

REGULAR MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL

November 28, 2011 6:08 p.m.
Council Chamber
City Hall

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Mayor Wayne Wright
Councillor Jonathan Coté
Councillor Bill Harper
Councillor Bob Osterman
Councillor Jaimie McEvoy
Councillor Betty McIntosh
Councillor Lorrie Williams

STAFF:

Mr. Paul Daminato	- City Administrator
Ms. Bev Grieve	- Manager of Planning, Development Services
Mr. Barry Waitt	- Senior Planner, Development Services
Mr. Gary Holowatiuk	- Director of Finance & Information Technology
Mr. Jim Lowrie	- Director of Engineering Services
Mr. Terry Dunlop	- Recording Secretary

PROCLAMATION

His Worship, Mayor Wayne Wright advised of a request to proclaim *Reserve Forces Day* in the City of New Westminster, in recognition of the significant contribution of the Canadian Forces Reserve Force to the community and the nation.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve receipt of the proclamation request regarding Reserve Forces Day.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

Mayor Wright then proclaimed December 1, 2011 as *Reserve Forces Day* in the City of New Westminster and presented the Proclamation to the Reserve Forces Honorary Colonel, Karen Baker-McGrotty.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Motion to adopt the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the City Council held November 7, 2011.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the City Council held November 7, 2011 be received and adopted.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

BYLAWS CONSIDERED AT PUBLIC HEARING

2. Zoning Amendment Bylaw (Building Encroachments) No. 7494, 2011 [a Bylaw to amend Zoning Bylaw No. 6680, 2001 re: incorporating the current encroachment Policy into the Zoning Bylaw]

THIRD READING

ADOPTION

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Zoning Amendment Bylaw (Building Encroachments) No. 7494, 2011 be read a third time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Zoning Amendment Bylaw (Building Encroachments) No. 7494, 2011 be adopted.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD AND ISSUANCE OF DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMITS

3. 221 Jardine Street

Procedural Note:

For information, staff submitted a supplementary report dated November 28, 2011, informing of correction of an error in the original DVP 526 report contained in the Council package for the November 28, 2011 Opportunity to be Heard and advising of an issue in connection with the subject DVP.

a) Opportunity to Be Heard for Development Variance Permit No. 526 for 221 Jardine Street

There were no requests to be heard.

- b) **Issuance of Development Variance Permit No. 526 for 221 Jardine Street to vary the following sections of the Zoning Bylaw:**

Sec.330.23 Site Area and Site Frontage

The applicant proposes a site frontage of 29.28 ft. /8.9 m. The Zoning Bylaw requires ten percent of the proposed lot perimeter which is 33.55 ft. /10.2m.

Required notification has been completed.

Attachments:

- Copy of Development Variance Permit notice;
- Director of Development Services' report dated August 29, 2011
- Director of Development Services' report dated October 3, 2011

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve issuance of Development Variance Permit No. 526.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

4. 342 Johnston Street

- a) **Opportunity to Be Heard for Development Variance Permit No. 527 for 342 Johnston Street**

There were no requests to be heard.

- b) **Issuance of Development Variance Permit No. 527 for 342 Johnston Street to vary the following sections of the Zoning Bylaw:**

Sec.330.23 Site Area and Site Frontage

The applicant proposes a site frontage of 33 ft. /10 m. The Zoning Bylaw requires ten percent of the proposed lot perimeter which is 35.96 ft. /10.92m.

Required notification has been completed.

Attachments:

- Copy of Development Variance Permit notice;
- Director of Development Services' report dated August 29, 2011
- Director of Development Services' report dated October 3, 2011

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve issuance of Development Variance Permit No. 527.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

5. 327 East Sixth Avenue

a) Opportunity to Be Heard for Development Variance Permit No. 529 for 327 East Sixth Avenue

On behalf of the applicant, Mr. Jean-Claude Luong, Mr. Don McCuiston distributed copies of information relating to the treatment of the proposed driveway.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council receive the on-table information from the applicant for Development Variance Permit No. 529.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

- i) **Mr. Don McCuiston** advised that neighbouring property owners supported the application, which involves installation of a honeycomb driveway surface material that allows grass to grow through. The driveway material is strong enough to support a vehicle, yet it appears as a grassed surface that enhances the visual impact.

b) Issuance of Development Variance Permit No. 529 for 327 East Sixth Avenue to vary the following section of the Zoning Bylaw:

Location of Off-Street Parking Section 150.44(a)

In (RS-1) districts, the Zoning Bylaw states “no parking shall be permitted in the required front yard.”

Required notification has been completed.

[Attachments:](#)

[- Copy of Development Variance Permit notice;](#)

[- Director of Development Services’ report dated October 24, 2011](#)

[- Director of Development Services’ report dated November 7, 2011](#)

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve issuance of Development Variance Permit No. 529.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

6. Portion of 271 Francis Way – Parcel J (Victoria Hill)

Declaration of Potential Conflict

Councillor Bob Osterman declared a potential conflict of interest and absented himself from the Council Chamber at 6:17 p.m.

a) Opportunity to Be Heard for Development Permit No. 009(W) With A Variance for a Portion of 271 Francis Way – Parcel J (Victoria Hill)

Request for Information:

A speaker requested clarification of details of the correspondence listed in the Council agenda package, in support or opposed to the application. In response, staff advised that this was the second Opportunity to be Heard and that the application relates only to the footprint of the building and sideyard setback, not to height, scale or viewscape issues. The current zoning relative to height remains as it was in 2002 and the only way to change zoning would be through the Board of Variance process or rezoning process. The application refers only to a difference in the Design Guidelines, which does not require the same legal process as a change in zoning.

- i) Mr. David Musser, resident** – opposed issuance of a permit at this time. The speaker noted the 20 petition letters in support of the variance but submitted 137 individual letters of petition in opposition. The consensus of opposition related to the proposed height of the structure on Parcel J. The speaker also reminded Council that point 18 of the Victoria Hill Development Agreement stipulates a covenant that the developer not apply for a building permit until a permit has been issued for non-market housing or there is a combination of non-market housing of not less than 100 units for Parcel O. The speaker insisted that this clause of the Development Agreement be upheld.

Questions from Council:

In response to a Councillor's question regarding the covenant, staff advised that it remains in place and the developer is obligated to observe the conditions prior to issuance of a building permit.

- ii) Ted Scogee, resident:** Onni's drawings site layout show different measurements. How is the building located on the parcel and how does it relate to adjacent property lines? *In later response, staff advised of a 2ft difference between the drawings on file and the plans now under consideration.*
- iii) Mr. Beau Jarvis, representing the Onni Group** responded to an earlier speaker's comments, which implied there was coercion at the developer's open house process. Mr. Jarvis maintained that the Design Guidelines clearly show the options for consideration. Onni has worked on the site for seven years and has liaised with three different City planners over that

period; Development Services has supported the density being accommodated in a single tower rather than several lower structures over the site.

- iv) **Mr. Gunnar Jonsson, resident** was pleased that Onni proposed changes to the original development, which provides a better solution to use of the site than the original. The speaker therefore supported the proposed setback requested by Onni Group.
- v) **Ms. Andrea** (surname not provided), **resident** directly opposite where the development would be built. A single, hi-rise tower is better than six other structures that would block views for all residents. The speaker therefore supported Onni's application.
- vi) **Ms. Lisa Locey, resident** supported the proposed variance. Onni held three information sessions to consult with local residents and the community. Subsequently, Onni responded with development of a single hi-rise plus townhomes at the base. The speaker therefore supported Onni's application.
- vii) **Mr. Ian Smith, resident** submitted amended and revised documents with illustrations of objections to the proposed 22-storey tower. The speaker contended that the increase from 16 to 22 storeys would disrupt view corridors to the river and mountains. The speaker's neighbourhood wished to maintain the existing high-quality single-family residential housing and not have towers looming close. The proposed tower would have a negative impact on adjacent lands. It is the wrong location for such a development due to the topography and elevation of the land. A related objection was suggested contradiction of the Woodlands Permit area, which seeks to maintain natural features.
- viii) **Mr. Bret McKie** (surname unclear), **resident** recently moved to Victoria Hill and favoured the variance application.
- ix) **Ms. Marian Assel** (surname unclear), **resident** – opposed a hi-rise Tower because the development would impact views. Furthermore, the higher density would create more noise and pollution.

Questions from Council:

In response to a question as to whether or not the speaker was aware of the full build-out potential at the time of purchase, the speaker answered in the affirmative.

- x) **Ms. Serena** (surname not given), **resident** opposite the development acknowledged increased density and expressed support for the project because those who live directly in front of the development would be less affected by a single hi-rise tower than a group of lower structures that would block all views.

Questions from Council: Staff was asked if there was any change in density of the project. *In response, staff advised that the Development*

Agreement contemplates transference of units [to the Parcel J site] not taken up in previous projects but maximizes the overall number of units allowed for Victoria Hill in general.

- xi) Jarin Locey, resident,** spoke in support of Onni's application. The Speaker noted the positive added greenspace features of Victoria Hill and suggested that a reduction of the building footprint on Parcel J was preferable to five or six lower structures covering the entire site.

Question of Developer:

In response to a question regarding the difference in greenspace allowance between a lower structure and the proposed hi-rise, Onni and staff advised that current proposed site coverage was about 23 percent, whereas the maximum allowable is approximately 42 percent. The hi-rise development would therefore permit more greenspace and tree preservation.

- xii) Christian Gaulin, resident** favoured a 22-storey tower and low-rise Townhouses, which would be preferable to a 16-storey tower and four lower structures that would block more views.
- xiii) Mr. Rani Poiani, resident** supported Onni's variance application, which Provides a footprint reduction and allows for more tree preservation and greenspace. Furthermore, it would not impose the effect of a "wall" in front of existing units and leaves a better view corridor.
- xiv) Mr. Eroll Fernando, resident** spoke in support of the development at Victoria Hill. The speaker maintained that Onni has rejuvenated the area and he therefore supported the application.
- xv) Ms. Johanna Werchohlad, resident** supported Onni's proposal.
- xvi) Ms. Priscilla McElacher, resident** opposed any increase from 16 to 22-storeys, as proposed by Onni.
- xvii) Mr. David Musser, resident,** rose for a second time to express concern at the choices for use of the site. The speaker contended that all opponents of the currently planned 22-storey tower would support a 16-storey structure. The speaker also challenged the developer for not following democratic due process. The Design Guidelines limited the hi-rise to 16 storeys, which the Onni site model always showed. Council was urged to hold to the original agreement. Residents who challenged the project were not opposed to increased density but disputed the development for being in the wrong location to build so tall.

Question of Staff:

In response to a question regarding how disposition of Parcels C and O would affect the density for the entire site, staff advised that the current Development Agreement does not have a maximum number of units for the whole site; however, if there were more than 100 non-market units on Parcel O, it would not violate the agreement. Plans for Parcel C have not

changed from what was originally contemplated. Staff reiterated that the variance refers only to the footprint and setback, not height.

Lisa Locey, resident, rose for a second time to urge support of the variance application, noting that Onni could pursue the original six allowable buildings if the permit is rejected. The public consultation process has resulted in a better project.

- b) **Issuance of Development Permit No. 009(W) With A Variance for a Portion of 271 Francis Way – Parcel J (Victoria Hill) to vary the requirements for side yard setbacks. The Zoning Bylaw requires a side yard setback of 59 feet for a building with a height of 250 feet. The development meets this requirement at the northerly end of the site where the tower is located; however, the applicant proposes that the townhouses be setback 35 feet from the southerly property line.**

Required notification has been completed.

Attachments:

-Copy of Development Permit No. 009(W) with Variance Notice dated November 28, 2011

-Copy of Revised Development Permit No. 009(W) with Variance Notice dated September 19, 2011

-Copy of Development Permit No. 009(W) with Variance Notice dated September 19, 2011

- Director of Development Services' report dated, February 14, 2011

-Director of Development Services' report dated, May 30, 2011

-Director of Development Services' report dated, August 29, 2011

- Director of Development Services' report dated, October 24, 2011

-Correspondence received in response to the Opportunity to be Heard Notice of Proposal to Issue a Development Permit dated September 19, 2011:

Opposed:

- Petition of 87 signatures, submitted by Sandy Keith
- Susan Wallace, resident
- Laura Zambakian, resident
- Steve and Melinda McKie, residents
- Lee Rothery, resident
- David and Beryl Musser, resident
- George and Valerie Vallance, resident
- Percy MacKerricher, resident
- On Table letters received September 19, 2011 from
 - David and Beryl Musser, resident
 - Grace and Ian Smith, resident
 - Dr. and Mrs. Ian Rivers, resident
 - Rachel and Frederico Lenos, resident
- Excerpt of Meeting Minutes pertaining to the Opportunity to be Heard for Development Permit 009 (W) with a variance for 271 Francis Way

[\(Parcel J, Victoria Hill\) from the Corporation of the City of New Westminster Regular Meeting held on September 19, 2011](#)

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council receive the following correspondence concerning this application:

Support:

- [Letter dated October 27, 2011 from Beau Jarvis, ONNI Real Estate Development, Property and Construction Management and letters of support from:](#)

- Reg, resident
- Lisa Locey, resident
- Jarin Locey, resident
- Editha Payumo, resident
- Peter Koel, resident
- B. Slocome, resident
- Gunnar Jonsson, resident
- Alexey Skiba, resident
- Ryan Ormerod, resident
- Linda Harrison, resident
- Jonathan Ip, resident
- Andrea Ip, resident
- Pam Trytko, resident
- J. Werchohlad, resident
- N. Polonio, resident
- Christian Eaulin, resident
- Errol Fernando, resident
- Christina Hu, resident

Other:

- David and Beryl Musser, resident - re: support for 16 storey building and concerns
- Hank Luck, resident– re: in opposition of the 22 storeys, in support of 16 storeys
- David MacGrotty and Karen Baker-MacGrotty, residents - re: concerns

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

Comments from Council

- Proposal reduces the footprint and allows nearby residents to enjoy better views. The Design Guidelines deliberately allow for flexibility.
- Although views will be affected, a vertical disruption is less objectionable than a horizontal “wall” of multiple structures.
- Council must keep in mind that the application relates only to a sideyard setback rather than height. In future, the City might consider the impacts

of connecting design guidelines with zoning. The Covenant for a non-market housing requirement does not diminish the City's commitment to that component.

- With respect to the allowable density, the benefits versus negative impacts are acknowledged by Council, which understands the concerns of blockage of views for some Victoria Hill residents.
- A Councillor expressed sincere thanks to all who were involved in the democratic process for sharing their opinions with Council and urged continued involvement by all interested parties.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve the issuance of Development Permit 009 (W)

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

Councillor Osterman returned to the Council Chamber at 7:25 p.m.

COMMITTEE MINUTES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7. Motion to receive and adopt the minutes of a meeting of Council in Committee of the Whole held November 7, 2011.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council receive and adopt the minutes of a meeting of Council in Committee of the Whole held November 7, 2011.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

8. Recommendations from the Council in Committee of the Whole meeting held November 28, 2011:

a) Grant Application In Support of Inclusion Enhancement Strategy for Century House November 28, 2011

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council provide its full support for the Century House Inclusion Enhancement Strategy as included in the report; and

THAT the City accept responsibility for providing overall grant and financial management to the project.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

b) Criteria for the Consideration of the Disposition of City Properties

Comments from Council (responses shown in *Italics*)

- Council was reminded of the following amendment to the criteria, as approved at the earlier meeting of Council in Committee of the Whole:
The amendment adds a Clause 7 to the criteria for the consideration of the disposition of City-owned properties as follows:
 - *Consider the potential of any surplus City-owned lands (such as streets or lanes abutting a proposed project) to consolidate with others to facilitate affordable housing*
 - *Provide assistance to non-market housing providers by leasing City-owned land and making grants available where opportunities arise.*

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council adopt the Policy Framework for the disposition of City Owned lands in Appendix A of the report, as amended.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

- c) [Temporary Borrowing for 2012 \(Bylaw No. 7503, 2011\) \[A bylaw to authorise temporary borrowing under Section 177 of the Community Charter\]](#)

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Revenue Anticipation Borrowing Amendment Bylaw No. 7503, 2011 be forwarded to Council for consideration and three readings.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

- d) [Development Cost Charge Expenditure Bylaw for 2011 \(Bylaw No. 7502, 2011\)](#)

Comments from Council

- A member of Council requested that staff forward a copy of the report to the Queensborough Residents' Association to clarify that the Queensborough reserves will not be diminished.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Development Cost Charge Expenditure Bylaw No. 7502 to ratify, confirm and authorise a total expenditure of \$435,400 from the Development Cost Charge Reserve Funds be forwarded to Council for consideration; and

THAT Council approve expending \$316,800 from the Queensborough Drainage DCC Reserve to pay for the costs of the project on behalf of the Mainland Sanitary DCC Reserve. This amount is to be paid from the Queensborough Drainage DCC Reserve no later than when the funds are needed for the purposes of the Queensborough Drainage DCC projects; and

THAT Council approve expending \$118,600 from the Queensborough Transportation DCC Reserve to pay for the costs of Queensborough Transportation Projects (\$15,840) and to pay for the costs of projects on behalf of the Mainland Transportation DCC Reserve (\$102,760). The latter amount is to be repaid to the Queensborough Transportation DCC Reserve no later than the time when the funds are needed for the purposes of the Queensborough Transportation DCC projects.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

e) **2011 General Local Election – Report of Election Results**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Chief Election Officer's report dated November 21, 2011, on the election results for the 2011 General Local Election be received for information.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

f) **Electrical Utility Commission: Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw No. 7505, 2011) [A Bylaw to amend Electric Utility Commission Bylaw No. 7125 – 2006]**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT the Electrical Utility Commission Amendment Bylaw No. 7505-2011 be advanced to Council for consideration of first three readings.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

g) **Veterans Free Parking**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve free parking for Canadian Armed Forces Veterans for the period January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2016, inclusive.

CARRIED.

All members of Council present voted in favour of the motion.

h) **Amendment to 2012 Council Meeting Schedule**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve amendment to the 2012 meeting schedule by deletion of the previously scheduled Regular Meeting of Council on January 16, 2012 and substitution of a Regular Meeting of Council on January 30, 2012 therefor.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

i) Appointment of Pastor

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve the appointment of Reverend Tim Bruneau as the Ministerial Representative for the City of New Westminster until November 30, 2012.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

j) “Wait for me Daddy” Memorial Task Force Membership

MOVED and SECONDED

WHEREAS the Terms of Reference for the “Wait for me Daddy” Memorial Task Force allows for one voting member to be the Manager of New Westminster Museum and Archives; and.

WHEREAS although Colin Stevens who will retire shortly from his duties as Manager of the New Westminster Museum and Archives has valuable expertise to offer this project;

IT IS THEREFORE recommended the “Wait for me Daddy” Memorial Task Force Terms of Reference be amended to accommodate for a Member at Large (Colin Stevens) until completion of the project.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

k) Massey Performing Arts Centre Task Force member

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Council approve the appointment of Mr. Bob Osterman to continued membership of the Massey Performing Arts Centre Task Force.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

BYLAWS

9. [Highway Dedication Removal Bylaw No. 7335 Amendment Bylaw No. 7488, 2011 \[A Bylaw to amend “Highway Dedication Removal Bylaw No. 7335, 2009” re former City lane adjacent to 409 Boyne Street\]](#) **ADOPTION**

Staff requested this bylaw be withdrawn from the agenda.

10. [Bylaw Consolidation and Revision Bylaw No. 7504, 2011 \[a Bylaw to authorize consolidation and revision of Bylaws\]](#) **ADOPTION**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Bylaw Consolidation and Revision Bylaw No. 7504, 2011 be adopted.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

a) Bylaws coming forward from the Council in Committee of the Whole meeting held November 28, 2011:

- i) [Temporary Borrowing for 2012 \(Bylaw No. 7503, 2011\) \[A bylaw to authorise temporary borrowing under Section 177 of the Community Charter\]](#) **THREE READINGS**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Temporary Borrowing Bylaw No. 7503, 2011 be read a first time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Temporary Borrowing Bylaw No. 7503, 2011 be read a second time.

CARRIED.

All members of the Council voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Temporary Borrowing Bylaw No. 7503, 2011 be read a third time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

- ii) [Development Cost Charge Expenditure Bylaw for 2011 \(Bylaw No. 7502, 2011\) \[A Bylaw to ratify, confirm and authorise a total expenditure of \\$435,400 from the Development Cost Charge Reserve Funds\]](#)

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Development Cost Charge Expenditure Bylaw No. 7502, 2011 be read a first time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Development Cost Charge Expenditure Bylaw No. 7502, 2011 be read a second time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Development Cost Charge Expenditure Bylaw No. 7502, 2011 be read a third time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

- iii) [Electrical Utility Commission: Bylaw Amendment \(Bylaw No. 7505, 2011\) \[A Bylaw to amend Electric Utility Commission Bylaw No. 7125 – 2006\]](#) **THREE READINGS**

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Electrical Utility Commission Amendment Bylaw No. 7505, 2011 be read a first time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Electrical Utility Commission Amendment Bylaw No. 7505, 2011 be read a second time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

MOVED and SECONDED

THAT Electrical Utility Commission Amendment Bylaw No. 7505, 2011 be read a third time.

CARRIED.

All members of Council voted in favour of the motion.

OTHER BUSINESS

12. Retirement of Councillor Bob Osterman

Each member of Council individually expressed thanks and appreciation to retiring member, Councillor Bob Osterman. Councillor Osterman was acknowledged for his 28 years of dedicated service to the community on both the Board of School Trustees and later, as a City Councillor. Members particularly recognised Councillor Osterman's friendship, mentorship, professionalism and dignity in dealing with the complex issues that faced the City during his tenure. Although there were sometimes healthy differences of approach, Councillor Osterman always shared the common vision that led to the betterment of the City of New Westminster.

His Worship, Mayor Wayne Wright reiterated Council's appreciation of the skills that Councillor Osterman brought to the table. Mayor Wright also noted that the Councillor would continue to serve the City in other voluntary capacities, where his experience and expertise would be highly valued. All joined in wishing Councillor Osterman good health and happiness in the future.

In thanking Council for its good wishes, Councillor Osterman advised that he considered the last three-year term to be his best since election to City Council in 1996. Councillor Osterman concluded by expressing pride at having played a role

in the municipality's significant achievements that have made New Westminster a city with even greater potential in the future.

NEXT MEETING

Monday, December 5, 2011

Inaugural meeting of Council commences at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chamber, City Hall.

ADJOURNMENT

ON MOTION, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Certified Correct,

WAYNE WRIGHT
MAYOR

PAUL DAMINATO
ACTING CORPORATE OFFICER