

Report on Anmore Regular Council Meeting Tuesday, January 12, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Acting Mayor McEwen at 7:00 pm. Councillors Isaak, Piamonte and Sedergreen were present as were Administrator, Howard Carley, Treasurer, Sharleen Karamanian and Planning Consultant, Michael Rosen. Approximately 40-residents were also in attendance.

Under Additions and Deletions to the Agenda, Acting Mayor McEwen reminded the public that the Village Hall was a scent free environment. However, the strong odour of scent remained within the public forum as those who were wearing scent did not excuse themselves from the meeting. With this in mind, resident Elaine Willis who has severe allergies and, as a result, can go into anaphylactic shock in a scented area had to sit by the sliding glass door for fresh air.

Editors Note: A scent free policy seems meaningless if it is not enforced.

The Adoption of the Minutes of the Special Council Meeting held of January 4, 2010 was passed unanimously. Under Business Arising from the Minutes, Councillor Sedergreen presented his rationale as to why he had not voted in favour of having Village Manager, Karen-Ann Cobb appointed as Chief Election Officer at the Special Council Meeting held on January 4, 2010. He said that it was unfortunate that he was not able to address his concerns privately to Ms. Cobb at an In-Camera Meeting, but since the opportunity to do so had not been presented and since there was so much demand from the public to give a response, he felt it his civic duty to do so.

He provided four reasons for voting the way he did:

- 1. Ms. Cobb's failure to ascertain Ken Juvik's ineligibility to run for Mayor in the November 2008 election and the manner in which Mr. Juvik's name was removed from the mayoral race.**

Mr. Juvik was not told until the eleventh hour of his ineligibility, thus, providing him with no recourse nor for others to run as a candidate for Mayor. Councillor Sedergreen stated that this had caused a great deal of damage to the Community.

As Chief Election Officer, Ms. Cobb had a duty to have this knowledge, yet she had failed to do so each time Mr. Juvik was elected Councillor.

2. As part of the Administrative Staff, Ms. Cobb had to be impartial and not influence policy.

Councillor Sedergreen stated that he had just been made aware that she had been communicating directly with government staff concerning the daycare issue without the knowledge of Council. Under whose instructions was she doing so?

Ms. Cobb had a duty to communicate with Councillors. She did not provide the document nor information contained in the document although Councillors had requested this for several months. Council was led to believe that there was no information regarding timelines, grant requirements and details about implementation. Ms. Cobb has a duty to give an explanation to Council.

3. Impartiality over the daycare issue.

Ms. Cobb had made a statement that the daycare centre project has been "unfortunately defeated". Councillor Sedergreen reminded the public that staff deals with administrative issues only, not policy and must remain impartial at all times.

4. The residents of Anmore deserved a "free, fair, impartial" election.

Councillor Sedergreen stated that all elections must be "free of taint". All staff and especially the Chief Election Officer must remain at arm's length from all participants.

As well, he stated that he did not know whether hiring an independent consultant as Chief Election Officer would actually incur a higher cost and was sure that the delay of choosing one would only delay the election by a couple of weeks.

Along these same lines, Councillor Piamonte, then, presented his rationale for not voting in favour of Ms. Cobb's appointment.

1. Appointment of the Chief Election Officer.

The appointment of the Chief Election Officer should not be a "simple rubber stamp". A Chief Election Officer should be a "gatekeeper" to ensure the integrity of an election. Ms. Cobb had failed to be this gatekeeper when she had never challenged the election of Ken Juvik as Councillor for 12-years and allowed Mr.

Juvik to submit his name to run for the election as Mayor when she should have known that, as a forester, Mr. Juvik was ineligible to run.

2. Timing of the By-Election.

A by-election must take place 80-days after the appointment of a Chief Election Officer. Councillor Piamonte stated that he did not see the need to rush into an election due to the number of Anmore residents being involved in the 2010 Olympics.

He noted Metro Vancouver is accommodating schools, business, etc., so that community participation can be facilitated. Anmore has been given an \$8000.00 grant to have the Olympic torch come through our Village.

Even the City of Coquitlam has not set a definitive date for their by-election with the resignation of Councillor Fin Donnelly as they do not wish to do so while the Olympics are going on.

Anmore has a quorum with the four members of its Council. Thus, there is no immediate need to fill Mayor Weinberg's vacancy.

3. Election Costs.

The Village will save over \$1000.00 per month due to not having to pay an honorarium for this position.

The last election in Anmore went over budget. It cost \$9374.00, rather than the budgeted \$8000.00.

Perhaps, Anmore is being "offered an opportunity in disguise". Council could possibly piggyback a no cost referendum on the daycare issue during the by-election.

The discussion was, then, opened to the public. The following were their comments:

- Tracy Greene - Ms. Greene was concerned that there was no discussion nor other options offered when Ms Cobb was not chosen as Chief Election Officer during the Special Council Meeting of January 4, 2010. She stated that Ms. Cobb was a 20-year employee of the Village and it was a waste of taxpayer's money to hire an outsider. As well, she felt that the onus was on Ken Juvik and

not Karen-Ann Cobb as Chief Election Officer, to realize that he was disqualified to run for the position as Mayor.

- Heather Anderson - Ms. Anderson was appalled that the longest serving staff member of the Village was being spoken of in such derogatory terms. She felt that Council had no leadership and that she was embarrassed and offended by what was said.
- Larry Barron in response to Ms Anderson - Mr. Barron chastised Ms. Anderson concerning her comments. He stated that she did not attend the Special Council Meeting, and, thus, did not know what transpired nor what was said at that meeting. He clearly stated that the Councillors were pressured into giving their responses, particularly after what had been written in the Anmore Times and the published comments by some of its readers.
- Elaine Willis - Ms. Willis stated that she had telephoned some small municipalities in the Region and asked what their policies were with regard to the appointment of a Chief Election Officer. Most stated that they contracted this position out. The Village of Harrison with approximately 1800 residents (similar to Anmore) went even further to state that the reason why they chose an outside Chief Election Officer was that using a village employee caused too much strife. The trend is to chose someone at "arm's length".
- Leah Weinberg - Ms. Weinberg stated that there was no political strife for 20-years, but there is now. She did not understand the need to hire an independent Chief Election Officer.
- Mark Obedzinski - Mr. Obedzinski asked why this Council was so suspicious and judgmental. He stated that we all make errors as adults and needed to be fiscally responsible. He felt that an employee of the Village could be at arm's length.
- Councillor Sedergreen in Response to Tracy Greene's Earlier Comment - Councillor Sedergreen stated that he was surprised about Ms. Greene's production of the minutes for the Special Council Meeting held on January 4, 2010. Since she had arrived late with only 10-minutes remaining in the meeting and had not been privy to the discussion relating to Ms. Cobb's non-appointment as Chief Election Officer, he had difficulty understanding her comments and lengthy publication of the minutes in the Anmore Times as if she was there.

Tabled items remained tabled.

Under Council Committee Reports, Councillor Piamonte pointed out that the Daycare Working Group had been chosen, that its first meeting was January 19, 2010, that neither he nor Councillor Isaak would be Chair and Co-chair, but that the members would choose their own and that the member's second responsibility would be to come up with their Terms of Reference.

Cherri Woode, Block Watch Co-ordinator for all of Anmore, then, presented an updated Block Watch Report. She stated that 154 homes were already registered with 45 pending. As well, she reiterated the need to be diligent about keeping an eye for strange people and cars in the area and to keep doors and window locked. Two Block Watch Fan Outs had just been sent out by the RCMP - an attempted break and enter on Strong Road on Friday, January 8 and a successful break and enter on Hemlock on Monday, January 11, 2010.

Councillor Isaak, then, stated that the Olympic Torch would be coming through Anmore on February 11. She encouraged all Villagers to attend not only the torch bearing event itself, but also the pancake breakfast to follow.

Under Petitions and Delegations, resident Terry Henfrey gave a power point presentation regarding the proposed diagonal road at the end of East Hemlock Drive connecting to the lands at the east end of Spence Way. This would provide access to the Anderson and Posnikoff lands. His concerns were the loss of trees, impact on Mossom Creek and the negative impact of traffic of the houses fronting East Road and backing on Hemlock.

Resident, Jody Cooke rescheduled her appearance before Council regarding the stop signs at East and Strong Roads to the next Council meeting of January 26, 2010.

The following by-laws were passed unanimously:

- Anmore Capital Roads Reserve Fund Establishment Bylaw No. 490-2010
- Anmore Water Storage reserve Fund Establishment By-law No. 491-2010
- Anmore Revenue Anticipation Borrowing By-law No. 492-2010

Under Unfinished Business, Bill 27, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Official Community Plan Amendment was discussed. Planning consultant, Michael Rosen told Council that the Provincial Government had passed Bill 27, whereby all local governments must include within their OCP targets for the reduction of green house emissions, and

policies and actions with respect to achieving those targets. This process must be completed by May 2010.

It was unanimously carried that staff be authorized to schedule a public information meeting on this matter. The APC and Environment Committee have already recommended to half the provincial government targets by the years 2020 and 2050.

Next, Michael Rosen presented an updated draft on the Metro Draft Regional Growth Strategy. Metro Vancouver is expecting to adopt the Regional Growth Strategy By-law by this summer. The RGS still designates Anmore as being **Rural**. However, this designation will not prevent the Middle School from being connected to sewers. As well, the **IOCO lands** designation is being requested as being a **Special Study Area** to enable density development in the future. Buntzen Lake has also been designated as **Conservation/Recreation** and both East and Sunnyside Roads have been designated as **Regional Roads**.

It was moved and passed unanimously that the report be received for information and that prior to finalizing its comments to Metro Vancouver, Metro Vancouver representatives be invited to attend a Council meeting on or before January 26, 2010 to discuss the status of the land use designation for the IOCO lands.

Finally, a report was presented by Planning Consultant, Michael Rosen concerning the Lock Subdivision, Lot 2, Section 20, TWP 39, NWD, BCP1168, Park Land Dedication. Mr. Rosen recommended that Council support the parkland dedication proposed from LKT Projects Ltd. in connection to the development of the Lock proposed subdivision. The proposed 2.03 park dedication would equate to 16.4% of the subject property, significantly greater than the 5.0% entitlement to the Village pursuant to the Land Title Act and would have "significant fish and wildlife values".

However, a number of concerns were expressed by both the Councillor and residents. Some of these voiced concerns follow:

- how much of the land being given to the Village for parkland as proposed by the Lock subdivision would be riparian area and, thus, designated as parkland anyway; with this in mind, is the Village really receiving anything?
- what percentage of the land lies within and outside the riparian area?
- the need for Development Permit Areas
- the need for the Village to designate green space and making such land undevelopable

- the need to identify all riparian areas in the Village, and have an overall plan for protected areas and a comprehensive parkland policy
- the need to be proactive rather than reactive, so that there is a clear understanding by developers as to what the rules are
- the need to see green space as not designated as parkland as no Council has done this to date. "Right now, Anmore looks like Westwood Plateau, but having bigger homes and lots."
- many residents had walked the proposed parkland area and stated that it was undevelopable anyway as it had a 45 degree pitch, was "billy goat stuff" and the developer was providing a "smoke screen"
- the concern that a trail can even be built on such a steep slope
- the necessity of destroying land for a trail in the area. Was it not more important to protect Mossom Creek?

Council did not accept the proposed designated parkland area as submitted and passed a motion to instruct staff to bring forward a draft park land dedication policy in connection with the proposed subdivisions for Council's future consideration. Councillor Sedergreen pointed out that it was the responsibility of the Council to make policy and that staff only make recommendations. At this point, Mr. Rosen replied, "It is staff that makes policy and Council that documents it" (Editor's Note: Perhaps, the Chair calling a point of order at this point would have been appropriate.)

Council also agreed that the matter be referred to the Environment and Public Works Committees and the APC and that detailed topographical maps be provided.

Under New Business, the need for a review of the Official Community Plan and the Zoning By-law was discussed. Planning Consultant, Michael Rosen wanted to know what was not working in the OCP and the zoning by-laws and questioned the need for any changes. Councillor Isaak wanted to know if only parts of the OCP could be changed and recommended a public meeting to address any concerns. Acting Mayor McEwen stated that they should only pursue this after a new Mayor had been elected.

Under Public Question Period, resident Heather Anderson stated concern as to when the election for Mayor would occur. Administrator Howard Carley stated that he had researched contractors and would submit a report at the next Council meeting on January 26, 2010. Once a Chief Election Officer had been chosen, the election would take place 80-days later - according to Provincial legislation.

Resident Dick Cresswell expressed concern over the extension of East Hemlock and stated that the OCP should always be followed with regard to roads policies. Otherwise, a dangerous precedent could be set with legal liabilities.

Resident Peter Abblitt asked what the status of the removal of the stop signs on East and Strong Roads was. Councillor Sedergreen responded that the Transportation Committee would be meeting on this issue on January 28th and all residents were encouraged to attend. Acting Mayor McEwen stated that he would be presenting a written report on this issue at the next meeting. As well, Jody Cooke will be giving a presentation at the next Council meeting of January 26, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

Written by: Camille Tribe
January 13, 2010