A. “ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, No. 9410”
PROPOSED REZONING FOR A 14-UNIT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT ON CLOVERDALE AVENUE

To rezone 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) from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RT-FC (Attached Housing Four Corners) zone to construct a 14 unit townhouse development. A DEVELOPMENT PERMIT will be considered for form and character, with variances to visitor parking, building separation, and rear yard setback. A COVENANT will also be considered to further regulate the use of the lands and buildings.

The Clerk introduced the following:

- Notice of Public Hearing;
- Report from the Director Planning dated August 18, 2016 and Supplemental Report from the Director of Planning dated November 22, 2016; recommending that:
  - the application to rezone from RS-6 to RT-FC and the Development Permit be approved;
  - Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant to secure the following:
    - BUILT GREEN® Gold or EnerGuide 82 (or equivalent), including the installation of heat pumps for each dwelling unit;
    - Installation of the necessary conduit and piping to be considered solar ready for the future installation of solar photovoltaic or hot water heating systems;
    - $1,000.00 per unit ($14,000.00) to be provided to Saanich for use in the construction of a Children’s water spray pad and permanent washrooms at Rutledge Park;
    - $500.00 per unit to the Saanich Affordable Housing Fund; and
    - $500.00 per unit to either a new Saanich Transportation Fund, or to the Saanich Affordable Housing Fund.
- Servicing Requirements dated December 22, 2016;
- Excerpt from the Committee of the Whole Meeting held September 12, 2016;
• Storm Water Management Statement dated August 7, 2015;
• Sustainability Statement received August 25, 2015;
• Report of the Advisory Design Panel dated December 23, 2015;
• An email from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure dated September 21, 2015;
• A letter from the Quadra Cedar Hill Community Associated dated November 19, 2015; and
• 32 letters from residents.

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Engineering stated:
- Egress from the site would be right-turn only and would be controlled by signage; there is no room on Cloverdale Avenue to construct a median.
- There are measures that could be undertaken at the driveway entrance to manage vehicles turning left onto Cloverdale Avenue; however, doing so could impede pedestrian use of the sidewalk.

APPLICANT:
T. Rodier, Outline Home Design and J. Gill, Seba Construction Ltd., presented to Council and highlighted:
- The proposed development is close to shopping, parks, schools, major public transit lines and a bike lane; it makes sense to increase density in this location due to its proximity to amenities and its walkability.
- The proposed development will promote and enhance street level engagement, pedestrian connections and will re-energize the neighbourhood.
- The addition of green space will act as a buffer between neighbours; it is a contemporary and durable design that fits in well with the character of the neighbourhood.
- The 14 units will be two to four bedrooms with garages; most units will include apron parking and all units will include dedicated bike storage and integrated recycling and garbage centres. Patios at street level are designed to promote community engagement.
- Rear units will have dedicated yards and a public pathway will circle the site.
- They met with neighbours and design changes were made in response to concerns.
- The development will be constructed to BUILT GREEN® Gold or EnerGuide 82 energy efficiency standards and green technologies will be utilized.
- The full complement of overall required parking is provided; however, only three are designated as visitor parking, as opposed to the five required. A proposed solution is to provide four additional, parallel parking spaces in front of the property with “two hour limit” signage.
- The homes will be built with a functional four foot crawl space for additional storage use.
- The density proposed is less than what is permitted.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:
- Bike storage will be of a standard size and would be located in the foyer of the units; visitor bike parking will also be available.
- The proposed units would range in size from 1,300 ft² - 1,750 ft².
PUBLIC INPUT:
N. Peters, Quailwood Close, stated:
- The current lack of affordable housing forces people out of centres into outlying areas, this proposal is supportable.

M. Daniel, Savannah Avenue, stated:
- The proposal would allow families to live and work in the same area; it is in a convenient location that is close to amenities.

J. Marcil, Savannah Avenue, stated:
- The proposed development does not fit with the character of the neighbourhood and the density is too high.
- There is concern with speeding and on-street parking on Savannah Avenue; speed bumps and no parking signage across driveways should be considered.
- Construction noise is a concern and neighbours should be compensated.

M. Webb, Savannah Avenue, stated:
- The proposed density is too high and the parking seems insufficient.
- The design of the access creates the potential for accidents.
- The claim of affordable housing cannot be supported given the proposed cost of the units.

P. Haddon, James Heights, Quadra Cedar Hill Community Association (QCHCA) member, Savannah Avenue, stated:
- A formal letter of general support has been submitted by the QCHCA; however, three concerns were identified: the safety of the access / egress when used by large vehicles, a possible increase in a demand for additional parking, and impacts to a predominately single family neighbourhood.
- The community contribution may not be adequate for the size of the proposal. The QCHCA is hopeful that a change in Community Contribution Policy may be forthcoming.
- The Quadra Corridor Study should be seen as a priority for the community.

H. Charania, Genevieve Road, stated:
- There is concern that the community contribution is not sufficient for the size of the proposed development; the combined contribution does not adequately represent the increased land value.
- Saanich communities deserve a fair Community Contribution Policy from which non-profit organizations could be exempt.

N. Stepushyn, Cloverdale Avenue, stated:
- He is opposed to the proposal in principle; the Local Area Plan (LAP) of 1999 is in conflict with the Official Community Plan (OCP); the LAP should be amended prior to any new development in the area being approved.
- The proposal is unsuitable for the location, existing housing stock should be retained.
- The community contribution does not adequately compensate area residents for possible inconveniences; traffic calming measures should be more suitably addressed via the amenity package.
M. Moser, Lovat Avenue, stated:
- The proposal is out of character and too dense for the existing neighbourhood; the LAP needs to be amended to protect the community.

W. Burke, Quadra Street, stated:
- Community development can be sensitive; however, this proposal will add to the area in a positive way.

D. Stubbington, Downham Place, stated:
- This is an enjoyable area near many positive amenities making the proposal both commendable and suitable.

D. Assenheimer, 1239 Tattersall Drive, stated:
- Current housing costs make this project supportable; the proposal will encourage residents to remain in the area.

A. Barker, Lovat Avenue, stated:
- The general aesthetics of the project are supportable; however, the proposed density is too much for the existing neighbourhood.
- A lack of visitor parking, access and egress concerns and existing traffic issues make the project impractical and unsupportable.

J. McCaw, Elliston Place, stated:
- Not opposed to the development; however, the proposed density is too much for the existing single family neighbourhood.
- Garages cannot and should not be used as a living space.
- Density should be reduced and parking availability should be increased. The access and egress design is dangerous.

K. Parmar, Bethune Avenue, stated:
- He is in full support of the project.

A. Lambrick, Cloverdale Avenue, stated:
- He supports the proposal due to the lack of existing affordable housing.

M. Ikonen, Whittier Avenue, stated:
- Current real estate listings and statistics in Saanich clearly indicate the need for affordable housing.
- Representing D. Machuk, Cloverdale Avenue, and D. Colbourne, Lovat Avenue, who both strongly support the proposal.

W. Marcinkovic, Vantreight Drive, stated:
- This proposal is less dense than a similar area project on Linwood; it was also built on land that was previously zoned as Single Family.
- Affordable housing is greatly needed in all areas of Saanich.

R. Warnhoff, Savannah Avenue, stated:
- The proposed density is not appropriate for the neighbourhood and parking will not be sufficient.

Resident, Cloverdale Avenue, stated:
- Bike lanes are not used regularly on Cloverdale Avenue; bike use is on the decline.
- The proposed density is not suitable for the neighbourhood and parking will be insufficient.

APPLICANTS RESPONSE:
- There are ongoing traffic concerns throughout Saanich; the applicant has been working with staff to ensure standards of functionality are met, including access and egress.
- Demographics show that dependence on vehicles is declining.
- Parking requirements have been met; however, two spots have been allocated to individual units versus toward visitor parking.
- An estimate cost range of the proposed units is $500,000-$600,000.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Councillor Derman stated:
- There is a need for additional density in Saanich; however, the design needs to be thoughtfully executed in relation to the community it is being proposed within.
- As denser communities are developed, there is a need to consider providing additional public open spaces, green spaces and play areas. This project is close to amenities; however no additional amenities are being proposed.
- There is a need for the planning process to determine what a village is and where density should be located.
- Community contributions should be fair to the neighbourhoods affected by increased density to ensure the community is livable, attractive and desirable.
- This cannot be considered affordable housing.

Councillor Brice stated:
- There are many positive aspects of the proposed development; however, the number of units could to be reconsidered.
- Further refinement of the proposal may need to be considered.

In response to questions from Council, the Acting Director of Planning stated:
- The density of the site is .82:1; this does not represent a significantly high level of density.
- There may be an opportunity for the developer to increase open spaces.
- This area has been designated as Village Centre; therefore, the OCP has directed that additional density is appropriate for the area.

Motion: MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That Council postpone further consideration of the application to rezone property at 1032, 1042 and 1052 Cloverdale Avenue to allow the applicant to consider comments made by Council.”

Councillor Plant stated:
- Concerned with the incongruity between the LAP and the OCP; this needs to be updated to be consistent.
- Development has to benefit the community it is proposed within.
- There may not be enough benefit to the community versus potential challenges; however, the purchase prices are affordable.
- The right fit for the neighbourhood needs some consensus; the applicant should undertake further discussion with the QCHCA and neighbourhood residents.
- Community amenity policies need to be brought in line with other municipalities.

Councillor Sanders stated:
- Direct neighbours do not support the proposed development; their concerns need to be taken into consideration.
- A reduction in density, an increase in viable parking and improvements to the access design should be undertaken.
- This is a great location for density; however, it has to be reasonable and not negatively impact the neighbours.
- The applicant should be creative in determining the amenity contribution.

Councillor Murdock stated:
- The site is appropriate for infill and redevelopment; it is well-served by public transit, and is close to amenities and parks.
- The park does not replace the need for green space on the site; a reduction in units may alleviate concerns regarding increased on-street parking.
- Further discussion should take place with the neighbours to improve the safety, livability and viability of the proposal.

Councillor Haynes stated:
- The fit within the neighbourhood is not quite right; the applicant needs to address the concerns regarding the lack of green space, the proposed density and insufficient parking.
- There is a critical shortage of affordable housing.
- The applicant should reconsider the community contribution.

Councillor Derman stated:
- There needs to be elements of livability incorporated into the proposal; a reduced number of units may result in more green space.
- All area traffic concerns are not the making of this proposal; however, the developer should consider options to help improve those concerns.
- A larger global plan needs to be created to ensure that development is undertaken in the correct manner; clearly defined initiatives need to be in place to help better inform the communities we are trying to create.
- Densification is inevitable; however, it needs to be done in a way that improves communities.

Councillor Wergeland stated:
- The neighbours have concerns with parking and traffic; however, a developer should not inherit existing neighbourhood traffic or parking concerns.
- Affordable and varied housing is important to the viability of all communities.
- A better system for determining community contributions should be undertaken.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
"ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, No. 9413"

PROPOSED REZONING FOR A DUPLEX ON MANN AVENUE

To rezone Lot 4, Section 8A, Lake District, Plan 9811, except that Part in Plan 43838 (814 MANN AVENUE) from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RD-1 (Two Family Dwelling) zone for the purpose of converting an existing single family dwelling into a duplex. A DEVELOPMENT PERMIT will be considered for form and character, with variances for non-basement area, combined side yard setback, allowable projections and the interior side yard setback for two accessory buildings. A COVENANT will also be considered to further regulate the use of the lands and buildings.

The Clerk introduced the following:
- Notice of Public Hearing;
- Report from the Director Planning dated December 8, 2016; recommending the following actions should Council support the application:
  - the application to rezone the subject property from RS-6 to RD-1 be approved; and
  - Final Reading and the Zoning Amendment and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant requiring that the new dwelling be constructed solar ready.
- Servicing Requirements dated May 03, 2016;
- Excerpt from the Committee of the Whole meeting of December 19, 2016;
- Storm Water Management statement dated March 21, 2016;
- Report from the Advisory Design Panel dated June 28, 2016;
- Letter from the Royal Oak Community Association dated August 24, 2016; and
- 7 letters from residents.

APPLICANT:
D. Snowsell, Mann Avenue, presented to Council and highlighted:
- Extensive neighbour consultation has occurred during the application process and concerns were addressed accordingly.
- Existing traffic issues have created parking configuration challenges.
- There is a need for increased density in our community.
- The benefits of the proposed development include upgraded insulation, storm water management improvements, and extensive landscaping.
- Solar conduits will be installed for future development.
- Unsightly cedar trees will be removed from the rear property line.
- The existing vinyl siding will be replaced with Hardie board siding.

PUBLIC INPUT:
M. Henderson, Royal Oak Community Association (ROCA), stated:
- ROCA has formally submitted its general approval of the proposed duplex.
- Attractive landscaping could be utilized to screen parking from the street; one driveway with parallel parking is supported unanimously by ROCA.

D. Jakes, Vanguard Place, stated:
- Mann Avenue is a busy street; a parking configuration that allows a vehicle to drive off the property heading forward is the best solution.
COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion: MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That:
1. the application to rezone the property at 814 Mann Avenue from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RD-1 (Two Family Dwelling) zone be approved;
2. Development Permit DPR00624 be approved; and
3. Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant requiring that the new dwelling be constructed solar ready.”

Councillor Derman stated:
- The parking configuration and overall proposal is supportable.

Councillor Murdock stated:
- While landscaping may assist in screening the parking area, it may still have the appearance of a parking lot.
- The duplex would be an improvement to the neighbourhood and neighbours are in support of the proposal.

Councillor Haynes stated:
- The applicant should consider the addition of green pavers.

Councillor Sanders stated:
- Disappointed that the applicant did not look at an alternative parking configuration; it is hoped that landscaping can improve the appearance and make it more appealing to the neighbourhood.
- Duplexing is a good use of property; however, the appearance of a parking lot is not preferable.

Councillor Plant stated:
- This proposal will result in an improvement to Mann Avenue; the design is pleasing.

Councillor Brice stated:
- The applicant has a clear incentive to make the proposal attractive; the parking configuration is appropriate and supportable.
- The design of the duplex is thoughtful and sensitive to the neighbourhood.

Councillor Wergeland stated:
- The driveway will be compatible with existing neighbourhood driveways.
- The design of the duplex is attractive and supportable.
- He would like input from staff on how to better improve development process timelines.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Bylaw No. 9413 be now passed.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That it be recommended that Council approve and issue Development Permit DPR00624 on Lot 4, Section 8A, Lake District, Plan 9811, Except that Part in Plan 43838 (814 Mann Avenue).”

CARRIED

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.
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