet, each small cell antenna must be hard-wired into the carrier’s underground fibre-optic network. Each antenna is also accompanied by various support or control equipment and requires its own power source. Therefore a fiber optic cable conduit and a power supply conduit might need to be constructed where the cables are located underground.

There are various types of small cells: their size, shape, weight, the way in which they are attached as well as their individual ranges all vary. The smallest are for indoor use, operating on power levels similar to Wi-Fi routers. The largest are for outdoor use and typically consist of a small equipment cabinet (pedestal) and antennas. The antennas are small, mostly smaller than a briefcase, while the pedestals can be as large as fridge-sized cabinets. The larger small cells are often located on existing assets like traffic lights, street lights, crosswalk arms, power utility poles and buildings. Some can be incorporated

into LRT or subway platforms, bus shelters, or placed underground, while others are installed in municipal buildings (city hall, libraries, arenas, recreation centres, police and fire stations, etc.).

Unlike traditional cellular equipment, which is placed high up on single cell towers or buildings, small cell technology requires the density of multiple equipment installations clustered closely together, located in proximity to the end user and closer to the ground. While technical needs will vary according to the location and specific device used, providing full 5G coverage

can require small cells as close to each other as every 250 metres. For these reasons, coupled with the high cost of installing dedicated monopoles and the resulting public discontent that sometimes occurs in residential neighbourhoods due to tower proliferation, by installing small cells on existing municipal infrastructure, carriers can also reduce their costs. The collection of photographs at *Appendix A* provides you with a good overview of the variety of small cell installations that are commonly found.

How is the deployment of small cells regulated in Canada?

An evolving landscape

Having a basic understanding of how federal regulations are structured is important for municipal officials dealing with telecommunications issues. This section sets out the fundamentals of these rules. However, the legislative and regulatory landscape for small cells in Canada is currently the subject of two in-depth reviews that could bring about significant changes to this framework.

The first review was undertaken by the federal government. It appointed the *Broadcasting and Telecommunications Legislative Review Panel* to recommend revisions to the statutes that govern all aspects of communications in Canada. The Panel examined issues such as telecommunications, Canadian content creation, net neutrality, cultural diversity, and how to strengthen Canadian media. Of significance to municipalities, the Panel reviewed the governance framework for antennas and the issue of access to municipal infrastructure for network deployment.

The Panel issued its final report in January 2020 ([Full Text](#)). A number of recommendations (namely 22, and 34 to 37) involve municipalities directly. The Panel proposes transferring jurisdiction over antenna siting—including small cells for 5G—from ISED to the CRTC. The Panel further recommends that the right of access that carriers currently enjoy within the right-of-way be extended to encompass all potential support structures. These structures are referred to as “passive infrastructure”, terminology that inaccurately portrays the functionality of a municipality’s assets.

Although this is not stated explicitly, there seems to be an assumption on the part of the Panel that municipal consent will be required as per existing requirements under the *Telecommunications Act*—but the ability to refuse access to municipal assets outright would be lost if the Panel’s recommendations are adopted. Other recommendations, and several segments of the Panel’s “rationale”, on the other hand, are supportive of the municipal role and perspective as guardians of the right-of-way.

A summary of FCM’s submission to the Panel is set out at *Appendix C*. At the time of publication, FCM was in the process of determining its official response to the recommendations. The federal government was also still studying the report. FCM will remain engaged in this issue and will update this guide as required.

In a parallel proceeding, the CRTC has embarked on a national consultation regarding the future of wireless services in Canada ([Telecom Notice 2019-57](#)). FCM is also actively engaged in representing the municipal sector in this process during which access to municipal infrastructure has become an important theme. The consultation phase of this process is expected to wrap up in March 2020 with no definite timeline for a decision from the CRTC. (To access copies of FCM’s submissions to the CRTC, follow the links in *Appendix C*.)

In the meantime, please consider the present guide as a living document, which will grow alongside the legislative and regulatory landscape as it evolves.

The current legislative backdrop

All matters pertaining to interprovincial communications fall under federal jurisdiction. As it stands, the federal framework relating to telecommunications in Canada is set out in three key statutes:

- ▶ **Telecommunications Act:** The oldest of the statutes, this Act was initially meant to regulate telegraphs. Today, the Act essentially covers all modes of communication that involve a cable or wire. Significantly for municipalities, this Act gives carriers (the word used to designate telecommunications service providers) a right to use municipal ROWs to install, maintain and operate telecommunications infrastructure, subject to municipal consent. The Act is administered by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC).
- ▶ **Radiocommunication Act:** This statute deals with the technical aspects of communications through transmitted signals: radio, television, cell phones, and the emerging 5G technology. The statute is administered by Industry, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED), formerly known as Industry Canada. The placement of any towers for transmission antennas, for any consumer or commercial application, must be approved by ISED and the approval process is set out in the Antenna Tower Siting Procedure. Contrary to the *Telecommunications Act*, carriers do not enjoy any rights of access to install

transmission antennas, including small cells, and must negotiate access on a case-by-case basis.

- ▶ **Broadcasting Act:** Much less relevant to the municipal sector, this statute deals with the management of frequencies, sets out policies regarding such things as Canadian content, and establishes the CBC/Radio-Canada. Most matters under this Act are administered by the CRTC.

When these laws were put in place, telling “telecommunications” and “radiocommunications” apart was simple: a telephone relied on a wire, while watching television or listening to the radio depended on your proximity to an antenna. However, as we all know from our daily lives, this dividing line has become blurred more than ever. Technically, our telephones now rely on transmission antennas, not cables, to function. And we consume most of our content through means, such as fibre-optic cables, that do not involve traditional broadcasters or antennas. We also tend to purchase all our communications services from a single carrier. These dramatic changes are undoubtedly why legislative and regulatory reviews are underway.

For municipal officials, understanding the different set of rules, and how they are applied, is essential to develop bylaws, agreements and practices that protect their municipality’s interests while ensuring the latest telecommunications services are available to businesses and residents. Being well versed in how these rules interact will take on even greater importance with the impending deployment of 5G technology.

Wires, cables, and municipal rights of way

If you have limited experience with the carriers operating within your ROW, understanding the rules regarding wireline infrastructure (such as fibre-optic cables) is important in the 5G context since—as we have seen—each small cell antenna has to be connected to the carrier’s wire network, typically located within the ROW—usually underground.

When it enacted the *Telecommunications Act*, Parliament did two things. First, it used its jurisdiction to grant carriers a right to access municipal ROW and “other public places” to deploy their networks. Second, Parliament also expressly curtailed the carriers’ rights. Under the Act, carriers can only access ROW and other public places with the consent of the municipality. Municipalities are prevented from refusing access to carriers, but they can dictate reasonable terms of access to their ROW through the conditions of their consent.

The conditions you set and the actual tool you decide to use to grant your municipality’s “consent” to a carrier’s work depends on your municipality’s circumstances. FCM’s updated handbook *Telecommunications and Rights-of-Way* explores in great detail the best practices that have developed over the last two decades in this field. The Small Cell Guide builds on that expertise, but only provides a cursory overview. You are therefore invited to consult the telecommunications handbook if you are not familiar with this topic.

In essence, there are three options available to you to grant consent for work within the ROW (or in other public places):

- ▶ **Ad hoc or individual permits:** If you only receive the occasional request from a carrier to perform work within your municipality’s ROW (typical in less densely-populated areas), you might decide to deal with the occasional request from a carrier through ad hoc or individual permits, attaching specific conditions to each permit. Individual agreements can also be used if the carrier is seeking access to public property, other than a ROW, that has unique characteristics such as a park.
- ▶ **Municipal access agreements:** The most widely used way of granting blanket consent and setting the terms of access to municipal ROWs is through the negotiation of a mutually-acceptable, comprehensive Municipal Access Agreement (or MAA). MAAs typically cover a host of issues to protect local taxpayers by ensuring direct and indirect costs are not transferred to the municipality (e.g. reinstatement costs, pavement degradation, relocation for municipal works, liabilities, etc.). Please note that site-specific access agreements are also used when dealing with unique properties or assets.
- ▶ **Municipal access bylaws:** The Telecommunications Act does not set out the form that municipal consent must take. Theoretically, therefore, consent and terms of access can take the form of a bylaw. A handful of municipalities have opted for this approach and, in some cases, the bylaws have worked well for some time. However, in other municipalities, the carriers have reacted by challenging the bylaws in

court. At the time of publication, cases involving Calgary, Alberta and Gatineau, Quebec are proceeding through the courts so the judicial response to this approach— the definitive interpretation of the word “consent” under the Telecommunications Act— is still unknown.

Regardless of the method used to grant municipal consent, both parties, the municipality as well as the carrier, can turn to the CRTC to resolve disagreements regarding the conditions of access to municipal ROWs. The CRTC has the authority to dictate the specific terms of carrier’s access and their decisions can be appealed to the Federal Court of Appeal, with the Court’s permission.

One of the central elements of the CRTC’s approach has been the principle of cost-neutrality. Under this principle, the CRTC has clearly set out how municipalities can recover all cost elements attributable to the work and presence of telecommunications infrastructure within the ROW. The only cost element the CRTC has consistently rejected is an occupancy fee. Municipalities are not allowed to charge occupancy fees or rent to carriers for the space (even if they do so for other ROW users).

Transmission antennas: towers and small cells

The legal framework for antennas is completely different and is set out under the *Radiocommunication Act*. Contrary to wires and cables, carriers do not have any rights to access property for the purposes of installing transmission antennas. Carriers must negotiate on an equal footing with the owners of the assets where they wish to install an antenna. Typically, carriers purchase or lease the land to install large towers or, if they wish to attach a smaller antenna to an existing structure (rooftop, building wall, utility pole, etc.), they negotiate an occupancy agreement with the owner, which usually includes some form of rent. Of course, any owner is free to refuse.

Once they have secured a location for an antenna, carriers must apply to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) for technical approval. ISED will assess each application based on the Antenna Systems Procedure ([**Client Procedures Circular CPC-2-0-03**](#)). For stand-alone tower structures, regardless of height, the procedure provides for formal consultations with the municipality as the local land-use planning authority. However, 5G small cell installations on existing structures (towers and non-tower structures such as a building or power pole) are excluded from this requirement as long as the height of the structure is not increased by more than 25 percent.

In practical terms, this means that if the power poles are owned by the provincial utility in your jurisdiction, a carrier could enter into an agreement to install 5G small cell antennas on these poles and not even have to notify your municipality (even if the small cell is added at the top of the pole, as long as the addition is less than 25% of the existing height). When the carrier undertakes work within the ROW to connect these antennas to their fibre network, they might approach you for a permit for that part of the process. However, a number of municipalities, even those with comprehensive MAAs in place, are reporting the installation of 5G small cell antennas without their knowledge. Even if they are affixed to someone else’s asset—like a power pole—if the antenna is located within the ROW space, it could raise issues of interest to the municipality such as safety concerns for the public and municipal workers. These aspects will be explored in the *Key considerations and emerging best practices* section of this guide.

5G deployment: where wirelines and antennas meet

As explained earlier in this guide, to provide connectivity, 5G networks rely on large numbers of small, short-range antennas. To properly cover a large urban area, several hundred antennas (if not thousands) must be installed throughout the service area. These might be “wireless” as far as the end user is concerned, but for the technology to function, each small cell antenna requires a power source and must usually be physically connected, by a cable, to the rest of the carrier’s Internet network.

What this combination means is that 5G deployment simultaneously engages both sets of rules—the antenna regulations and the wireline regulations—and it does so on a very

large scale. From a legal and a practical ROW point of view, the deployment of 5G networks potentially engages your municipality in at least six different ways:

1. **Municipality as an asset owner:** Carriers must obtain the consent of any property owner in order to place an antenna. Therefore, if a carrier wishes to install an antenna on a municipal asset, it cannot proceed without the full agreement of the municipality. Conditions of access to a supporting structure for each small cell antenna (traffic light, bus shelter, light standard, hydro pole, etc.) will have to be negotiated between the carrier and the owner of the structure. As we will explore further below, conditions typically include assigning liability, accessing a power source, maintenance, occupancy fees, worker safety, etc. In negotiating access, a municipality should feel free to impose any reasonable conditions to safeguard its interests. Like other private property owners, municipalities typically receive rent from carriers for any antennas installed on their property.

2. Municipality as the ROW owner/custodian: Each small cell will have to be connected to the 5G network through cables to transmit the data captured by the small cells or to deliver data to the wireless users and devices. This wire connection component of a carrier's 5G network will likely be located within your ROW and could require the installation of pedestals or cabinets at grade. As per the rules applicable to wire-line infrastructure, carriers have a right to use the ROW space for these installations but, as we have seen, this right is subject to the terms of your municipality's consent. Disagreements on the terms of access can be brought to the CRTC by either party for resolution.

3. Municipality as land use planning authority: In 2014, the FCM was successful in advocating for regulatory amendments to the federal government's Antenna Siting Procedure that previously exempted smaller supporting structures (notably towers under 15 metres in height) from the public consultation requirements. The updated federal procedure requires consultation with the municipality and the public for all tower installations, regardless of height. In the 5G context, in the absence of a readily-available supporting structure, carriers might ask to place their own dedicated poles (or "monopoles," in 5G parlance—see *Appendix A* for images) within the ROW or elsewhere, to support a small cell antenna. Officially, the request to install a supporting structure would trigger the formal public consultation requirements with the land use planning authority, set out in ISED's procedure. Practically, since the carrier would have to seek permission from the municipality as the owner of the land on which the monopole is to be installed, both processes would likely unfold simultaneously.

Installations to existing towers or other existing structures such as power poles or buildings do not trigger the formal consultation requirement set out in CPC-2-0-03 unless the installation would result in an increase in height, of the existing structure, of more than 25 percent. A grey zone exists with respect to pre-emptive pole replacements by utilities. If a utility were to replace a pole with a much taller one, and then add antennas to it, it would likely fall outside the consultation requirements.

(Please note that, in addition to the changes to the federal framework, FCM negotiated a comprehensive Antenna System Siting Protocol Template with the Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association. This template is not mandatory and has no legal force unless it is used by a municipality and a carrier to enter into an agreement that complements the federal consultation requirements and reflects local considerations.)

-
- 4. Municipality as building code enforcement authority:** If a carrier wishes to attach a transmission antenna to an existing privately-owned building or structure, municipalities should feel free to require a building permit application if they have any concerns regarding the effects of the installation on the structure. The rationale for this requirement is the same as for any other change to an existing structure and FCM is of the view that this approach is legally and constitutionally sound.
-
- 5. Municipality as utility:** Each small cell installation requires a dedicated power supply (although battery back-ups are being reviewed by some manufacturers). If your municipality also owns the local power utility, or acts as the utility itself, it will also have to consider the technical requirements for these power connections, as well as determine how to metre and bill for each antenna's electricity usage. There is no expectation that the utility will simply allow carriers to plug in to their power source and use electricity without paying for it. Some municipalities have calculated an annual rate for non-metered power connections as the power utility, or with the agreement of the power provider.
-
- 6. Municipality as legislator:** Municipalities also enjoy a number of lawmaking powers through the adoption of bylaws. However, municipal officials should keep in mind that, in the context of telecommunications, these powers are greatly limited by the federal government's exclusive jurisdiction in this field. As the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in *Rogers Communications Inc. v. Châteauguay (City)*, ([2016 SCC 23](#)) clearly sets out, municipalities cannot use their powers to establish mandatory rules regarding antenna placement. A bylaw establishing a minimum separation distance between a dwelling and a small cell, for example, would be unconstitutional.

Key considerations and emerging best practices

As with any change of this magnitude, it is difficult to anticipate all the legal and operational issues that will arise. Looking back to the impacts of the deregulation of the telecommunications industry in 1993—and the immediacy with which issues arose on the ground—we know that such changes can create significant challenges for individual municipalities and for the municipal sector as a whole.

FCM's goal through this guide and the ongoing work of the Technical Committee, particularly its Small Cell Working Group, is to support information sharing and the development of best practices with respect to 5G technology, and to do so as proactively as possible. Although 5G deployment is barely starting in Canada, we already know from Canadian municipalities at the forefront of this work and from experience elsewhere, that there are certain steps municipalities can take right away in order to protect municipal interests while make the deployment of 5G networks on their territory as smooth as possible.

GETTING STARTED Administrative and stakeholder considerations

Internal engagement: Depending on your municipality's size and its approach and experience in processing applications from carriers for traditional ROW work, your internal structures and/or resources may or may not be adequate to deal with 5G issues comprehensively. In some municipalities, the division of responsibilities between various administrative units (engineering, public works, water, legal, transit, etc.) might not lend itself to handling the various aspects of 5G deployment naturally. There might not even be any obvious coordination point for this work.

Coming together internally to figure out the basic “who does what,” including designating a 5G function within your structure, is often a necessary and worthwhile first step, even before the carriers come knocking. Some municipalities have used the opportunity to coordinate or centralize the technical 5G work with initiatives such as smart-city opportunities and connectivity strategic plans for their communities.

Engaging carriers: Being able to anticipate and plan for the arrival of 5G with the carriers is certainly the preferred approach. This might be a slightly utopian objective as deployment is largely market-driven, with carriers going first where they can make the most money. This can make it challenging to obtain detailed plans in advance. Carriers want to protect their competitive advantages and may be reluctant to share too much information. Furthermore, experience has shown that plans can change suddenly as carriers review their commercial priorities. Nonetheless, engaging carriers as early as possible remains a preferred approach.

Obtaining information on planned service areas, deployment timelines, preferred support structures, the types of small cells that will likely be used, the requirements for power and cable connections, etc., will allow you to assess what measures are required to ensure that the framework is in place to manage the arrival of 5G technology in your municipality.

Conversely, regular meetings with carriers will allow you to test out ideas on how your municipality is proposing to deal with these issues. For example, experience has shown that carriers can have difficulty understanding how power connections and fibre-optic feeds can be best installed to avoid safety risks and planning concerns. A healthy dialogue is often the most efficient way of resolving these issues.

Lastly, a proactive approach is also helpful in developing a healthy collaborative relationship with carriers for the long term. By and large, municipalities at the forefront of 5G deployment in Canada have reported good success with most carriers in jointly developing the parameters for a successful 5G introduction on their territory.

Business processes: The information gathered in the first two steps above will assist you in adapting or developing business processes and corresponding staffing needs to manage the influx of 5G small cell installation requests. Municipalities are free to develop and use whatever process is convenient and logical in their jurisdiction but, at this point in time, it seems that the type of installation has been guiding the comprehensiveness of permitting process used:

A. Attachment to an asset owned by a third party (like a power pole) within the ROW:

In these cases, the relationship is mainly between the carrier and the third-party owner. The power supply may or may not involve municipal interests while the wire connection might only require minor work within the ROW. In such cases, the governing ROW processes might be sufficient, along with a new “notification” requirement that allows you to know that there is a small cell at this location, the type and strength of the device, etc. This information would be useful to ensure a complete shutdown of the antenna if municipal employees must work in close proximity (more on this in the *Technical and engineering considerations* below). Some municipalities are going a bit further and treating the presence of this type of small cell installation within the ROW under their general ROW occupancy bylaws and requesting an occupancy fee for the small cell as well as an indemnity agreement with the carrier for civil liability and the cost of any future relocation at the municipality’s request.

- B. Attachments to private property outside the ROW:** In such cases, you might consider that being notified is sufficient, depending on how much work needs to take place within the ROW to connect the antenna to the carrier's wireline network.
- C. Attachments to municipally-owned assets:** In these cases, municipalities are generally requiring a full permit application process to make sure that municipal interests are protected, both as the asset owner and as the manager of the space. The complexity of the process will depend on whether the installation type has already been reviewed for technical and engineering purposes. If the application is for the same type of small cell antenna on the same type of municipal asset, for example, application processes are typically simplified and bulk applications are often considered. Applications for new antenna-asset combinations, on the other hand, typically require a closer examination (see *Technical and engineering considerations*).
- D. In-building installations:** Requests for small cell installations inside municipal buildings are not frequent yet but will be coming. These will obviously require individual consideration as each building will present different challenges. However, a standard set of conditions can be developed in advance to govern general legal and operational issues associated with the presence of the antenna within a municipal building.

As with most approval processes, in developing any 5G-specific business process, you can set out the different goals that you wish to achieve: data collection on 5G infrastructure in your municipality, cost-recovery, protection for potential liabilities, public consultation or notification, etc.

- E. Pilot projects and soft launches:** In the Canadian municipalities where 5G deployment has progressed the most, municipal official and carriers have tended to work together in order to proceed incrementally and learn and develop best practices collectively. This has been achieved through limited pilot projects (installing a few small cells in different environments to identify practical issues that need to be resolved) or through soft launches of comprehensive business processes. In these cases, a permitting process and basic legal framework are put in place, a number of installations take place, and the lessons learned from this initial phase are used to inform the final versions of the permit process and master agreement between the carriers and the municipality.

Technical and engineering considerations

Civil or structural engineering: In many cases, attaching a small cell antenna to an existing asset will require a review by a civil engineer. Some poles might quite readily accommodate the added weight of the antenna, its control box and its power supply. But the added wind load on the pole (depending on the location of the device, its shape, and size) can become a problem that needs to be addressed through modifications to the pole or an outright replacement with a stronger structure. The great variety of small cell devices, multiplied with the various types of assets to which a carrier might want to attach an antenna, will mean that each antenna-structure configuration will need to be assessed to ensure public safety. On the positive side, once this work is done for a specific antenna-structure combination, approvals can proceed much more quickly, streamlining business processes over time. To that end, some municipalities are creating tables of each type of antenna coupled with each type of support structure with carriers and integrating them into their legal agreements.

Electrical engineering and power supply: How each small cell is powered is an important consideration in establishing approval parameters in your jurisdiction. This aspect will have to be examined closely as carriers often assume that a power source is readily available when, in fact, it is not. For example, in many municipalities, street lights are not powered at all during the day, requiring significant reconfiguration of lighting circuits in order to provide the 24-hour power required for the operation of the small cells. Provincial electrical codes also vary, which

means that a solution in one location might not work in another province. Lastly, metering power usage is an important part in ensuring full cost-recovery for taxpayers. Emerging practices currently vary according to the location and type of small cell, from individual smart meters attached to each cell, to a flat fee per cell negotiated with the local utility.

How an electrical feed is introduced in the pole is also another issue of contention. Where an external power feed is needed to feed a small cell antenna on an existing pole, the underground feed from the meter or the pedestal may be required, but supplying that feed through the existing streetlight's base can be problematic. Some carriers and municipalities have agreed to a shroud to cover the external cable routing on the outside of the base to the bottom of the pole itself, but it has been found to either be aesthetically undesirable or the shroud gets deformed or broken by snow clearing or by pedestrian traffic. A better practice is to allow for conduit paths in new streetlight bases/poles to allow an eventual power and/or fibre-optic feed through the base into the pole.

Access to municipal assets: In some municipalities, once the installation request has been reviewed, the carrier will be allowed to simply proceed with the work, from installing the small cell to connecting it to its power supply and to the underground fibre network. However, in other municipalities, work on municipal assets such as traffic lights and street lights can only be performed by municipal employees because of collective agreements. In some cases, this restriction might not apply to the installation of the antenna itself, as it is owned by the carrier. But the connection to the power supply within a pole might have to be done by

municipal workers. In other jurisdictions, work on municipal assets can only be performed by designated contractors. These are important considerations that will have to be examined in your own context.

It is worth noting that some municipalities have opted, with the concurrence of carriers, to undertake the work of connecting the antenna to a designated location where the carrier brings its fibre-optic. In other words, the carrier installs the antenna but the municipality does the rest of the work on (or inside) the pole. This includes hooking up the power supply and the fibre-optic cable to a designated and municipally-provided junction cabinet at grade, where the carrier then connects the antenna to its underground network. This ensures that any work affecting the integrity of the municipal asset is directly under municipal control. Furthermore, by providing common cabinets for all 5G antennas, the goal is to limit proliferation of at-grade infrastructure.

Abandoned assets: 5G will only increase demand for congested spaces. Ensuring that carriers remove infrastructure that is no longer useful will be important in many locations. By and large, carriers resist incurring these costs however, municipalities might have to become more demanding on this point as time goes on to ensure that the space available is used efficiently.

Density and antenna-sharing: The concern of demand for 5G locations outstripping the supply, particularly in dense urban areas, has been identified openly by some carriers. Municipalities should also bear this in mind as they move forward with 5G approvals. If five different carriers each want to install their own 5G small cell networks, will there be enough room on available structures? Will the resulting visual clutter be

tolerated by officials or residents? This is still an unknown variable, but an important one to keep in mind.

Shutdown and employee/contractor safety:

Municipal employees might need to work in close proximity to small cells (to install street signage, decorative banners, or flowerpots, for example), while those working on streetlight luminaires would have to pass the cells' radiation zone. First responders arriving at the scene of an accident where a pole has been knocked down and a small cell is lying on the roadway will be placed in a similar situation of being in close proximity to the radiation emitted by the small cell. While some provincial safety associations and industry groups are examining the potential impacts of this kind of deployment, mechanisms and protocols to ensure the complete shutoff of individual small cells in such circumstances should form part of any technical parameters developed with the carriers.

Interference with existing wireless assets:

There is a small risk that 5G small cells might interfere with existing wireless infrastructure. For example, if your municipality already uses wireless devices to control traffic flows or street lights, advanced testing of the carriers' preferred antenna models would be a worthwhile exercise to avoid any surprises.

Ground-mounted installations: On this point, it is sufficient to remember that all small cells have to be connected to a carrier's fibre network in order to function. How this is managed at grade is another logistical challenge, particularly in congested urban areas. Municipalities will likely want to ensure some level of coordination—or control—to avoid the proliferation of cabinets at grade.

Financial considerations

Cost recovery: With respect to traditional telecommunications infrastructure within the ROW, the CRTC has long supported full recovery of “causal costs”—cost elements associated with the work and presence of telecommunications infrastructure. Municipalities have been approaching the deployment of 5G technology with the same principle in mind: ensuring that the taxpayer is made whole. Municipalities have been identifying direct costs such as engineering studies, electricity supply and workforce time, and billing them back to carriers. This seems to be the accepted best practice in Canada for the moment, a practice based in the sound public policy principle that taxpayers should not be subsidizing the for-profit ventures of the carriers.

Permit fees: Municipal law parameters are well-established when it comes to what a municipality can charge to process permit applications. These fees must bear a direct relationship to the service provided. To charge less than the cost of processing permit applications would be problematic as carriers would be treated differently from other utilities that provide services that are also of vital importance locally and nationally. It would also amount to a *de facto* subsidy to carriers that could be challenged by others.

Occupancy fees: Although the CRTC has long held that municipalities cannot charge occupancy fees or rent for the use of the ROW space by telecommunications equipment, with respect to antennas, carriers have to negotiate access to the supporting structure and typically pay rent to the owner of that structure. This is certainly the case for current 4G antennas found on many buildings. In places where initial 5G installations

and testing has begun, agreements with carriers do include occupancy fees or rent for access to the municipality’s structure. These typically include a fixed annual fee for the location as well as a per-meter annual fee for the underground conduits where these are provided by the municipality. In some cases, in-kind contributions are also being considered, such as free access within municipal buildings, as part of the fees package.

Lastly, municipal officials should also keep in mind any developments with respect to access to hydro poles in their jurisdiction. Even in Ontario, where the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) has set a tariff for wireline attachments on hydro poles, the OEB declined to regulate fees for small cells. Carriers must therefore pay market rates for these attachments. These developments can have an effect on municipalities’ bargaining position.

Public opinion considerations

Health concerns: Health Canada ensures that 5G installations comply with all existing safety regulations, including Safety Code 6 (SC6), which determines exposure limits for wireless devices and their associated infrastructure. Canada’s limits are consistent with the science-based standards used in other countries. Large safety margins have been incorporated into these limits to provide a significant level of protection for the general public and personnel working near radio frequency sources. ISED’s regulatory framework, including market surveillance and compliance audits, provides safeguards to protect Canadians against overexposure from wireless devices and antenna installations.

To this effect, ISED requires that all wireless equipment sold in Canada, including consumer devices such as cell phones, tablets and Wi-Fi routers comply with SC6. Carriers are obligated to comply with these regulations. In cases where residents express concern about this technology and health risks, carriers and Health Canada should be equipped to address the issue.

Planning concerns: Proper municipal oversight should help address the most obvious planning concerns such as sight lines and the effective management of the public realm by avoiding duplication, ensuring proper positioning, etc. However, clusters of small cells can be visually unappealing and create unique safety concerns. They can, in particular, detract from the quality and integrity of areas such as historical or heritage districts as well as some planned urban environments. Products and techniques are available to camouflage and mask antennas, and municipalities can also facilitate placement in less visible locations.

Framework and legal considerations

Reviewing your Municipal Access Agreement:

The current dual governance structure, coupled with the relatively low number of antennas required for traditional cell phone technology, means that wireless connections are not often addressed explicitly in traditional MAAs. You should review any agreements in place to determine whether they capture items such as power feeds and fiber optic connections to the small cell attachments from a vault or pedestal. For example, what is the definition of “works” or similar word in your agreement? What is its scope? Obtaining legal advice on this point in advance is recommended as it will allow you to know what position to take in future negotiations. You might consider proposing changes to your MAAs to explicitly cover any unique elements flowing from 5G deployment.

Prepare to negotiate a lease for supporting structures:

If a carrier has identified municipal assets (light poles, traffic lights, transit shelters, etc.) as one of its preferred options to install small cell antennas, it has to negotiate with the municipality and come to an agreement. As asset owners, municipalities have the right to refuse access. In this light, municipalities would do well to give some thought to their needs in this regard beforehand. For example, are there locations or asset types for which your municipality is not prepared to grant access? There is currently no preferred model to govern access to municipal infrastructure, but basic parameters will undoubtedly evolve over time.

Combining legal agreements: You may find this more efficient, instead of entering into two distinct agreements to negotiate a comprehensive document to manage 5G deployments alongside traditional telecommunications infrastructure in your municipality. There is certainly nothing preventing a municipality from proceeding this way. However, it is worth repeating the fundamental point that antennas and their connecting infrastructure are subject to two different sets of rules. Municipalities can refuse antennas on their property, but they cannot refuse the installation of equipment required to connect antennas located on other assets. Municipalities cannot charge occupancy fees for the connecting cables and other equipment installed within the ROW, but they can charge market value for an antenna located on their assets.

Some municipalities have been misinformed by carriers into believing that small cells deployment is already covered in MAA's and that, as a result, carriers enjoy the same conditional right of access for antennas as they do for their cables, etc. This is not the case.

Prepare for litigation: While FCM's goal is to be a constructive partner in the deployment of 5G technology, there will inevitably be a few cases where it will be necessary to turn to regulatory bodies or the Courts to clarify jurisdictional grey zones. FCM, through its Legal Defense Fund, can intervene in key cases. However, experience in the telecommunications realm over the last 25 years has clearly shown that, in order to help regulators and the courts gain a better understanding of municipal needs, the presentation of strong, objective evidence, collected by individual municipalities, is crucial. By preparing reliable data on contentious legal and operational issues, individual municipalities will be able to demonstrate the legitimacy of their arguments and positions, not just for themselves but also for the municipal sector as a whole.

The future

There is still a fair amount of uncertainty with respect to how both the legislative framework and the range of technical challenges for 5G deployment will be managed. How will the federal government respond to the Report of the Broadcasting and Telecommunications Legislative Review Panel? If the Panel's recommended changes to the regulatory framework for antennas and wireline infrastructure are adopted, this would certainly upend existing practices. Changes of that magnitude would not only take time to make their way through Parliament, they would also generate inevitable legal questions that might require final determination by the courts.

From a technical point of view, the review of mobile wireless services undertaken by the CRTC in Telecom Notice 2019-57 is another source of uncertainty. As part of this process, some carriers have urged the CRTC to adopt an expansive interpretation of its authority in order to take over the authority over small cells antennas. Others argue that the CRTC should impose measures similar to those enacted by the Federal Communications Commission in the United States: time limits for municipalities to process 5G applications, fee caps, etc.

In its various submissions (see Appendix C for the complete documents), FCM has argued strenuously that the CRTC does not have the same authority as the FCC, and that the conditions in the U.S. that led to the imposition of measures simply do not exist in Canada. FCM's central position is that, in fact, the real impediments to timely and efficient deployment of 5G are technical—not legal—and the focus of all stakeholders' efforts should be on coming together to define and resolve these issues of common interest.

To that end, FCM has supported the proposals made by certain carriers who have opted for a more collaborative tone. For example, a proposal for the creation of a national 5G working group to work through common technical issues with municipalities and other stakeholders holds tremendous potential to make sure 5G deployment is done properly. Another suggestion from a number of stakeholders was the need for a faster dispute-resolution process to facilitate 5G implementation, an idea also endorsed by FCM.

During FCM's presentation at the CRTC hearings, the Commission seemed to express a good level of interest in this collaborative approach. The CRTC also seemed receptive to the various

examples provided by FCM with respect to the nature of the challenges on the ground—congestion, power supply to small cells, backhaul connections, etc—and the fact that these challenges require a technical solution, not a regulatory one. The CRTC's process is expected to wrap-up at the end of March 2020 with a final round of written submissions but a timeline on the publication of the CRTC's preferred approach was not known at the time of publication.

In short, municipal officials should continue to monitor closely developments on these fronts, as well as FCM communications on these issues.

APPENDIX A: **Photos**



Example 1 of 13-metre tall streetlight antenna pole with connection cabinet at grade



Close-up of connection cabinet



Example 2 of 13-metre tall streetlight antenna pole with cabinet.



Close-up of connection cabinet



Small cell attachments to decorative street lights
(the white vertical element is the light)



Small cell attachments to decorative street lights
(the white vertical element is the light)

APPENDIX B: The U.S. context

The deployment of 5G is a bit more advanced in the U.S., so there is more collective experience from which to learn. However, it should be noted that the unique political dynamics at play in the US also affect the scope of municipal authority with the FCC and several states specifically curtailing local ability to manage 5G installations.

Recent U.S. federal and state legislation (presently in 21 states) concerning the deployment of small cell technology may prevent cities from addressing aesthetic or safety concerns, and severely limits what cities may charge for private sector use of public streets as well as imposing new unfunded mandates on municipalities in the form of radically shortened application timelines.

The following areas have been the focus for legislative interest in the U.S.:

- ▶ Streamlining processing times for applications and permits.
- ▶ Capping and lowering collocation, application, and ROW fees.
- ▶ Limiting municipalities' design aesthetics jurisdictions.
- ▶ Limiting municipalities' control over denying applications for reasons other than required by legislation.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the U.S. regulator, believes that municipal governments are overcharging wireless carriers to access public ROW. As an example of recent action, the FCC issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on the topic of Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment.

This NPRM suggests stripping local governments of siting authority by significantly shortening permitting "shot clocks" and eliminating cities' ability to temporarily freeze complicated siting applications. It also limits annual lease rates to \$270 per small cell, significantly lower than the present market rate in most communities. The RVA LLC/Next Century Cities found that among municipal governments surveyed, the average annual lease rate was US\$1,438 per attachment and the median annual lease rate per pole was US\$1,200.

Interestingly, the RVA LLC/Next Century Cities report also found that municipalities are indeed concerned about maintaining local control and input. For example, over half of respondents (59% of 176 surveys returned) reported being greatly concerned about state laws and 52% are concerned about federal regulations that are passed without municipal input. A full 84% of respondents believe that state laws presently under consideration related to pole use for small cells will have negative impacts for their community.

In the U.S., market value rates are being calculated by comparison for fees charged for installation of a monopole or lattice tower on municipal ROW or titled lands. For example, based on the current rates for monopoles—which can be anywhere from US \$20,000 to US\$27,000 per year—with the standard range of 1.3 km and the stated range of various wireless units of about 180 meters, the annual rate per pole could be anywhere from US\$2,769 to US\$3,738. The fee could be applied for multiple attachments, or per attachment. Some cities charge different fees depending on the number of poles attached (e.g. in increments such as 1-25, 26-50, 51-100, 100-200, and over 201). For example, the rate in Long Beach, CA is US\$1,500 per pole per year, whereas in Buffalo, NY, it is US\$2,000 per pole per year with an automatic 3% annual increase.

A 2018 study by RVA LLC/Next Century Cities that was implemented to help determine the current deployment status of, and community attitudes toward Smart City and small cell deployment, found that the appearance of the equipment was the most common complaint about small cells. Fifty-eight percent of 176 municipal respondents reported complaints from citizens about deployment aesthetics. In Boston, the city worked with carriers and community members to come to agreement on how to ensure the equipment blended in more naturally with the cityscape.

Huntington Beach, California

Huntington Beach had great success in balancing carriers' interests with maintaining local control and community values. They found that bringing as many stakeholders as possible to the table and collaboration was important at every turn.

They were able to leverage already available assets, by acquiring 11,000 street lights from Southern California Edison. As well, Philips approached Huntington Beach to offer a deal to deploy 200 Smart Fusion Poles, making them the first city in the country to have this technology. The poles include integrated stealth antennas that can support service from several carriers at each location. So far, agreements have been made with Verizon, AT&T, and Mobilitie, creating another source of revenue for the city.

They first created a broadband strategic plan and then based on that wider plan, a specific plan with carriers to deploy small cell technology. They also made use of public-private partnerships, where this made sense, in the deployment of small cells.

They created an internal (municipal) telecommunications committee to evaluate all permitting processes. At the start, internal permitting processes didn't include any protocol for wireless siting in the public ROW, so a new process for permitting of wireless facilities through the public works department was created. They also amended the zoning code to permit small cells that meet pre-approved design standards within the public ROW. The committee created a forum that encouraged participation from all city departments, including fire and police, to work together to create policies that worked for everyone.

Importantly, the municipality worked with carriers to develop four pre-approved small cell design standards. Input from carriers on design was incorporated into the final permitting process, so if carriers' deployments fit one of the four standards, they are free to follow a streamlined, over-the-counter application process for permits. Collaborating with carriers to develop these designs was integral to ensuring the permitting process would work for both the city and the carriers. They also worked with other municipalities in Orange County to develop best practices in wireless siting. As a group, the cities worked through similar questions together to problem-solve and create shared resources and tools.

Denver, Colorado

Denver is currently exploring its policies and ordinances for Small Cell infrastructure and reviewing all new pole applications, within the parameters of federal and state law as well as Denver rules and ordinances. Under current law, it is not clear how the city can restrict height, design, or location (unless conflicting) of Small Cell infrastructure. The city is having success in coordinating expectations and recommendations through enhanced communication efforts at the outset of each carrier's program. So far each carrier has been receptive to:

- ▶ Considering standardizing pole design elements, colour, location, etc. to meet intent and character of existing infrastructure in the public ROW.
- ▶ Limiting pole heights to match existing street lighting and other poles in the public ROW.
- ▶ Generally avoiding placing poles adjacent to parks and historical places.
- ▶ Encouraging pole and equipment designs that enclose as much equipment as possible to minimize visual impact.

- ▶ Co-locating equipment onto existing infrastructure wherever feasible.
- ▶ Installing consistent infrastructure that does not discriminate based on neighbourhood type, demographic, or character.
- ▶ Exploring new concepts in combining equipment from multiple companies into single poles.

Public Works currently performs careful consultation with top executive and program management staff from each wireless carrier about proposed infrastructure programs before the carrier is allowed to submit any applications for approval. This ensures that each carrier approaches the city in a consistent manner, and that the city's current policies and permitting procedures are well known at the outset.

Per state law, the city must allow each company to propose their infrastructure in the public ROW. Additionally, the city must offer permitting procedures that can process "bulk" Small Cell programs in batches, in 90 days or less, rather than requiring individual permits for each pole or antenna. In response to these requirements, Public Works has established a plan review and permitting program that combines existing utility plan review and encroachment permitting into one contiguous process. Each applicant may submit batches of 10 or fewer unique poles or pieces of ground-mounted equipment per application. Each application will result in a revocable encroachment permit.

APPENDIX C: FCM submissions

Broadcasting and telecommunications legislative review process

January 2019 – Recommendations (excerpt from the full submission which can be found here: [https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/110.nsf/vwapj/908_FederationofCanadianMunicipalities_10_EN_CA.pdf/\\$FILE/908_FederationofCanadianMunicipalities_10_EN_CA.pdf](https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/110.nsf/vwapj/908_FederationofCanadianMunicipalities_10_EN_CA.pdf/$FILE/908_FederationofCanadianMunicipalities_10_EN_CA.pdf))

As stated, municipalities are crucial partners in the timely and cost-effective deployment of communications infrastructure in Canada. Therefore, in their submission to the Broadcasting and Telecommunications Legislative Review, (January 2019) FCM made clear their recommendations involving municipal ROW management related to access and consent, including:

- ▶ Develop a national broadband strategy, with elements that enhance accountability, transparency and cooperation between federal agencies, orders of government and with industry to improve broadband service across the country, as well as better ensure universal access to emerging technologies at affordable rates for consumers.
- ▶ Maintain municipalities' legislated role in managing public space for the benefit of all users. Achieving national connectivity objectives must build on and enhance the long-standing partnership with municipalities.
- ▶ Maintain the integrity of the local taxpayer without transferring costs onto the municipal tax base.
- ▶ Maintain the wording of sections 43 and 44 of the *Telecommunications Act*.
- ▶ Maintain the jurisdiction between the CRTC and ISED in the governance of small cells.
- ▶ Clarify the responsibilities of ISED and the CRTC over broadband in order to facilitate the implementation of a national broadband strategy.

FCM continues to focus on ensuring that municipalities maintain their rights around managing ROW issues and assisting with informational tools and strategies to improve the operational deployment of emerging technologies.

CRTC Telecom Notice 2019-57 - Review of Wireless Services

Initial submission dated May 15, 2019 - <https://services.crtc.gc.ca/pub/DocWebBroker/OpenDocument.aspx?DMID=3646824>

Response to the CRTC's "Request for Information" (RFI), a series of targeted questions, dated September 2019 <https://data.fcm.ca/documents/tools/guides/crtc-telecom-notice-2019-57-fcm-responses-to-questions.pdf>

Further comments, as per CRTC procedures, in response to all submissions and responses to RFIs submitted by all parties, dated November 23, 2019 <https://services.crtc.gc.ca/pub/DocWebBroker/OpenDocument.aspx?DMID=3756327>

FCM presentation slides for the CRTC hearings on February 21, 2020 - https://data.fcm.ca/documents/members_only/board_march/2020/FCM-CRTC-Telecom-Notice-2019-57-Presentation-en.pptx

Video recording of FCM's presentation at the CRTC hearings on February 21, 2020 - <https://www.cpac.ca/en/programs/crtc-hearings/episodes/66152116/>

APPENDIX D: Canadian case study

Edmonton, Alberta

The City of Edmonton proceeded using a clear and precise order in finding solutions to small cell deployment issues. Public consultation was an important piece and the technical review of the technology was extensive. The telecom carriers had input, and they indicated that they thought the process made sense. Edmonton has developed ROW consent and access agreements that are separate from MAAs and has developed a streamlined permitting process along with clear policies for permit review. The following is a brief selection and summary of agreement provisions and requirements.

- ▶ The annual fee for an attachment is \$500 plus GST per attachment, as approved by city council.
- ▶ The cabinets associated with the antenna are not to be attached to the pole, contractor cabinet bases will not be allowed.
- ▶ For large cabinetry, there is no objection to the unit being wrapped or painted with a mural or other artwork approved by the City.
- ▶ Any proposal to install an attachment in an area serviced with decorative poles must be designed to match, as much as possible, the design used in that neighbourhood.
- ▶ If multiple attachments are proposed in a given area, it is the city's preference that the poles are fed from a central location (e.g. three or four poles with a fibre-optic feed from a central vault).
- ▶ Installations will be permitted at any time (subject to co-ordination with other construction work and/or events).
- ▶ "Mid-span" stand-alone poles will only be allowed in areas where there are no existing street lights or poles. Should an area become serviced by standard street lighting, any stand-alone pole may need to be removed at the telecommunication company's expense.

- ▶ Red light camera poles and/or CCTV poles are not available for attachments.
- ▶ The companies shall be responsible for all electrical permits, installation of the power feed, meter installation, and associated power consumption bills from the power carrier.

The city will review and, where appropriate, approve the installation of attachments. Once a pole has been determined to be useable, the applicant shall apply for a Utility Line Assignment (ULA) permit for the underground connections to the pole. All fees associated with the ULA permit process, pavement degradation fees, and lost productivity costs shall be charged as per the applicable agreement with the company (usually the ROW Consent and Access Agreement).

For the installation of pole attachments on public road ROW, there will be a pre-consultation site investigation meeting with the city to:

- ▶ Determine if a specific pole can accommodate an attachment.
- ▶ Identify preliminary issues of concern.
- ▶ Identify requirement for public consultation.
- ▶ Guide the content of the proposal submission.

Once the meeting has taken place, Edmonton's City Operations will give the applicant an information package that includes requirements for public consultation, installation and design and a list of plans and studies that may be required as well as any additional approvals and/or studies that the City has identified as being required. If the proposal is found to be technically possible, City Operations will forward an agreement to the applicant, advise if any additional approvals are required and require the applicant to engage in public consultation similar to the consultation required under City of Edmonton Policy C471C "Policy for Siting Telecommunications Facilities."

APPENDIX E: References for further reading

Models and Challenges for the Deployment of Next-Generation Telecom Systems in Cities, report commissioned by the City of Montreal, June 2018 (English version)

<https://res.cloudinary.com/villemontreal/image/upload/v1573053761/portail/nitmhkplhc1yi00poxi.pdf>

Background of Small Cell Technology. SmartWorks Partners. December 18, 2018

<https://www.smartworkspartners.com/small-cell-overview>

Becoming Broadband Ready: A Toolkit for Communities. Next Century Cities. January 2019

<https://nextcenturycities.org/becoming-broadband-ready/>

Broadband Strategy, City of San José CA

<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/department-directory/office-of-the-city-manager/civic-innovation/broadband-strategy-and-small-cell-deployment-5147>

Broadband Strategic Plan. Huntington Beach, CA

<https://nextcenturycities.org/guest-blog-bridging-the-digital-divide-in-huntington-beach/>

New Guide: How to Plan for Small Cell Wireless Infrastructure. National League of Cities (NLC). August 27, 2018

<https://www.nlc.org/article/new-guide-how-to-plan-for-small-cell-wireless-infrastructure> accessed March 4, 2019

Next Century Cities' 5G and Small Cell Resources. June 28, 2018

<https://nextcenturycities.org/next-century-cities-5g-resources/>

Status of U.S. Small Cell Wireless/ 5G & Smart City Applications from The Community Perspective. RVA LLC/Next Century Cities. March 2018

<https://nextcenturycities.org/wp-content/uploads/5Gresearch.pdf>

Summary of Final FCC Small Cell Order Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment. Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order; WT Docket No. 17-79; WC Docket No. 17-84. December 20, 2018

<https://nextcenturycities.org/wp-content/uploads/Guide-to-FCC-Small-Cell-Order.pdf>

fcm.ca

