

In DISTRICT OF SAANICH
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2015 AT 7:00 PM

Present: **Chair:** Mayor Atwell
Council: Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Haynes, Murdock, Plant, Sanders and Wergeland
Staff: Andy Laidlaw, Chief Administrative Officer; Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering; Jarret Matanowitsch, Acting Director of Planning; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager; Sharon Froud, Deputy Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

Minutes

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That Council adopt the minutes of September 28, 2015 Council and
Committee of the Whole meetings.”**

CARRIED

PUBLIC INPUT ON COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

Public Input on
Council Agenda
Items

1790-20
Governance
Review

J. Schmuck, President, Quadra Cedar Hill Community Association:

Governance Review

- The Community Association appreciates that the process has started.
- Members of the Association would like to be involved in the process; they have a lot to contribute.

D. Wick, Edgemont Road:

Governance Review

- The draft report, including the Terms of Reference, was supposed to be sent back to the Focus Group for review before it came to Council; this did not happen.
- The Group recommended that Legislative Services shortlist candidates for the Governance Committee and then the Focus Group would do a blind selection.

K. Harper, Bonair Place:

Governance Review

- It may be difficult for members of the committee to take a leadership role because of the lack of expertise; the Terms of Reference should be prepared by the Governance Committee.

H. Charania, Genevieve Road:

Governance Review

- The report lacks clarity; he wonders how decision-making, transparency and accountability will be ensured and reported objectively to Council.
- The process must be consultative to be effective.

K. Whitworth, Viewmont Avenue:

Governance Review

- The duties of the committee fall short; it appears that the committee will only be tasked with providing input and guidance to staff, consultants and indirectly to Council.
- It would be appreciated if Council could provide the framework for the Governance Review.

BYLAWS

1110-30

Tax Exemption
Real Property
Bylaw

TAX EXEMPTION REAL PROPERTY BYLAW

Three Readings of the "Tax Exemption Real Property Bylaw, 2015, No. 9350". To exempt certain lands and improvements from taxation for the years 2016-2019 inclusive.

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
"That Bylaw No. 9350 be introduced and read."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
"That Bylaw No. 9350 be read a second time."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
"That Bylaw No. 9350 be now passed."

CARRIED

1110-30

Tax Exemption
Real Property
Bylaw (Riparian
Land & Heritage
Property)

TAX EXEMPTION REAL PROPERTY BYLAW (RIPARIAN LAND AND HERITAGE PROPERTY)

Three Readings of the "Tax Exemption Real Property Bylaw (Riparian Land and Heritage Property), 2015, No. 9356". To exempt certain lands from taxation for the years 2016-2019 inclusive.

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:
"That Bylaw No. 9356 be introduced and read."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:
"That Bylaw No. 9356 be read a second time."

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:
"That Bylaw No. 9356 be now passed."

CARRIED

RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

5370-30
RFP 26/15

RFP 26/15 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR JD EDWARDS UPGRADE

Report from the Director of Finance dated September 25, 2015 recommending that Council award RFP 26/15 for Project Management Services for JD Edwards Upgrades to Randstad Technologies with an estimated cost of \$275,000 to \$335,000 (excluding taxes), subject to change orders within the approved budget.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That RFP 26/15 for Project Management Services for JD Edwards Upgrades be awarded to Randstad Technologies with an estimated cost of \$275,000 to \$335,000 (excluding taxes), subject to change orders within the approved budget.”

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

- The estimated timeline for the JD Edwards upgrade is 15 to 16 months; the project will commence mid-October.
- A project manager, with extensive experience in JD Edwards upgrades, will be hired to assist with the project.
- Randstad Technologies also provides a full suite of services and resources to support the project manager.
- The total estimated budget for the upgrade is \$1 million dollars.
- A small portion of the total budget for the upgrade will be spent in 2015; the remaining amount will be carried forward to 2016.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1790-20
Governance
Review

GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Report of the Chief Administrative Officer dated September 30, 2015 recommending that Council receive the report for information and approve the recommendations as set out in the report.

The Chief Administrative Officer presented and highlighted:

- A Focus Group consisting of Advisory Committee members, who were randomly selected, met and provided recommendations on how a Governance Committee should be structured.
- The group recommended that a citizen-led Governance Committee of 11 be struck; they also recommended that Legislative Services be asked to advertise for residents wishing to participate on the committee and Council select the members.
- Selection of the committee could be referred back to the Focus Group or another group could be created to choose the committee members if that is the wish of Council.
- Members that participated in the Focus Group would not be eligible to put their name forward for the Governance Committee.
- In the report, the committee has been given broad latitude to define which issues they wish to review in terms of governance; during the public consultation process, other issues may be identified that the committee may wish to review.

- Once the committee is established, they will choose a consultant to manage the process; they will determine the work they will take on and the role of the consultant.

In response to questions, Linda Allen, CitySpaces Consulting Ltd., stated:

- The draft report was not sent back to the Focus Group for review; an alternative approach was decided upon to expedite the process.
- The Focus Group provided input into the draft Terms of Reference included in the report.
- They recommended that the principal purpose of the committee would be to provide input and guidance; they believed it would be difficult for a volunteer committee to take on a leadership role.

Councillor Derman stated:

- It is important that the committee be representative of the residents of Saanich.
- It will also be important that the venues for providing feedback are accessible.
- Items could be referred to other organizations such as Saanich Community Association Network (SCAN).

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That the report of the Chief Administrative Officer dated September 30, 2015 be received.”

In response to questions from Council, L. Allen, stated:

- The Focus Group was made aware that a Governance and Cooperative Review Select Committee had been established but terms of reference and the names of committee members were not shared because they were unknown.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- There are two competing processes going on; the Standing Committee consists of Rob Wickson and Councillor Plant and terms of reference for the for the committee have been developed and shared with SCAN.
- There are 16 Community Associations that have a stake in the Governance Review with only potentially two spots for Community Associations on the committee; members of the Community Associations want to be part of the process.
- The two processes should be merged.

Councillor Brice stated:

- It is important that the Governance Review process moves forward.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He would appreciate the Focus Group shortlisting candidates for the committee; Council could then select the members for the committee.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- Input into governance items could be solicited from Community Associations, seniors groups, and other municipalities; the Governance Committee is not the only resource to be used to review governance.
- Recommendations to Council must be representative of the residents of Saanich; there needs to be a balance in the process.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- The role of Standing Committees is to do delegated work initiated by Council; recommendations from Standing Committees can come in the form of a report with Council making the final decision.

Councillor Derman stated:

- It is important that the members of the Governance Committee represent a cross-section of residents; the committee must be seen as open and not taken over by interest groups.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- A broad scope of residents representative of the community is needed for the committee; she is pleased that the process is moving forward.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- One of the roles of the committee is to educate, it will be important to include educational institutes, youths and seniors in discussions.
- Council should have an arms-length approach to the committee.
- She looks forward to the process moving forward.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- A governance review has not been done before in the region; there is no template to follow.
- He is pleased to see that a Standing Committee has been established and looks forward to hearing more about the work plan.
- The review should be a citizen-led process; Council should maintain an arms-length approach.

In response to a question from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- To date, \$6,000 has been spent on the consultant.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- He does not support the motion; there is no mention of the Standing Committee in the report.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
with Mayor Atwell OPPOSED**

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: “That

- 1. Council advertise for eleven persons to serve on a Governance Committee. Governance Committee members will be recommended to Council by a Focus Group comprised of representatives of the Saanich Advisory Committees plus two members of Saanich Community Association Network (SCAN);**
- 2. Staff be directed to complete a Terms of Reference for the committee as outlined in the report;**
- 3. The Committee report to Council and be authorized to engage a consultant to manage work flow;**
- 4. Staff be requested to report on budget guideline options for the Committee work; and**
- 5. All Committee meetings be open to the public.”**

Councillor Brice stated:

- Using the Focus Group to select committee members maximizes the use of those that are already involved in the process.
- There has been an evolution of the public’s idea of what could be reviewed.
- Recommendations to Council will be successful if they have wide acceptance by the community at large.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Using the Focus Group to select committee members is appropriate.
- Members of the Focus Group would be disqualified from applying to be a committee member.
- Having too large a Group may make it difficult to make decisions.
- Wording of the advertisement should appeal to a broad representation of the community.
- Face-to-face interviews may be held if that is the wish of the Focus Group.

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That the motion be amended as follows: 1. That Council advertise for fifteen persons to serve on a Governance Committee and the committee be comprised of interested persons and those experienced in governance reviews.”

Councillor Plant stated:

- Eleven persons is too few for this committee; the committee needs members with expertise.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- It is defined in the report that the committee should be advertised to appeal to a wide range of residents and members who have knowledge of local government; asking for specific qualifications may be too prescriptive.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The committee should not be too large; it should be up to the Focus Group to recommend to Council which candidates would be suitable for the committee.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- Fifteen may be too many members for the committee.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- Advertising for members should not be too prescriptive.
- A larger committee may make it cumbersome for discussion.

**The Amendment to the Motion was DEFEATED
With Mayor Atwell and Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Haynes,
Murdock, Sanders and Wergeland OPPOSED**

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That the motion be amended as follows: 1. That Council advertise for thirteen persons to serve on a Governance Committee.”

**The Amendment to the Motion was CARRIED
with Councillor Wergeland OPPOSED**

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That the motion be amended by adding to the list of activities in the draft Terms of Reference as follows: 1. Provide input on the topics to be included in the Governance Review.”

In response to questions from Council, the L. Allen stated:

- Item No. 1 was missing from the report and is a clerical error; the item is reflected under 1.2.2 - Roles.

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- Council will have another opportunity to review the Terms of Reference before the committee begins its' work.

The Amendment to the Motion was then Put and CARRIED

In response to questions from Council, the Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- The Terms of Reference were drafted to assist with advertising for members and provide insight into the purpose of the committee.
- The committee will choose the consultant that they wish to work with; a Request for Proposal will be advertised for a consultant.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- He does not support the motion; he does not feel that residents' concerns have been addressed.
- The Standing Committee has not been recognized or included in the process.

**The Main Motion as Amended was then Put and CARRIED
with Mayor Atwell OPPOSED**

Motion as Amended:

1. That Council advertise for thirteen persons to serve on a Governance Committee. Governance Committee members will be recommended to Council by a Focus Group comprised of representatives of the Saanich Advisory Committees plus two members of Saanich Community Association Network (SCAN).
2. That staff be directed to complete a Terms of Reference for the committee as outlined in the report, as amended by adding the following to the list of committee activities, 1. Provide input on the topics to be included in the Governance Review;
3. That the Committee report to Council and be authorized to engage a consultant to manage work flow;
4. That staff be requested to report on budget guideline options for the Committee work; and
5. That all Committee meetings be open to the public.

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 11:08 pm.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held October 5, 2015

2310-20
Shelbourne Valley
Action Plan

SHELBOURNE VALLEY ACTION PLAN – IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS OF MOBILITY ACTIONS

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That the report of the Director of Planning dated September 22, 2015 be received; and that Council direct staff to seek public input on mobility implementation options as outlined in Process Option A.”

CARRIED

2860-30
Woodhall Drive

968 AND 970 WOODHALL DRIVE – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Derman: “That Council approve and issue Development Permit DPR00597 on Lot B, Section 65, Victoria District, Plan 20777 (968 and 970 Woodhall Drive).”

CARRIED

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That in accordance with Sections 90 (1)(c), (i), (j) and 90 (2)(a) of the *Community Charter*, the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject matters being considered relate to:**

- **Labour relations and other employee relations;**
- **Receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege;**
- **Information that is prohibited from disclosure under Section 21 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*;**
- **Consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between a provincial government or the federal government and a third party.”**

CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned at 11:10 pm.

.....
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, OCTOBER 5, 2015 AT 8:41 PM

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

2310-20
Shelbourne
Valley Action
Plan

SHELBOURNE VALLEY ACTION PLAN – IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS OF MOBILITY ACTIONS

Report of the Director of Planning dated September 22, 2015 recommending Council receive the report for information and direct staff to seek public input on mobility implementation options.

- C. Scott, Manager of Community Planning, presented and highlighted:
- The Shelbourne Valley Action Plan (SVAP) was developed through a multi-phased process; it is currently in the fifth and final phase.
 - Over 4,000 residents were engaged in the plan development process.
 - The long-term vision for Shelbourne Street looks at an expanded right-of-way

that will be able to achieve a Complete Street that accommodates walking, cycling, transit, motor vehicles and landscape features; in order to achieve that, additional rights-of-way need to be acquired as new development occurs.

- The short-term mobility action plan includes an interim cycle track and new sidewalks on parts of Shelbourne Street, pedestrian and transit improvements in University and Shelbourne Valley Centres and bikeway improvements on other routes in the Shelbourne Valley.
- The right-of-way on Shelbourne Street is currently 20-23 metres wide with 2/3 allocated to motor vehicles and transit; the ultimate vision for Shelbourne Street is to lower that allocation to 50%.
- A key variable in the vision design is the distance from curb to property line to accommodate sidewalk, cycle track, utilities and landscaping.
- 90% of the 300 street trees on Shelbourne Street are in good health; there are over 150 driveways along Shelbourne Street.
- The street trees, utilities and driveways pose a challenge to the design of a cycle track on Shelbourne Street.
- Two proposed mobility action plans have been developed.
- Option 1 maintains four general purpose travel lanes along the full extent of Shelbourne Street, incorporates pedestrian improvements at key locations and introduces cycle track on approximately 25% of the corridor at an estimated cost of \$10.8 million; the disadvantages of this option include the lack of a continuous cycling route, the loss of some street trees, and minor impacts on vehicle travel times due to the removal of bus lanes and turn lanes.
- Option 2 utilizes two, three and four lane configurations to provide pedestrian improvements and a continuous bike lane along the entirety of Shelbourne Street; the disadvantages of this option include impacts to traffic and travel times due to the reduction of travel lanes, no physical separation from traffic and the limited property acquisition required; the estimated cost for this option is \$9.9 million.
- Due to the new information provided in the report, it is recommended that further public consultation take place in relation to the potential mobility options.

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

- The Shelbourne Valley Stakeholders Committee previewed the report and provided feedback; further feedback can be provided through stakeholder meetings or individually to Council.
- The committee is split on which option is preferred.
- Lane closures could be considered and piloted as part of the implementation process.
- The removal of bus bays provides more space for pedestrians.
- Public consultation could result in further options being put forward.

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

- If priority was given to Cedar Hill, Gordon Head and Richmond Roads for capital improvements, there may be a need to re-evaluate the five-year plan with other street improvements lowered in priority; the Safe Route to School plan would also have to be reviewed to see if these streets are priorities for improvements.
- There may be an increase of traffic on parallel roads due to a reduction in vehicle capacity on Shelbourne Street.
- Concrete bus pads could be considered; they have a longer lifespan for heavy vehicles stopping and starting.
- Concrete may not be appropriate for intersections because there are utilities underground which must be accessed; asphalt for intersections is preferable.

PUBLIC INPUT:

D. Wick, Edgemont Road, stated:

- Shelbourne Street is a vital link for cycling; Mobility Option 2 provides a transition to the ultimate plan.

S. Henrich, Victoria, stated:

- Further public engagement on the options is appreciated.
- The Stakeholders Committee should be consulted if survey questions are drafted.

M. Simmons, Christmas Avenue, stated:

- The number of trees that may be removed under Option 1 is alarming.
- Shelbourne Street is not desirable for walking or cycling; routes parallel to Shelbourne Street should be considered for alternative routes.
- Further public engagement would be appreciated.

L. Thiessen, Louise Place, stated:

- This is a step in the right direction; the report does not include data on safety for cyclists, impacts on greenhouse gases, and quality of life for residents of the Shelbourne Valley.
- The negative aspects of Option 2 may have been over-estimated; staff should be directed to provide the information that is missing.

C. Marven, Cheverage Place, and Women's Everyday Bicycling Association, stated:

- There is a need for a straight, direct, and flat cycling route in the Shelbourne Valley; Option 2 provides a continuous cycling route.
- More input and analysis are needed to refine the plan.

D. Gunn, on behalf of the Gordon Head Residents' Association, stated:

- Process Option B is preferred; removing short-term mobility actions from the Shelbourne Valley Action Plan (SVAP) will enable Council to proceed with endorsement of the land use design and environmental goals in the original report.
- Further public engagement is needed.

J. Gaylord, Carnegie Crescent, stated:

- The Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Advisory Committee (BIPED) has not been given the opportunity to review the report; connectivity and continuity within the region has been overlooked.
- Option 2 protects the pedestrian environment and retains the trees.
- The SVAP as a whole should be adopted as soon as possible so that development guidelines are clarified; given the new information, further public input is necessary.

E. Pullman, Victoria, stated:

- Traffic volume projection data should be collected; he appreciates that the plan is moving forward.

B. Tabata, Torquay Drive, stated:

- The Gordon Head Residents' Association Traffic Committee supports further consultation taking place due to the new information received.
- The use of green cycle track may be dangerous.

M. Bergstrom, President, Mount Tolmie Community Association, stated:

- Option 2 is preferred; it complements other initiatives already in place in Saanich.
- Option 2 will result in improvements to mobility and transportation and will have a positive impact on the community.
- Refinements could be considered after public input takes place.

T. Newton, Shorncliffe Road, stated:

- The process has been time consuming and frustrating; the mobility options address some of the pedestrian issues.
- Improvements to the walkability of Shelbourne Street is needed; Option 2 is preferred; it provides a continuous bike lane and separation for pedestrians from the roadway.

J. Schmuck, President, Quadra Cedar Hill Community Association, stated:

- An extension to the Bowker Creek Greenway Trail could be achieved by purchasing property; it could then be used as an alternative pedestrian and cycling trail.

B. Boyd, Derby Road, stated:

- Option 2 is preferred; having a continuous cycle track would be appreciated.

M. Ang, Louise Place, stated:

- Option 2 is preferred; further evaluation of the effects of each of the options on the social aspects, reduction of greenhouse gases and climate change would be appreciated.
- A broader vision that incorporates educational institutions and the possibility of creating a University District is preferable.

J. Newton, Shorncliffe Road, stated:

- Option 2 is preferred; the process needs to get underway as quickly as possible.
- The Shelbourne Valley is looked at as a traffic corridor; it should be considered a vital community with a busy street running through it.
- The options should consider community building and how improvements such as a continuous bike lane and sidewalk improvements could bring new businesses and employment to the Shelbourne Valley.

A. Nagelbach, Lavender Avenue, stated:

- A hybrid option should be considered that includes both separated cycling lanes and on-street bike lanes.

In response to questions, the Manager of Community Planning stated:

- Baseline information is needed to project future bike traffic.
- Reducing greenhouse gases and improving the quality of life are implicit goals; identifying the benefits of each option could be incorporated into the plan.
- Shelbourne Street is desirable for cycling because it is a straight, direct and flat route; both options propose upgrades to parallel pedestrian and cycling routes, including Bowker Creek Greenway, which may be more suited to all ages and abilities.
- Property acquisitions would be required to create a continuous trail along the Bowker Creek Greenway.

In response to questions, the Director of Engineering stated:

- Improvements to the pedestrian and cycling routes are proposed for the Kingsley Bike Connector and the Bowker Creek Greenway.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Councillor Derman stated:

- Walking and cycling have been identified as priority modes of transportation.
- Shelbourne Street is an important cycling corridor; it is a flat and direct route.
- The pedestrian infrastructure on Shelbourne Street is sub-standard; it is not safe or comfortable for pedestrians or cyclists.
- Quality of life must be considered in the options; the nature of Shelbourne Street is the biggest obstacle to development.
- A deadline should be set for the mobility report; BIPED should be included in the consultation process.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Pedestrian and cycling networks are important.

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

- Public consultation would take place and based on feedback, refinements would be made; a final detailed design would then be prepared and funding options considered.

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

- Borrowing is one component of capital planning and would be an option for this project.
- There are other significant projects that have been identified for borrowing; therefore prioritization would be required.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The community should be consulted to assist with setting priorities.

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That it be recommended that the report of the Director of Planning dated September 22, 2015 be received; and that Council direct staff to seek public input on mobility implementation options as outlined in Process Option A."

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Further public input would be beneficial; he thanks staff and the Stakeholders Committee for their work on the report.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- It is time to move forward on this; further consideration of the social and economic benefits of each option is needed.
- Public input is appreciated.

Councillor Derman stated:

- There is a need to move forward with this; the proposed improvements are worthwhile.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- It is important to create a safe cycling environment; although connectivity is important, it is also important to keep people on Shelbourne Street in an effort to build the community.
- Safe Routes to School may complement this work.
- Investment in the Shelbourne Corridor may increase development.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Public transit needs to be part of the conversation.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He appreciates that the item is moving forward.

Councillor Plant stated:

- He appreciates that the public will provide input on both mobility options.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

2860-30
Woodhall Drive

968 AND 970 WOODHALL DRIVE – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

Report from the Director of Planning dated September 8, 2015 recommending that Council approve Development Permit DPR00597 for a proposed addition to an existing duplex.

APPLICANT:

P. Carr, 970 Woodhall Drive, presented and highlighted:

- The application proposes removing an existing substandard building; an addition would be constructed within the footprint to accommodate an extended family member.

PUBLIC INPUT:

H. Charania, President, North Quadra Land Use Protection Association, stated:

- The Community Association supports the application and appreciates the improvements to the Quadra Street frontage, that there is no loss of trees and no variances required.
- The proposed development will allow the family to stay together.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That it be recommended that Council approve and issue Development Permit DPR00597 on Lot B, Section 65, Victoria District, Plan 20777 (968 and 970 Woodhall Drive).”

Councillor Derman stated:

- There are considerable advantages of this application.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- This is a small change to the property and will allow the family to stay together; the improvements to Quadra Street are appreciated.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

2870-30
Agnes Street

593 AGNES STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND REZONING APPLICATION

Report from the Director of Planning dated September 8, 2015 recommending that Council approve the rezoning from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RD-1 (Two-Family Dwelling) zone, and approve Development Permit DPR00600; and that Final Reading of the Zoning Bylaw Amendment and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant to secure BUILT GREEN® Gold, EnerGuide 82 or equivalent energy and environmental performance standard, and provision of conduits to accommodate future installation of solar panels.

APPLICANT:

D. Patterson and S. Ramsay presented and highlighted:

- The applicant proposes to construct a two-storey duplex; the existing carport will be removed.
- The existing driveway would be used to access both dwellings; each dwelling would have two onsite parking stalls.
- The proposed dwelling fits within the character of the neighbourhood.

PUBLIC INPUT:

R. Betts, Agnes Street stated:

- He opposes the application; there has been an increase of traffic and on street parking on Agnes Street due to construction on neighbouring streets.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: “That the meeting extend past 11:00 pm.”

CARRIED

A. Ross, on behalf of the Residents Association of Strawberry Vale, Marigold and Glanford, stated:

- The Residents Association does not object to the application; it is a sensitive addition to the neighbourhood.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That a Public Hearing be called to further consider the rezoning application on Lot 10, Section 50, Victoria District, Plan 11604 (593 Agnes Street).”

Councillor Brice stated:

- The Residents Association supports the proposed development.

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

- Secondary suites are not permitted in duplexes.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- He supports the application being forwarded to a Public Hearing.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Removal of the oil tank on the property should be considered.
- The proposed development will not have a negative impact on traffic.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The design of the main entrance of the house could be improved.

Councillor Plant stated:

- The proposed development will not add to traffic concerns.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Haynes, the meeting adjourned at 11:07 pm.

.....
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK