

25 September 2026

To the Mayor and Council of the District of Saanich, and to the Chief Administrative Officer

By email to each recipient at the District of Saanich

Every word you have spoken in open council since September 2017 has been transcribed, timestamped to the second, and indexed against every report you adopted, every minute you approved and every budget you passed. Four hundred and ninety-five meetings. One thousand three hundred and eighty hours. Twelve million words. Each of you can be searched by name, and each of you already has been.

You have not seen this archive because the District never built one. Its own search box reads agenda headings. This one reads the room. It returns, for any phrase, the meeting, the second on the recording, who the chair had just called on, and the document that was on the table when you said it. It matches your voice in one meeting to your voice in any other, so that a position taken in 2019 can be set beside its contradiction in 2021 in the time it takes to type both dates.

It was built from your own material. Nothing in it was created by anyone but you and your staff. Below is what it has already returned. You will recognise your own words. What you will not be able to do is dispute them, because the recording is yours.

What the record already shows

Mr. Reems. 28 February 2019, to Councillor Plant: ticket revenue was about \$20,000 and "not going to make up hiring an additional staff person." January 2021: three officers sold on \$120,000 a year in tickets. 17 September 2018, on the missing conduct standards for enforcement staff: "it hasn't been a problem." 3 May 2021, on Bylaw 9694: "no consequential changes." 14 July 2025, on an owner encumbered while abroad and uninformed: "procedural fairness afforded." 20 July 2026, to Councillor Plant: the appeal "is really to court." Council directed a report on your performance evaluation on 20 September 2022. It is not in any open agenda, minute or recording since.

Councillor Plant. You asked for the comparator ratios in 2019 and were told tickets would not pay. You asked about the conduct standards in 2018 and moved the policy without them. You asked whether 9694 made consequential changes, were told no, and moved all three readings, seconded the waiver of its hearing, and moved its adoption. You asked what the District's liability would be if a notice were lifted on 3 February 2020, 28 September 2020 and 10 January 2022. You have never asked what the enforcement department's liability is. You told Harry Bains, who never received notice of his hearing, "we have to rely on the systems that we have in place," and "for \$500 this notice on title will be able to be taken away," three minutes after staff told you it required a permit, an engineer, completed work and a final inspection. On 24 February 2025 you said appeals to council were "probably a good" thing. On 14 July 2025 you seconded the refusal of one. On 20 July 2026 you named the missing appeal as a defect and said "I'm going to lend my support on it." In the chair on 6 May 2024 you stopped two residents inside a minute and told one of them what he could speak about was "for you to determine."

Councillor Chambers. 3 February 2020, seconding the first notice on title: "Mr. Barbour will realize and remember that I too once had a permit that had gone out of expiration, and I had to take down a very loved tree house." Your website credits an environmental activist with no trade certification for restoring your barn. The Development Tracker shows no permit for 4317 Blenkinsop Road. This was put to you and to the bylaw department in writing on 23 February 2024. 28 September 2020, to an owner asking to lift his notice: his letter was "very compelling." You seconded the refusal. 14 July 2025, you asked whether an owner abroad should get more time, said "I would personally, as one councillor, be willing to remove that notice," were told by the chair to wait, and voted with the eight.

Councillor Harper. 28 September 2020: "you replace a couple of stairs, well you replace three, is it four, suddenly you need a permit?" You put the owner's case better than he did and let the refusal carry. You moved the endorsement of Report 1970-20. 9-0 on 14 July 2025.

Councillor de Vries. 20 November 2023, on a notice on title: "it would be negligent not to." 9-0 on 14 July 2025.

Councillor Brice. 3 February 2020, the one resident-minded question of the night, then "I'm supporting the staff recommendation." You seconded every reading and the adoption of 9694. You seconded the notice on 938 Ambassador Avenue. 9-0.

Councillor Brownoff. "We do have to protect the district." Three notices moved in one night, 10 January 2022. 9-0.

Councillor Phelps Bondaroff. You moved the notice on 938 Ambassador Avenue on 20 November 2023 while its owner was out of the country and had not been told. You moved the motion refusing to cancel it. You rose on a point of order to stop his lawyer naming the complainant. On 6 May 2024 you raised the point of order on which a resident was stopped after fourteen seconds: "so much as we'd like to hear information from our resident, we cannot."

Councillor Westhaver. Seconded the deferral. 9-0. Asked nothing at either hearing.

Mayor Murdock. 20 November 2023: "another opportunity for that person to approach," to an empty gallery, and the motion twenty seconds later. 23 June 2025, having just heard counsel argue that council had encumbered a man's title without telling him, to the next presenter: "in fact we're interested in what you're going to say." Same night, as the CAO dictated council's motion to a councillor who could not find the words: "I think we would take that as ventriloquism." 13 August 2024, to a resident who said the words "conflict of interest": "you'll have to step away from the microphone." 16 June 2026, to a resident quoting Councillor Plant's own words back to him: "I'm going to stop you."

What the record shows as a whole

Twenty-one properties encumbered since February 2020. Three owners have asked you to lift one. You refused all three, the last 9-0, after the CAO told you procedural fairness had been afforded to a man who was never told the meeting was happening. In no instance in the archive did any of you reject a staff recommendation on a notice. In no instance did any of you ask staff what the enforcement department's own exposure is. That exposure is now more than \$571,000 in outside counsel on one file that produced six acquittals, a Supreme Court finding that your Manager of Inspection Services' methodology was "conclusory and without an evidentiary foundation," an open provincial Registrar file on unqualified officers making Building Code decisions, and civil, human rights and tribunal proceedings. None of it appears in a financial plan any of you has adopted. Bylaw services satisfaction: 29%. Building services: 19%.

The service you were sold on \$120,000 a year in tickets cost \$644,700 in 2020 and \$1,605,200 in 2025. Not one ticket count has ever come back to this table.

What happens now

Every quotation here carries a date and a time. If any is wrong, identify it by 5 p.m. on Sunday 28 September and it will be checked against the recording; if wrong, it will be corrected and published the same day with an acknowledgment. What is not identified will be published as undisputed on Monday 29 September.

You made this record. The only thing new is that it can now be read.

Christopher Caddell, 938 Ambassador Avenue. saanichbylawreform@gmail.com