

DISTRICT OF SAANICH  
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD AT THE SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2016**

Present:           **Chair:**       Mayor Atwell  
                  **Council:**   Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Haynes, Murdock, Plant, Sanders and Wergeland  
                  **Staff:**       Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer; Mike Burgess, Fire Chief; Sharon Hvozdzanski, Director of Planning (7:30 p.m.); Harley Machielse, Director of Engineering (7:30 p.m.); Laura Ciarniello, Director of Corporate Services; Donna Dupas, Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk (7:30 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 Derman and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That pursuant to Sections 90 (1) (c), (i) and (m) of the *Community Charter*, the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject matters being considered relate to labour relations or other employee relations; the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose; and a matter that, under another enactment, the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, is such that the public may be excluded from the meeting.”**

**CARRIED**

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
Director of Corporate Services left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.  
\*\*\*\*\*

**The regular Council meeting reconvened in Council Chambers at 7:30 p.m.**

Minutes               **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**  
  
**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That Council adopt the minutes of the October 17, 2016 Council and Committee of the Whole meetings.”**

**CARRIED**

**BYLAWS FOR FINAL READING**

1110-30  
Tax  
Exemption  
Real Property  
Bylaw

**TAX EXEMPTION REAL PROPERTY BYLAW AMENDMENT**  
Final Reading of “Tax Exemption Real Property Bylaw, 2015, Amendment Bylaw, 2016, No. 9396”. To exempt certain lands and improvements from taxation for the years 2017, 2018 and 2019.

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That Bylaw No. 9396 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”**

**CARRIED**

1110-30  
Tax  
Exemption  
Bylaw

**57 CADILLAC AVENUE – TAX EXEMPTION BYLAW**

Final Reading of “Tax Exemption Bylaw (57 Cadillac Avenue), 2016, No. 9397”. To exempt the leased premise at 57 Cadillac Avenue from taxation for the years 2017-2023.

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That Bylaw No. 9397 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”**

**CARRIED**

1110-30  
Tax  
Exemption  
Real Property  
Bylaw

**TAX EXEMPTION REAL PROPERTY BYLAW**

Final Reading of “Tax Exemption Real Property Bylaw, 2016, No. 9399”. To exempt certain lands and improvements from taxation for the years 2017 and 2018.

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Bylaw No. 9399 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”**

**CARRIED**

**PUBLIC INPUT ON COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS**

Public Input  
on Council  
Agenda Items

T. Woynillowciz, Leaside Place  
Federal Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP)

- The TPP is not a trade agreement; it is a corporate bill of rights.
- Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) is anti-democratic and gives rights to foreign investors; it does not attach actionable responsibilities to those rights and privileges, it is disrespectful of domestic institutions and courts, and it has potential financial risks to taxpayers.
- A large sector of the European Union is opposed to the ISDS but are not necessarily being heard.
- Council should consider passing a resolution asking the federal government not to ratify the TPP.

1300-20  
UBCM

1300-60  
Federal  
Trans-Pacific  
Partnership  
Agreement

L. Layne, San Lorenzo Avenue  
Federal Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP)

- Under the TPP, awarding contracts locally may be challenged; the TPP puts profit over people.
- It is important to frame the opposition in terms that are relevant to the municipality, which may include regulations around pesticides, EDPA, building permits, water and land use and the integrity of bylaws.
- Large corporations are putting profit over the environment and communities have no recourse.
- It has been questioned if the municipality has the power to ask the federal government not to ratify the TPP; the federal government represents all the people of Canada.

K. Whitworth, Viewmont Avenue

UBCM Resolutions

- Councillor Haynes' dedication and work done in the area of affordable housing is appreciated; emergency motions to the UBCM can be made but in this case the universities and colleges should take action regarding their own governance.
- The established procedures of the UBCM should be adhered to.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES**

1300-60

Federal  
Trans-Pacific  
Partnership  
Agreement

**FEDERAL TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT**

Reports from the Environment and Natural Areas, Healthy Saanich and Planning, Transportation and Economic Development Advisory Committees providing their recommendations to Council on the matter of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The Planning, Transportation and Economic Development Advisory Committee felt that discussion on international trade is beyond the purview of the committee; he does not agree with the recommendation of the committee.
- The TPP is in conflict with the Environmental Bill of Rights.

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: "That Council send a letter to the Federal Government expressing opposition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, in particular in relation to the Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) process and how it will affect local governments' ability to protect the natural environment."**

Councillor Murdock stated:

- A joint information session was held where the Environment and Natural Areas (ENA), Healthy Saanich (HSAC) and Planning, Transportation and Economic Development (PTED) Advisory Committees received a presentation from the Victoria Chapter of the Council of Canadians in relation to the TPP; ENA considered the input received and voiced concerned around the ability of Saanich to protect the natural environment as a result of the provisions of the TPP.
- Other jurisdictions have been challenged for banning the use of pesticides.

Councillor Plant stated:

- Municipalities around the world have opposed the TPP; it is important to add our unified voice, but the federal government may choose not to listen.

Councillor Derman stated:

- There is concern that the ISDS process would limit the ability of the municipality to protect the natural environment; the ISDS may also impact social initiatives and attempts to foster local business.
- The federal government needs to hear the concerns.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- A similar motion was passed in 2012 around the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA); the TPP may impact the ability of local governments to protect the environment and foster local business.
- The ISDS is problematic and vague; it is important that all local governments raise their voices.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- It may not be appropriate to get involved in federal issues; there are many other federal issues that affect Saanich.
- Senior levels of federal government represent our residents.

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

- No research has been done on the impact of the TPP on Saanich.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- He is unsure what impact a letter would have on the federal government; Council may not have enough information in relation to the impact of the TPP on the municipality.
- It is important that Council considers the public's best interest.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

1420-30  
Healthy  
Saanich  
Advisory  
Committee

### **MOVEMBER**

Recommendation from the September 28, 2016 Healthy Saanich Advisory Committee meeting that Council approve the raising of the Movember flag at the Municipal Hall for the month of November in support of awareness for the Movember 2016 campaign.

**MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That Council approve a request to raise the Movember flag at the Municipal Hall for the month of November 2016 in support of a staff initiative to raise awareness for the Movember 2016 campaign."**

Councillor Plant stated:

- Staff have been tasked with developing a policy on raising flags at the municipality; although a policy has not been completed, he requests Council support the gesture.
- A flag would be provided; there is no cost to the municipality.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Flying the flag will show support to staff that have undertaken the initiative; there is a need to have a policy in place around raising flags as other agencies may come forward with their worthwhile causes.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- In the absence of a policy, it could be that the Advisory Committees monitor the process.
- This is a staff initiative and is supportable.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- It is a worthy cause but if flags are raised for every occasion, the gesture may lose its impact.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- It may be more appropriate to wait for the policy to be drafted before a decision is made to raise flags.

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

- It may be a more complicated flag policy than originally thought; due to competing priorities, staff may be able to begin developing a policy in the new year.
- He is not aware of any other requests to raise flags at this time.

Councillor Plant stated:

- In this case, he does not believe that Council should wait for a policy to approve the request; there has been no other requests to raise flags.

Councillor Brice stated:

- It is appropriate to support this staff initiative.
- It would not be appropriate for committees to initiate further requests to raise flags before a policy is created.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Because it is a request of staff, it is supportable; a flag protocol should be created.
- It may be appropriate to have a community flag pole; this request may result in other requests coming forward.

Councillor Plant stated:

- There are five municipal flagpoles so there should not be a problem with space to raise a flag.

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

2650-50

Environmental  
Bill of Rights

### **ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS**

Recommendation from the September 27, 2016 Environment and Natural Areas (ENA) Advisory Committee that Council consider, as part of the Strategic Planning process, providing staff resources to work with ENA related to the Environmental Bill of Rights as outlined in the report.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Last year, Council endorsed the Environmental Bill of Rights and committed to a number of environmental aspects that Saanich would take action on.
- A gap analysis was attempted by members of ENA but it became apparent that they could not do the work required to make recommendations with respect to actions, timelines and success indicators.
- A staff member could be assigned to undertake the work; recognizing the priorities that Council has, a work plan could be considered amongst Council priorities at the next Strategic Planning meeting.

**MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That the recommendation of the Environment and Natural Areas Advisory Committee, that Council consider providing staff resources to work with the committee on the Environmental Bill of Rights, be referred to the Strategic Planning process.”**

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

- Council and staff report out on the Strategic Plan to the public on a regular basis; discussions are ongoing on developing a public engagement process for the Strategic Plan.

Councillor Brice stated:

- When the Environmental Bill of Rights was endorsed, it was understood that it is a living document.
- Costs for staffing should be provided during the Strategic Planning process; if it is decided to move forward with staffing, there should be a commitment to include public input as part of the review of the Bill of Rights.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- There is the need for staff to review the recommendations from ENA; she is pleased that the item will be discussed further during the Strategic Planning process.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The Bill of Rights is a good guiding principle, but the vagueness may make it difficult to do a gap analysis.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The Suzuki Foundation are looking at best practices around community initiatives, but they have found that initiatives vary between communities.
- Part of the process should include an environmental scan within Canada.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She is pleased that this item will be discussed during the Strategic Planning process.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- All the work does not have to be undertaken this year.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- He thanked the committee for all the work that has been done.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

## **REPORTS FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL**

1410-04  
Report –  
Council

xref: 1300-20  
UBCM

### **UNION OF BC MUNICIPALITIES (UBCM) RESOLUTIONS**

Report of Councillor Brownoff dated October 3, 2016 recommending that Council confirm that all resolutions advanced to UBCM are endorsed by Saanich Council and that Saanich Council write a letter to the UBCM requesting they verify that late or emergency resolutions presented to them are endorsed by the local government.

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:**  
**“That:**

**WHEREAS based on recent 2016 UBCM convention experience in which a resolution was advanced to UBCM without the approval or endorsement of Saanich Council and published in the UBCM Policy Book;**

**AND WHEREAS UBCM should be requested to review its processes and make any necessary changes to ensure the democratic process is respected;**

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Saanich Council confirm that all resolutions advanced to UBCM be endorsed by Saanich Council as set out by UBCM procedures;**

**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Saanich Council write a letter to UBCM requesting they verify late or emergency resolutions presented to them are endorsed by the local government.”**

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The UBCM has an established process that any resolution brought forward to the UBCM conference must be endorsed by the local government; this is to ensure that debate took place at the municipal level; the UBCM has a June deadline to receive resolutions.
- There is an opportunity for late or emergency resolutions to come forward, but they also should be endorsed by the municipality before they are brought forward.
- There was a late resolution put forward at the UBCM conference and was advertised as endorsed by Saanich Council.
- The UBCM should be reminded to verify that any late or emergency resolutions presented to them are endorsed by the local government.

Councillor Derman stated:

- It is appropriate that all resolutions are endorsed by Council before proceeding to the UBCM.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The late resolution that was put forward had been prepared by the UBCM; supporting documentation was provided to the UBCM in relation to the resolution.
- This was a lesson learned on process.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She was surprised to see the resolution from Saanich as it had not been endorsed by Council; the process to endorse resolutions being put forward to the UBCM should be adhered to.

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

- The resolution was assigned to Saanich by the UBCM based on what they believed, although they did not confirm if Saanich endorsed the resolution; the UBCM expressed their regret.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- He had contacted the UBCM to ask if he could provide supporting documentation on a resolution; that might have resulted in the resolution being assigned to Saanich.

Councillor Brice stated:

- It does not appear that the UBCM process that is in place was followed; the UBCM should clarify what constitutes an emergency resolution.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The UBCM may consider “late breaking” as an emergency; in this case, information had just been received that the Province would be providing a great deal of funding for student housing.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

1410-04  
Report -  
Council

**PRESENTATION ON THE PLANS FOR THE HARTLAND LANDFILL FACILITY**

Further to the Notice of Motion from the October 3, 2016 Council meeting. Report from Councillor Haynes dated October 13, 2016 recommending that Council request staff to invite the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project Board to present at a future Committee of the Whole meeting on the plans for the Hartland Landfill Facility, bio-solids, pipeline, and any other pertinent information with the intent to allow the public to hear the details, and that CRD Director Mike Hicks be advised of the date of the presentation.

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That Council request staff to invite the Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project Board (CAWTPB) to present at a future Committee of the Whole meeting on the plans for the Hartland Landfill Facility, bio-solids, pipeline, and any other pertinent information with the intent to allow the public to hear the details, and that CRD Director Mike Hicks be advised of the date of the presentation.”**

Councillor Haynes stated:

- This will be a significant physical and fiscal undertaking for the residents of Saanich; a Committee of the Whole meeting will provide a forum for the CRD to present its plans around the Hartland Facility.
- In the absence of clear and accurate information, people will fill the gaps.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Although there may not be a lot of concrete information available at the moment, it may be appropriate to have the CRD attend and hear residents' concerns.

Councillor Brice stated:

- At this stage, there may not be much information available but residents should be involved in the process; communication is expected throughout the process.
- It is important to clarify the intention of the meeting; the public engagement process must start early in the process.
- A more sophisticated process of public engagement should be considered.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- It may be useful to have some sort of meeting or process where the CRD can present on a specific topic; the CRD is doing its own public engagement as well.
- A meeting needs to have a specific intention and provide value.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The CRD has advised that they would have public consultation at the appropriate time; Saanich Councillors who are on the CRD Board could present to Council at any time.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The project will include substantial community engagement; it is important that the CRD start the communication within the communities surrounding Hartland.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The public engagement piece by the CRD may be completed by the time the item is brought to a Committee of the Whole meeting; by then there may be a sense of what direction the plan will be taking.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- Public engagement should take place in the neighbourhoods surrounding Hartland.

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

- If it is the wish of Council to have the CRD attend, a Committee of the Whole meeting is the appropriate venue.
- It would allow the community to hear the plans and provide input.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Although the CRD is the forum for this item, there could be further discussion.
- Any discussion needs to be focused and any questions from residents be forwarded to the CRD.
- The CRD has Open Houses where the public are able to engage with project engineers and provide input.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED  
With Councillors Sanders and Wergeland OPPOSED**

Adjournment      On a motion from Councillor Murdock, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 12:32 a.m.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

*From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held October 24, 2016*

2110-20  
Hunt Road

#### **6187 HUNT ROAD – SUBDIVISION, AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE AND HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT**

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That:**

- 1. The application to subdivide within the Agricultural Land Reserve to facilitate the inter-generational transfer of an existing farm operation be forwarded to the Agricultural Land Commission with a recommendation for approval; and**
- 2. If the application is approved by the Agricultural Land Commission, that the Heritage Revitalization Agreement be approved.”**

**CARRIED**

1300-20  
Island  
Corridor  
Foundation

#### **REQUEST FROM CRD – ISLAND CORRIDOR FOUNDATION (ICF) REVIEW**

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That Council support the recommendations of the Association of Vancouver Island and Coastal Communities (AVICC) review of the Island Corridor Foundation as outlined in the report prepared by aKd Resource dated September 2, 2016”.**

**CARRIED**

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: "That the In Camera meeting be reconvened pursuant to Sections 90 (1) (c), (i) and (m) of the *Community Charter*."**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Brice, the meeting adjourned at 12:34 a.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, OCTOBER 24, 2016 AT 9:14 P.M.**

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

1410-04  
Report -  
Planning

xref: 2110-20  
Hunt Road

**6187 HUNT ROAD – SUBDIVISION, AGRICULTURAL LAND RESERVE AND HERITAGE REVITALIZATION AGREEMENT**

Report of the Director of Planning dated September 14, 2016 recommending that Council forward the application to subdivide the land within the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) to the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) with a recommendation for approval and, if the application is approved by the ALC, that the Heritage Revitalization Agreement be approved.

In response to questions from Council, the Director of Planning stated:  
- There are currently two dwellings on the property; the heritage house would remain and the farm workers dwelling would be deconstructed and a new house built at the eastern end of the property.

**APPLICANT:**  
D. Strongitharm, Strongitharm Consulting Limited, presented to Council and highlighted:  
- The family has been involved in farming for approximately 100 years; the family home will be retained.

- The Heritage Revitalization Agreement would allow a subdivision to facilitate the inter-generational transfer of the farmland.
- The new dwelling will be relocated to a lesser used area of the property.
- The application allows for retention of farmland, addresses improved and enhanced food production and protects Saanich heritage values.
- The family dwelling has significant heritage features and is important to the Saanich community; it is currently on the Saanich Heritage Registry; the Revitalization Agreement will protect the heritage value.
- Improvements to the agricultural land may result in more intensive crop development.
- The Peninsula and Area Agricultural Commission (PAAC) and the Saanich Heritage Foundation (SHF) support the application.
- The application preserves and protects Saanich's rural heritage and preserves and enhances the District's agriculture and food production.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- The property is currently zoned A-1; there would be one house constructed on the balance of the land.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

L. Layne, San Lorenzo Avenue, stated:

- He questions the elevation of the eastern part of the site where the new home would be built; the elevation may affect where the home should be built on the property.

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:**

- The proposed dwelling would be set back between 75 and 100 feet from the edge of the bluff; there would be no issue with sea level rise or erosion of the bank.

**COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**

**Motion:**

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

- 3. The application to subdivide within the Agricultural Land Reserve to facilitate the inter-generational transfer of an existing farm operation be forwarded to the Agricultural Land Commission with a recommendation for approval; and**
- 4. If the application is approved by the Agricultural Land Commission, that the Heritage Revitalization Agreement be approved."**

Councillor Derman stated:

- He appreciates the Heritage Revitalization Agreement; this is a well thought out project.

Councillor Brice stated:

- She is pleased to support the application.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She is pleased that the owners will enter into a Heritage Revitalization Agreement; she is also pleased that the property will remain within the family.

Councillor Plant stated:

- He is pleased to hear that the heritage home will be protected.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

2870-30

Townley Street

**1780 TOWNLEY STREET – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND REZONING**

Report of the Director of Planning dated October 6, 2016 recommending that Council approve the application to rezone from RA-1 (Apartment) zone to RM-6 (Residential Mixed) zone to construct a 4-storey, 51 unit apartment building for affordable seniors/persons with disabilities housing, and 16 affordable townhouse units; that Development Permit DPR00634 be approved; and that Final Reading of the Zoning Bylaw Amendment and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a housing agreement and a covenant to secure items as outlined in the report.

**APPLICANT:**

J. Gauld CitySpaces Consulting Ltd., I. Batey, Greater Victoria Housing Society, A. Fox, HCMA Architecture + Design; and S. Murdock, Murdock De Greeff Landscape Architects presented to Council and highlighted:

- The Greater Victoria Housing Association (GVHA) has been providing affordable housing for over 60 years; there are four properties in Saanich which provide approximately 120 affordable homes.
- The GVHA is committed to providing a solution to the critical need for affordable housing in the region; financial support is in place to move forward with the project.
- The average rents will be below BC Housing and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation limits, seniors will be eligible for rental subsidies, and all units will be subject to long-term housing agreements with Saanich.
- The current Townley residents will be relocated but could return once construction is completed; the proposed development would be a three and four storey senior apartment building with 51 apartment units and 16 family townhouses.
- The property is currently zoned for multi-family units; the proposed development would fit within the character of the neighbourhood and is in close proximity to services.
- The applicant has demonstrated a commitment to consultation and has responded to neighbours' concerns.
- Concerns were identified as being building height, shadowing and overlook; as a result, there will be no balconies and the proposed building will be oriented north-south to minimize overlook; two apartment units were removed from the fourth floor so that the building would be stepped back.
- The garbage and recycling location has been moved to near Townley Street and pick up times have been changed; the garage door entry to the underground parking was moved south to minimize noise.
- The electrical transformer was moved to the centre of the site away from the adjacent property; the applicant offered to increase the buffer to the existing hedge by providing small parking spaces instead of full size parking spaces.
- Light fixtures will be located and shielded to prevent glare onto adjacent properties.
- There is a commitment to preserve two large maples on the property and to 4:1 tree replacement ratio.
- Traffic engineers report negligible impact on the road system; parking needs will be met entirely on-site.

- Traffic Demand Management (TDM) strategies have been incorporated into the project.
- On-site walking loops, play opportunities and a central gathering area have been included in the plans.
- The gabled roofline reduces the height of the wall of the building; if it were a flat roof, the wall of the building would be higher to accommodate the roof structure.
- The existing hedge would remain; it is on the neighbours' property.
- The proposed building would adhere to Passive House Design fundamentals.
- 10 trees would be retained, 12 trees would be removed and 52 additional trees would be planted; nine Garry oaks would be replanted on the site.
- Water will be managed on-site through rain gardens and permeable pavers.
- The proposed development will revitalize the neighbourhood, increase age diversity in the community, allow residents to age-in-place and introduce new families to the neighbourhood.
- It is the vision of the GVHS to maintain and expand the inventory of affordable housing.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

K, Harper, on behalf of the Camosun Community Association, stated:

- Although the critical need for affordable housing is recognized, the Community Association does not support the application in its current form.
- Neighbours are in favour of an increase of affordable housing but the proposed development is not to scale for the neighbourhood or in keeping with the Local Area Plan.
- The height, density and lot coverage are not appropriate on a residential street; RM-6 zoning is not suitable for residential streets.
- The transitioning from four storeys to single family dwellings is not adequate.
- A large number of significant trees would be removed; more work is needed to address neighbours' concerns.

B. McBain, Queenston Street, stated:

- The proposed development will address the urgent need for affordable rental housing; some increase in density is needed so that non-profits can provide affordable housing opportunities.
- Affordable housing should not be only located along major traffic corridors; residents should be able to enjoy quiet neighbourhoods.
- The proposed development will bookend the other buildings already in the neighbourhood; the TDM shows a negligible impact.
- The open spaces will be useable and will encourage interaction between generations; it is close to schools, shopping, and green spaces.
- It addresses social sustainability by providing for both seniors and families and would increase the economic diversity.

D. Horwood, on behalf of the Board of the Victoria Alliance Church, stated:

- It is very difficult to find a site for community benefit; the church is a supporter of the GVHS; they do good work in the community.
- The existing Townley Lodge is quiet and safe; increased traffic and noise are not concerns.
- There is diversity in the community and the proposed development will add to that; there is a need for affordable housing in the region.

L. Urquhart, Queenston Street, stated:

- Providing affordable housing is supportable but there is concern with the height and design of the proposed building.
- Neighbours are also concerned with light blockage, reduced privacy and insufficient on-site parking.
- Three storeys would be in line with the Official Community Plan (OCP); on street parking is already an issue on Queenston Street.
- Approving the height of the proposed building may set precedence.

N. Sherrington, Ilene Terrace, stated:

- The redevelopment of Townley Lodge is supportable but the height and the removal of trees were not addressed adequately.
- Using a church roofline to justify the height of residential units is not good practice; the transitioning between the four storeys to the single storey dwellings does not flow.
- Shading will affect neighbours and could reduce the energy efficiency of neighbours' homes.
- A three storey building would be supportable; there should be an attempt to retain the significant trees on the property.

M. Henderson, Cedar Avenue, stated:

- She has great respect and admiration for the GVHS; it is a tight rental market.
- Affordable housing is an urgent matter; the proposed development is supportable as it is close to amenities and away from high traffic roads.
- The passive house design is appreciated; the close proximity to transit and services means that residents may not need to own a car.

J. Young, Queenston Street, stated:

- The proposed development would block the view and increase shadowing on adjacent properties; it is not supportable because it does not fit the character of the neighbourhood.
- Approving a four storey building may set precedence for other similar developments in the area.
- Increased density should be sensitive to existing neighbours.

M. Young, Queenston Street, stated:

- Increased density on the property is supportable but there is concern with the height of the building; it does not fit within the character of the neighbourhood.
- The proposed amenities for the property are appreciated.
- The removal of the large trees along the property line and the design of the driveway to the underground parking lot will result in car lights shining into adjacent homes; precedence will be set if this four storey development is approved.

G. Berube, Queenston Street, stated:

- The proposed height of the building is unacceptable and is not sensitive to neighbours; the peaked roof makes it more like 5 stories.
- Vegetable gardens will be impacted; there is concern with increased on street parking, loss of mature trees and the negative impact on the resale value of homes in the neighbourhood.
- There is already age diversity in the neighbourhood.

C. Balmer, Queenston Street, stated:

- There is concern for the social wellbeing of residents of Townley; he wonders if sufficient open spaces have been incorporated into the design.

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That the meeting continue past 11:00 p.m."**

**CARRIED**

E. Ausio, Townley Street, stated:

- The need for affordable housing is recognized but this is not the appropriate location for density.
- The variance for building setback will affect neighbours' privacy; the proposed development would cover too much permeable ground and that may affect neighbours' properties and Bowker Creek.
- The proposed density does not fit within the streetscape; it is important to consider the effect of development on neighbours.

S. Roberts, Ilene Terrace, stated:

- There is concern with the height and density of the proposed development; tree loss, increased on street parking and loss of green space are also concerns.
- There is a need for more affordable housing in the region but density must be done in a sensitive manner.
- Building either townhouses or apartments may have less impact on the neighbourhood.

I. Graeme, Dean Avenue, stated;

- There is a need for more affordable housing in the region; the work of the GVHS is appreciated.
- The proposed development would be close to public transit and services; there is a need to have a graduated transition to single storey dwellings.

K. Stinson, Ramsey Place, stated:

- There is a housing crisis in the region; the proposed development will provide long term rental housing at an affordable rates for seniors and families.
- It is an attractive, innovative and environmentally sustainability project.
- Removal of a couple of units could make the project untenable.

P. Burns-Walker, Carrick Street, stated:

- The Local Area Plan states that building height and design should acknowledge the adjacent single family dwellings; the applicant should think outside the box on fitting the proposed development into the neighbourhood and address the concerns of neighbours.

A. Lubkowski, Ilene Terrace, stated:

- The height of the proposed development is a concern; other options on a smaller scale should be considered.
- Neighbours feel their concerns have not been addressed; the proposed development does not include enough green space.

L. Layne, San Lorenzo Avenue, stated:

- The vacant school property may be a more appropriate location for this development; the school playground could be used by residents of Townley Lodge.

- He questions the number of underground parking stalls available for residents.

G. Scheidt, Queenston Street, stated:

- The proposed development would block the view; it is not desirable to live near an apartment building.
- The proposed development may negatively affect home values.

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

- The amount of open gathering space would meet the requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.
- Staff are unaware of the potential disposal or future re-use of the school property.

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:**

- The OCP allows for a four storey building; it has been demonstrated that the proposed development is a good fit for the neighbourhood.
- BC Housing have monitored the plans in relation to the open spaces and a peer review was held; they are satisfied with the site plans in its entirety.
- There is significant landscaping on the property and a significant amount of planting has been done.
- Currently the green space around the building is barren and poorly used; the proposal includes opportunities for seating, walking, gardening and children's play throughout the property.
- The unit sizes have not been reduced to accommodate passive house design; the sizes meet BC Housing standards.
- Passive house means the units are designed to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases expended with a high environmental standard of building construction.
- The viability of three vs four storeys has not been considered; this project meets BC Housing cash flow analysis.
- Reducing the number of units to 41 means only a net gain of two seniors affordable housing units.
- Existing tenants will be able to move back and rents will be the same as current rates.
- GVHS has not received any responses from the school board in relation to re-use of the school.
- The total number of underground parking stalls is 22 with 43 above ground.
- A retaining wall would be constructed and the potential addition of a noise barrier would alleviate concerns of vehicle lights and noise; privacy fencing could also be installed.
- During Spring to Fall, there is no shadowing to the north except very late in the day; there would be some impact on neighbours during winter months.
- The step back of the fourth storey mitigates shadowing.

**COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**

Councillor Derman stated:

- The neighbours and Community Association have stated that they support both affordable housing and development on this property but this particular application may not be appropriate.
- It is not within scale of the neighbourhood; the height of the proposed building, the location of the parking and the lack of green space is concerning.

- It is important to consider transition into the single storey neighbourhood; development should fit within the neighbourhood.
- The sustainability features are appropriate; this is too much density for the location.

**Motion:**

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That consideration of the application to rezone the property at 1780 Townley Street be postponed to allow the applicant to reconsider the proposal and make modifications to the application that addresses concerns."**

Councillor Haynes stated:

- It may be possible to convert one townhouse unit to apartments.

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

- The policies of the OCP can potentially conflict; the subject of "fit" is subjective and is different for each community.
- The use and height are permitted under the OCP.
- Each application is addressed on a case-by-case basis, therefore there should be no concern about setting precedence.
- In this case, the neighbours value affordable housing but feel the fit is not right.
- Staff felt that because of the strong need for affordable housing in the community, the proposed development was appropriate.
- It is worthy in having an expanded discussion.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- It is important, when looking at a proposal, that both the community and the development benefits; changes may be needed to address the concerns of neighbours.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The GVHS does great work, but consideration must be given to neighbours' concerns.
- The application, in its current form, would not be approved at a Public Hearing.

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

- Significant design changes could take place during the postponement; Council should provide specific direction to the applicant on what changes would be appropriate.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- There are a lot of good points in this application but the impact of the proposed development on the neighbours needs to be considered.
- The neighbours are concerned with the height of the building.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Postponing the item will give the applicant time to make some changes and address the concerns with the height of the building, transitioning and the fit within the neighbourhood.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The project is too large for the site; increasing the number of affordable housing units is supportable.
- The proposed development should fit within the character of the neighbourhood.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- There needs to be balance between the need to create more affordable housing and a development that is an appropriate fit within the neighbourhood; a postponement will allow the applicant to return with an improved design that is sensitive to neighbours.

Councillor Plant stated:

- The proposed development, in its current form, does not fit within the neighbourhood.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

\*\*\*\*\*  
**The Directors of Engineering and Planning left the meeting at 12:10 a.m.**  
 \*\*\*\*\*

1300-20  
 Island Corridor  
 Foundation

**REQUEST FROM CRD – ISLAND CORRIDOR FOUNDATION (ICF) REVIEW**

From the October 12, 2016 Capital Regional District (CRD) Board meeting requesting Council consider the Association of Vancouver Island and Coastal Communities review of the Island Corridor Foundation (ICF), and the ICF response to local governments in the CRD and to Songhees and Esquimalt First Nations, and to provide comments and recommendations to the CRD by October 31, 2016.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Nil

**COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**

Motion:

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That it be recommended that Council support the recommendations of the Association of Vancouver Island and Coastal Communities (AVICC) review of the Island Corridor Foundation as outlined in the report prepared by aKd Resource dated September 2, 2016”.**

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- This is a valuable transportation corridor; more business people should sit on the Island Corridor Foundation (ICF) Board.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Greater transparency and accountability on the part of ICF is needed.

In response to questions from Council, the CAO stated;

- Saanich does not give an annual contribution to ICF; the CRD gave a one-time grant of approximately \$1.2 million.
- Those funds are currently being held in a reserve account for the project.
- Other regional districts have decided to withdraw from the ICF and are returning the funds to the taxpayers.

- Local governments want some control because they have provided funding.
- There is no rail track located in Saanich.
- Any changes to the ICF governance have to be ratified by the membership at an Annual General Meeting.
- The structure of the ICF intended to keep local governments at arm's length in order to limit liability and financial exposure.
- The ICF is trying to address transparency and accountability concerns.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

Adjournment      On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 a.m.

.....  
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK