

DISTRICT OF SAANICH
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD AT THE SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016

Present: **Chair:** Mayor Atwell
 Council: Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Haynes, Murdock, Plant, Sanders and Wergeland
 Staff: Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer; Valla Tinney, Director of Finance (7:00 p.m.); Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Suzanne Samborski, Director of Parks and Recreation; Jarret Matanowitsch, Acting Director of Planning (7:00 p.m.); Eva Riccius, Senior Manager, Parks; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk (7:00 p.m.)

Mayor Atwell called the regular Council meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in Committee Room No. 2.

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That pursuant to Sections 90 (1)(e) and 2(b) of the *Community Charter*, the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject matters being considered relate to the acquisition and/or disposition of land and/or improvements, the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality; and consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party.”**

CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Sanders, the meeting adjourned to In Camera at 6:02 p.m.

The regular Council meeting reconvened in Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m.

The Director of Parks and Recreation and the Senior Manager, Parks left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Council adopt the minutes of the August 22, 2016 Council and Committee of the Whole meetings.”

CARRIED

RISE AND REPORT

1600-20
Legal Framework
– Procurement
Process

Rise and Report from the In Camera Meeting held July 4, 2016

“That Council approve use of the District’s standard Request for Proposal process for selection of the EDPA consultant.”

BYLAWS FOR FINAL READING

2870-30
Gorge Road
West/Earl Grey
Street

2921 EARL GREY STREET – OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW AMENDMENT

Final Reading of “Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2008, Amendment Bylaw, 2014, No. 9294.” To amend Appendix “M” – Tillicum Local Area Plan – to designate 2921 Earl Grey Street for potential multi-family use.

MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:
“That Bylaw No. 9294 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”

CARRIED

2870-30
Gorge Road
West/Earl Grey
Street

114 & 120 GORGE ROAD WEST AND 2921 EARL GREY STREET – REZONING TO RA-3

Final Reading of “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2014, No. 9295” and approval of Development Permit DPR00506. To rezone from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RA-3 (Apartment) zone for a proposed four storey, 24 unit apartment building with underground parking.

MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That Bylaw No. 9295 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That Council approve and issue Development Permit DPR00506 on the Easterly 52 feet of Lot 13, Block R, Section 11, Victoria District, Plan 860 (114 Gorge Road West); Amended Lot 14 (DD 105151I); Block R, Sections 11 and 12, Victoria District, Plan 860 (120 Gorge Road West); and Lot 15, Block R, Sections 11 and 12, Victoria District, Plan 860 (2921 Earl Grey Street).”

CARRIED

PUBLIC INPUT ON COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

Public Input on
Council Agenda
Items

Nil

BYLAWS

1410-04
Report - Finance

xref: 1110-30
Water Utility
Bylaw

WATER UTILITY BYLAW – HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENT

Three Readings of “Water Utility Bylaw, 2000, Amendment Bylaw, 2016, No. 9398”. To delegate authority to staff to manage the application of penalties in the event of a postal service disruption.

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Haynes:
“That Bylaw No. 9398 be introduced and read.”**

CARRIED

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Haynes:
“That Bylaw No. 9398 be read a second time.”**

CARRIED

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Haynes:
“That Bylaw No. 9398 be now passed.”**

CARRIED

RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

1410-04
Report -
Engineering

xref: 5370-30
RFP 34/16

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 34/16 – PURCHASE OF THREE (3) TANDEM DUMP TRUCKS

Report of the Director of Engineering dated August 26, 2016 recommending that Council award RFP 34/16 for the purchase of three (3) Tandem Dump Trucks, and change orders within project budget, to P & R Truck Centre Ltd. in the amount of \$467,612.48 (net price after trade in and excluding taxes).

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That Council award RFP 34/16 for the purchase of three (3) tandem dump trucks, and change orders within project budget, to P & R Truck Centre Ltd., in the amount of \$467,612.48 (net price after trade in and excluding taxes).”**

CARRIED

1410-04
Report -
Engineering

xref: 5370-30
RFP 36/16

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 36/16 - CONSULTING ENGINEERING SERVICES – ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Report of the Director of Engineering dated September 1, 2016 recommending that Council award RFP 36/16 for Consulting Engineering Services – Active Transportation Plan, and change orders within project budget, to Urban Systems in the amount of \$226,937 (excluding GST).

**MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Haynes:
“That Council award RFP 36/16 for consulting engineering services – Active Transportation Plan, and change orders within project budget, to Urban Systems in the amount of \$226,937 (excluding GST).”**

CARRIED

REPORTS FROM DIRECTORS

1410-04
Report – Finance

xref: 1220-20
EDPA

ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA (EDPA) REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL – EVALUATION CRITERIA

Report of the Director of Finance dated August 25, 2016 recommending that Council approve the Evaluation Criteria, as outlined in Attachment B of the report, established for the Request for Proposal to hire a consultant to review the EDPA Bylaw.

The Director of Finance stated:

- Council had requested the opportunity to review the Evaluation Criteria for the Request for Proposal (RFP); once approved, the procurement process to hire a consultant to review the EDPA Bylaw would begin.
- Detailed Project Team requirements included in the full RFP include a minimum five years professional experience and preference for an Environmental Planner or Conservation Biologist.

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That Council approve the Evaluation Criteria, as outlined in Attachment B of the report of the Director of Finance dated August 25, 2016.”

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:

- The Scope of Work provides direction to the consultant; correspondence received to date and any available data would be consolidated and provided to the consultant; they would have access to the raw data, if necessary.
- The level of public engagement recommended keeps the Scope of Work within the project budget and builds on public consultation to date.
- Professional groups, such as the Real Estate Board, had previously been consulted and that information will be provided to the consultant.
- Saanich's Advisory Committees will be included as part of the process to “inform” the consultant.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- It may be preferable not to mention specific groups in the Scope of Work and have a registration process at the start of the review for those wishing to provide feedback.

The Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- It is being recommended that Council approve the Evaluation Criteria; it is not the intention, at this time, to make changes to the Scope of Work.
- There is no limitation on the consultant collecting information within the Scope of Work and within the budget; also, there is nothing from preventing groups from contacting the consultant to provide additional information.
- The consultant would provide updates to the community in relation to process and outcomes; there has already been significant amounts of public consultation that has taken place.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Council is being asked to consider the Evaluation Criteria so that a consultant can be hired to review the bylaw; a lot of work has already gone into preparing the Scope of Work.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Council committed to respecting the input that has already been received at previous public engagement opportunities; when the consultant's report is completed, further public consultation will take place.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Further discussion should take place to clarify the intent of Scope of Work in terms of the types of public engagement that would take place.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

The Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- If further clarification and discussion is needed, it would delay the start of the procurement process and specific direction to staff would be required to not to issue the RFP.
- The word "inform" in the Scope of Work is meant to assist the consultant in understanding the feedback already received; the consultant would not be expected to engage in significant consultation with the community; there has already been a significant amount of public consultation undertaken.
- The RFP is ready to be issued.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Further discussion with the groups mentioned in the Scope of Work may be needed to clarify their expectations in terms of consultation; it would be appropriate to have the support and consensus of these groups before the RFP is issued.
- The word "inform" may confuse the consultant and it may affect the bid on the work; there is more work to be done before the procurement process begins.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The process should not be delayed; given the work already done, and the fact that no concerns were identified through the Public Input portion at this Council meeting, it is assumed there are no concerns.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- There has already been significant input received and a lot of information available for the consultant; it is time to move forward with the RFP.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The Scope of Work has already been discussed and agreed upon; it is appropriate to move forward with the RFP.

Councillor Plant stated:

- He is clear on the intention of the word "inform" and is comfortable to move forward.

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:18 pm.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held September 12, 2016

2860-20
Rainbow Street

4027 RAINBOW STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That Council approve and issue Development Permit Amendment DPA00861 on Lot 2, Section 49, Victoria District, Plan VIP89128 (4027 Rainbow Street).”

CARRIED

2110-20
West Saanich Road

5058 WEST SAANICH ROAD – AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE APPLICATION

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That:
1. The application to include 5058 West Saanich Road in the Agricultural Land Reserve be forwarded to the Agricultural Land Commission with a recommendation that only the lands outside the Natural State Covenant area on the property be included; and
2. The Agricultural Land Commission be requested to take into the consideration the Natural State Covenant previously registered against the Title.”

CARRIED

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Haynes, the meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

.....
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK

DISTRICT OF SAANICH
MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2016 AT 7:42 P.M.

Present:

- Chair:** Councillor Murdock
- Council:** Mayor Atwell and Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Haynes, Plant, Sanders and Wergeland
- Staff:** Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer; Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Jarret Matanowitsch, Acting Director of Planning; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

1410-04
Report -
Planning

xref: 2860-20
Rainbow Street

4027 RAINBOW STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT

Supplemental Report of the Director of Planning dated August 5, 2016 recommending that Council approve Development Permit Amendment DPA00861 to construct a second entrance to the underground parking for the proposed south condo building on Rainbow Hill on the west side of the building so that each parking level would be accessed independently.

APPLICANT:

D. Doore, Aplomado Developments Ltd., and P. de Hoog, de Hoog & Kierulf Architects, presented to Council and highlighted:

- The proposed amendment is to construct a separate entrance to the parkade on the west side of the building so that each underground parkade would be accessed independently; this would result in the internal ramp being eliminated.
- There is a significant change in grade on the property with a full storey drop in the west corner of the property where the new entrance would be constructed.
- Parking stalls are allocated therefore there is no need for residents of the building to have access to both parkade levels.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- The additional parkade entrance is a minor Development Permit Amendment; another Development Permit Amendment may come back to Council in the future in relation to a new driveway access from Rainbow Street.
- The intention is to move forward with this amendment so that construction of the building can begin.

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:

- The two amendments to the Development Permit were previously bundled for efficiency; the applicant has now asked that the items be considered separately.

PUBLIC INPUT:

H. Charania, President, North Quadra Community Association, stated:

- The proposed amendments for the parkade entrance and the driveway access from Rainbow Street should be considered jointly to ensure that the concerns of neighbours are addressed and a fair community amenity be offered.
- There is concern regarding construction traffic, parking and noise.
- The condo towers should have been constructed before the homes were built; Council is urged to seek a commitment that the concerns of the community be addressed and an appropriate community amenity provided.

Saanich Resident, stated:

- The disruption to the neighbourhood, the increased truck traffic and pedestrian safety are concerns; there is already a great deal of traffic in the area.

G. Nash, Tattersall Drive;

- The amendment to modify the parkade is appropriate; it would mean less on-street parking.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:

- Three additional parking spaces would be created as a result of removal of the internal ramp; this application is separate from the application for driveway access to the site from Rainbow Street.
- The building will be constructed regardless of whether or not the second parkade entrance is approved; the second entrance makes the development more efficient for residents and has no adverse effect on neighbours; it is a

minor amendment.

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:

- The existing entrance to the parkade and the proposed entrance are both off the approved drive aisle, and there are no changes to the drive aisle design.
- A community amenity may be considered in the future if the developer proceeds with a rezoning application on the adjacent properties along McKenzie Avenue; the applicant has provided community amenities in relation to the current application including significant Garry oak planting.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion: **MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That it be recommended that Council approve and issue Development Permit Amendment DPA00861 on Lot 2, Section 49, Victoria District, Plan VIP89128 (4027 Rainbow Street).”**

CARRIED

1410-04
Report –
Planning

xref: 2870-30
Cloverdale
Avenue

1032, 1042 & 1052 CLOVERDALE AVENUE – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND REZONING APPLICATION

Report of the Director of Planning dated August 18, 2016 recommending that Council approve the application to rezone the property from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RT-FC (Attached Housing Four Corners) zone for a proposed 14 unit townhouse development; approve Development Permit DPR00619; and that Final Reading of the Zoning Bylaw Amendment and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant to secure the items outlined in the report. Variances are requested for visitor parking, building separation and rear yard setback.

Councillor Haynes left the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:

- There is a requirement for six outdoor and 14 indoor bicycle parking spots.
- There are guidelines in terms of reducing impervious surfaces but no Zoning Bylaw requirements.
- A commitment to deconstruction of the existing dwelling could be included in the recommendations to the applicant.

Councillor Haynes returned to the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

APPLICANT:

T. Rodier, Outline Home Design, presented to Council and highlighted:

- The proposed development is close to a village centre with shopping, parks, public transit, the Galloping Goose and schools; the location may lessen the need for residents to have more than one vehicle.

- The development is designed to attract families to the neighbourhood.
- This is a good location for infill; the character of the neighbourhood will be maintained.
- Each unit would have a ground level patio which would integrate the residents with the neighbourhood; a crushed rock walkway would surround the development and create a buffer between the neighbouring properties.
- Each unit would have a dedicated place inside the unit for bike parking; there is also a dedicated location on site for recycling and garbage.
- There would be a mix of two and three bedroom units and a commitment to construction to BUILT GREEN® Gold or equivalent.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- A full size garbage truck would not attend the site; the roadway is 25 feet wide and there is room to maneuver a regular sized vehicle.
- Two of the existing entrances on Cloverdale Avenue would be eliminated; access to and from the proposed development would be restricted to “right turn” movements only.
- There are no separate storage rooms in the homes but the design includes large closets.
- Eleven units have parking for two vehicles; three units have one garage parking stall.
- The intent is to deconstruct and recycle the existing dwelling.
- The smaller units would be approximately 1,300-1,500 square feet and the larger 1,700-1,800 square feet.

In response to a question from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:

- A covenant could be registered to restrict residential use of the garage however the Zoning Bylaw already prohibits this.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Engineering stated:

- The restriction for the “right turn” movement only is included in the servicing requirements; the driveway would have signage to that effect.

PUBLIC INPUT:

J. Schmuck, Rock Street, stated:

- The village centre has deteriorated over time; densification may result in revitalization.
- The Official Community Plan and Local Area Plan support density close to village centres; concerns of neighbours include traffic safety, increased on-street parking and the impact on the single family neighbourhood.
- The community amenity for Rutledge Park is appreciated.

D. Stubbington, Downham Place, stated:

- The development offers suitable homes to downsize or for families; it is in close proximity to shopping and services.

Saanich Resident, Quadra Street, stated:

- The proposal is supportable.

N. Stepushyn, Cloverdale Avenue, stated:

- Neighbours have concerns with the appropriateness of the location for multi-family housing; this is a neighbourhood of single family dwellings.

- Saanich commits to protecting urban forests; the proposed development will result in seven mature trees being removed.
- The proposed development is too much density and does not fit within the character of the neighbourhood.
- There are two new developments currently under construction that will add approximately 100 new multi-family units to the neighbourhood.

P. Ferguson, Savannah Avenue, stated:

- The number of parking stalls is not adequate and that may result in residents parking on Savannah Avenue; there is also concern that traffic would increase on Savannah Avenue due to the right turn only.
- The single entrance/exit on Cloverdale Avenue may be dangerous; the design needs more thought.

M. Webb, Savannah Avenue, stated:

- On-street parking and increased traffic flow on Savannah are concerns; right turn only has been attempted at another development on Cloverdale Avenue and it has not been effective.
- The concept of families having only one vehicle is great but may not be realistic; the number of visitor parking stalls is not adequate and will result in increased on-street parking on Savannah Avenue.

B. Morton, Lovat Avenue, stated:

- The in-suite storage proposed is not adequate, one vehicle families is not realistic.
- The proposal is not supportable; this is not the right development for the location.

M. Ikonen, Whittier Avenue, stated:

- This project would provide affordable housing options for young families; there is only a small supply of townhomes in Saanich.

G. Nash, Tattersall Drive, stated:

- This property is outside the village centre; the Local Area Plan says that this area should be maintained with single family dwellings.

J. McCaw, Ellston Place, stated:

- The proposed density is not appropriate; a few less units may give more room for parking and driveways.

W. Marcinkovic, Vantreight Drive, stated:

- Townhomes are attractive to singles, young couples, young families and retirees; the proposed development gives residents an affordable opportunity to buy a home.
- Most condo buildings only offer residents one parking stall, therefore it is not unreasonable to offer one parking stall; moving trucks would only be on the property occasionally.
- The proposed development is well thought out and the applicant has addressed the neighbours' concerns; it may help to revitalize the community.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:

- Crawl spaces could be used for extra storage.
- The applicant would commit to a covenant that the garages be used solely for vehicle parking.

- In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:
- Secondary suites are not permitted in townhomes.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Engineering stated:

- It would be difficult to estimate if there would be an increase of traffic on Savannah as a result of the proposed development.

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That a Public Hearing be called to further consider the rezoning application on Lot 9, Section 63, Victoria District, Plan 4628, Except that Part in Plan 15395 (1032 Cloverdale Avenue); Lot 8, Section 63, Victoria District, Plan 4628, Except that Part in Plan 14267 (1042 Cloverdale Avenue); and Lot 7, Section 63, Victoria District, Plan 4628, Except that Part in Plan 14267 (1052 Cloverdale Avenue).”

Councillor Haynes stated:

- Neighbours are concerned with the potential change of the character of the neighbourhood and the impacts of parking; infill near a village centre is appropriate.
- It is becoming more difficult to maintain larger unaffordable lots without subdividing.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- This is an attractive development; there is a need for more affordable housing units.
- The potential increase of on-street parking impacts adjacent neighbours.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The amenity package is appreciated; although the location for infill is appropriate, there may be too many units proposed.
- There is also concern with the lack of space between units and lack of green space; consideration should be given to construction of fewer units.

Councillor Brice stated:

- There may be too many units proposed for this property; the location is appropriate for infill.
- The applicant should address the concerns of neighbours including the on-street parking and increased traffic.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The proposed development is close to services and may help to revitalize the village centre; there is concern with the number of units, the amount of parking available and the increased traffic on Savannah Avenue.
- This may not be the right number of units for the property; the applicant needs to address the concerns identified.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Although future uses of the property should be considered, the proposal should be addressed on its current merits.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The proposed development is close to public transit and parks; there is concern with the lack of visitor parking and the potential for increased on-street parking on neighbouring streets.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
with Councillor Sanders OPPOSED**

1410-04
Report –
Planning

xref: 2870-30
Agnes
Street/Hess
Crescent

671 AGNES STREET, 664 & 670 HESS CRESCENT – REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT

Supplemental Report of the Director of Planning dated August 11, 2016 recommending that Council approve the application to rezone the property from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to P-1 (Assembly) zone for a proposed consolidation with the Pacific Christian School site to construct a new gymnasium; and that Development Permit Amendment DPA00792 be approved. Variances are requested for rear yard and exterior side yard setback.

APPLICANT:

J. Mann, HDR-CEI Architecture, and R. Lussier, LADR Landscape Architects, presented to Council and highlighted:

- The previous proposal was to build a gymnasium on the property on Hess Crescent; that proposal would have resulted in a loss of green space.
- The revised plan relocates the proposed gymnasium on the site and incorporates it into the existing footprint of the school.
- It will be a smaller gymnasium but is an improved project; access to the gymnasium will be off the parking area shared between Christian Reform Church and the elementary school.
- A benefit of the revised plan is the amount of green space that would be available.
- A height variance is requested to reflect the interior overhead clearances required for sports.
- New servicing would be installed for water and storm drains and new sidewalk constructed on Hess Crescent; rain gardens and a small storage tank would be constructed for storm water management.
- Landscaping on the southeast portion of the property includes an expanded playground, level play areas and accessible play spaces.
- Trees would be planted for shade close to the southern boundary; vines and screened foliage would be planted along the fences to make a more comfortable pedestrian pathway.
- Hess Crescent residents have expressed a concern with the pick-up and drop off area; a gate in the fence would be installed to address this concern.
- The intent is that the gate be locked during certain times of the day to prevent the traffic concern; staff would have a key to control the access.
- Some neighbours would like the fruit trees on municipal property on Hess Crescent removed.

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:

- The Parks Department can assess the viability of the fruit trees on Hess Crescent.

PUBLIC INPUT:

D. Baanstra, Hess Crescent, stated:

- The proposal is supportable; the proposed gate contradicts the school's commitment to addressing the drop off and pick up area on Hess Crescent.
- He requests that some of the fruit trees on Hess Crescent be removed; the apples fall from the trees, rot at the side of the road and attract rodents.

B. Helmus, Principal, Pacific Christian School, stated:

- He endorses the proposal; currently, students are bused to the Salvation Army gymnasium because the existing gym is too small and the ceiling too low for sports.
- The apple trees on Hess Crescent should be removed as they attract insects and could be used as projectiles by students.

H. Bomhof, Goward Road, stated:

- The project is supportable.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**Motion:**

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Plant: "That a Public Hearing be called to further consider the rezoning application on Lot 23, Section 49, Victoria District, Plan 1477 (664 Hess Crescent) and Lot 1, Section 49, Victoria District, Plan VIP55591 (670 Hess Crescent)."

Councillor Brice stated:

- The revisions to the application are appreciated and is supportable; it is apparent that the applicants have a good working relationship with the neighbours.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He compliments the school; the proposed construction is supportable.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She is pleased that there will be extra play spaces; the applicant is commended for addressing the neighbours' concerns.

Councillor Plant stated:

- He appreciates the applicants' willingness to work with the neighbours and addressing the concerns in relation to the traffic on Hess Crescent.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The applicant is to be congratulated on the revised proposal; the additional play space is appreciated.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- He appreciates the revisions to the proposal.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1410-04
Report -
Planning

xref: 2110-20
West Saanich
Road

5058 WEST SAANICH ROAD – AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE APPLICATION

Report of the Director of Planning dated August 18, 2016 recommending that Council forward the application to include the property in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) to the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) without a recommendation and request that the ALC take into consideration the Natural State Covenant previously registered against the title.

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:

- The applicant originally applied to include the entire parcel in the ALR; they also wish to protect the Natural State Covenant area.
- Their intent is to farm only one-third of the property.

APPLICANT:

C. Davidson and Dr. T. Elliot, presented to Council and highlighted:

- The applicant requests that Council support Option 2 and make a recommendation to the ALC that only the lands outside the Covenant Area be included in the ALR.
- The property is roughly Class 3 farmland; she has approval to bring it up to Class 1 or 2.
- There is an absence of control on agricultural land; including the land in the ALR would protect the agricultural land.

In response to questions from Council, Dr. Elliott stated:

- The property has nutrient rich soil that currently has excess water; the improvements that are currently being undertaken would help with drainage.
- The land would be appropriate for sheep or planting; it is a great example of small scale agricultural land.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Planning stated:

- There would be no risk to the municipality in forwarding a recommendation that the ALC consider Option 2.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Nil

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: "That it be recommended that:

- 1. The application to include 5058 West Saanich Road in the Agricultural Land Reserve be forwarded to the Agricultural Land Commission with a recommendation that only the lands outside the Natural State Covenant area on the property be included; and**
- 2. The Agricultural Land Commission be requested to take into the consideration the Natural State Covenant previously registered against the Title."**

Councillor Brice stated:

- This is a unselfish request to protect agricultural land.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- This type of farming is supportable in terms of local food security.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The request to protect agricultural land is supportable.

Councillor Plant stated:

- The applicant should be commended for the considerate gesture; whenever there is an opportunity to include land in the ALR, it is should be supported.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- He is pleased to support the request and recommendation.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Plant, the meeting adjourned at 10:17 p.m.

.....
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK