

M. Boyd, S. Laidlaw, M. Sawa, D. Phillips, J. Windecker, D. Wood, and O. Anderson, GVPL Board, presented to Council and highlighted:

- Staff have successfully implemented many of the community inspired priorities targeted by the Board; the budget is realistic and resourceful.
- By increasing accessibility and the impact of library services, the GVPL is living up to its vision which is “your place to connect, discover and imagine”.
- Libraries build bridges.
- The GVPL is in its second year of the five year Strategic Plan.
- There are four branches of GVPL in Saanich; there have been over 887,000 visits to the four branches; over 980 programs have been hosted by the four branches and 145 hosted in the community.
- The programs support health and wellness from babies to seniors, literacy and school engagement through active partnerships.
- There were over 6,896 new cardholders registered in 2016; the Emily Carr branch holds 30% of the membership.
- Facility improvements were completed at the Nellie Mcclung branch.
- Work is being done on the Greater Victoria Literacy Initiative; the library has been part of the education group that developed an action plan for priorities for refugees settling in the Greater Victoria area.
- Budget drivers are negotiated salaries and benefits, the reduction in fines and fee revenue, and the increased use of electronic resources; budget savers include realignment of services, looking at innovative approaches to technology, and partnerships with over 100 community organizations.
- The 2017 contribution increase for Saanich would be 1.72% which means a per capita increase of .84 cents; the provisional budget remains at the previous level.
- There is interest in exploring opportunities for library participation in terms of the future development of the Nigel Valley.
- Changes to the parking lot at Uptown Mall have been positive.
- The GVPL does outreach to a number of seniors facilities and that will increase with the new community inspired librarian services.
- Patrons can return books to any library; that results in collections being refreshed on a regular basis.
- The Emily Carr branch is being used as a quiet work space and for computer access.
- Partnerships with universities and colleges are being explored; the GVPL is committed to being resourceful with an emphasis on partnerships.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The GVPL staff are to be commended; this is the only instance where participating communities collaborate on the budget.
- The GVPL has high value to Saanich residents; it may be appropriate to consider the Nellie Mcclung branch as part of the vision of the Shelbourne Valley Action Plan.
- The way that patrons use libraries has changed; libraries are the last free common space and they are an important part of a community.

Councillor Plant stated:

- The budget increase is acceptable.

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That the motion to approve the GVPL budget and financial plan be lifted from the table.”

CARRIED

MOTION:

“That Council approve the Greater Victoria Public Library Board 2017 Operating Budget and endorse the Five-Year Financial Plan for 2017-2021.”

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1410-04
Report -
Engineering

AWARD OF TENDER 01/17 – REPLACEMENT OF THE GRANGE ROAD AND UPGRADE OF THE WILKINSON ROAD SEWER PUMPING STATIONS

Report of the Director of Engineering dated March 3, 2017 recommending that Council award Tender 01/17 for replacement of the Grange Road and upgrade of the Wilkinson Road Sewer Pumping Stations to Ralmax Contracting Ltd. in the amount of \$609,112.75 (excluding GST).

xref:5370-20
Tender 01/17

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Council award Tender 01/17 for replacement of the Grange Road and upgrade of the Wilkinson Road Sewer Pumping Stations to Ralmax Contracting Ltd., in the amount of \$609,112.75 (excluding GST).”

CARRIED

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Brice, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:03 p.m.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held March 13, 2017

2860-20
Boleskine Road

433 BOLESKINE ROAD – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That the overall parking concerns within this area be referred to the Administrative Traffic Committee.”

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Plant, the meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

.....
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK

DISTRICT OF SAANICH
 MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
 HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
 SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE
MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2017 AT 7:41 P.M.

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

1410-04
 Report -
 Planning

xref: 2860-20
 Boleskine Road

433 BOLESKINE ROAD – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT

Report of the Director of Planning dated February 20, 2017 recommending that Council approve Development Permit Amendment DPA00874 for a proposed residential-commercial space development, and that prior to ratification, the existing covenant be discharged and replaced with a new covenant to secure the items outlined in the report. Variances are requested for total parking and visitor parking. Covenant amendments are also requested.

APPLICANT:

K. Da Silva and M. Miller, Abstract Developments, D. Casey, Watt Consulting Group, and V. Gretka, Morrison Hershfield presented to Council and highlighted:

- The development was previously rezoned for mixed use; research has shown that the market may not be ready for a condominium proposal in this location.
- More rental units are needed in the Greater Victoria area.
- The applicant is proposing an increase in the number of residential units to 95, with two-thirds of the units being studios for the target market of students and employees in the Uptown area.
- The revised application decreases the commercial space by half which will result in less demand for parking.
- A parking plan has been developed; parking stalls would be unbundled from units.
- 150 secure bicycle parking stalls and end-of-trip facilities for each commercial unit would be provided.
- Minor changes to the façade were made in response to the changes of the unit mix; the design will help extend and define the boundaries of the Uptown Corridor area.
- All units will be move-in ready; rents will start below \$800 per month.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- There is no dedicated gathering space within the proposed building although there is plaza space at the corner of Boleskine Road and Whittier Avenue.
- The site coverage has not changed from the previous design; the location is close to amenities and services.
- Bike parking would be located throughout the proposed site.
- The parking stalls for commercial tenants would be offered to residential tenants outside regular business hours at a discounted cost; the commercial visitor stalls would revert to residential visitor stalls outside regular business hours.
- An onsite resident manager will manage parking.
- The Parking Management Study states, and neighbours confirm, there is no

on-street parking available; there currently are parking issues in the area and a need for enforcement.

- The target market for tenants would be students or people working within the Uptown area; it is expected that the demand for parking would be low.
- The community would benefit from having a clean, modern new building that would extend the boundaries of the Uptown Corridor, the addition of a public plaza on the corner of Boleskine and Whittier, and substantial landscaping that would create more visual interest.
- The design revisions reduce the amount of commercial space.
- Achieving BUILT GREEN® Gold energy standards would mean the inclusion of Heat Recovery Ventilation (HRV) systems in each unit; that would make it difficult to keep the units affordable.

PUBLIC INPUT:

S. Phillips, StarFish Medical, Boleskine Road, stated:

- There is concern that the proposed building will mean more shading, decreased view and an increase of on-street parking.
- He is confident that the building will be constructed professionally and will be a positive addition to the neighbourhood; he supports the application.

W. Ford, Culduthel Road, stated:

- There are 9,500 employees, 3,000 residents in the immediate area and 140,000 people residing within 10 minutes of the Douglas Corridor.
- There is a critical need for affordable housing; creativity is needed to solve the parking issues.
- It may be appropriate to limit the length of time for on-street parking.

M. Bourne, Boleskine Road, stated:

- Parking is a concern; the reduction in parking stalls for tenants and the charge for parking may increase on-street parking.
- Studio units would create a transient neighbourhood; the need for affordable housing is recognized.
- There are safety concerns at the intersection of Whittier Avenue and Boleskine Road.

S. Belford, Rowland Avenue stated:

- On-street parking is dangerous on a narrow street without sidewalks; the onus will be on the onsite manager to enforce parking.
- Other concerns are the parking fronting on Boleskine Road and that the design is not BUILT GREEN® Gold energy efficiency standards; the addition of HRV is an important aspect in improving the environment.
- Costs from the inclusion in HRV would be recovered through rental fees; it is not appropriate that rental buildings are not held to the same environmental standards as condominium buildings are.

Resident, Harriet Road, stated:

- The site needs cleaning up; there is a need for increased density that will support businesses in the area.

M. Clarke, Whittier Avenue, stated:

- The proposed building is attractive and the proposed development supportable; there is a need to revitalize the neighbourhood.
- There are challenges with parking during the day due to the businesses in the

- area; it may be appropriate to have Residential Parking Only in the neighbourhood.
- The site is close to public transit and the Galloping Goose; students tend to bike or use public transit.
- M. Kalsbeek, Boleskine Road, stated:
- The revisions to the application are appreciated and supportable; the decrease in commercial content will limit the amount of commercial traffic.
 - It is likely that the target demographic for the suites will embrace public transit and bicycling.
 - The quality of construction and design are good.
- C. Hammel, on behalf of the Mt. View Colquitz Community Association, stated:
- The Community Association does not support the revisions to the design specifically the parking variances and the lack of transition from businesses to residences.
 - Single family dwellings on the site would be preferable.
 - All of the commercial space should be removed from the development; that would alleviate the parking at the front of the building.
 - There will be no one bedroom suites; the building should be built to BUILT GREEN® Gold energy efficiency standards; more community consultation could be undertaken to give the neighbours a sense of comfort.
- R. Wickson, on behalf of the Gorge Tillicum Community Association, stated:
- It is appropriate to have a parking lot or lawn as a buffer between the building and the road; every building should be constructed with solar panels.
 - Increased density is good for the economy; land use should be done appropriately and development be located close to businesses and services.
- M. Henderson, Goyette Road, stated:
- There is concern that the target rents may change over the term of the project.
 - She questions if a covenant can be registered to ensure that rents remain at affordable levels.
- B. Johns, Boleskine Road, stated:
- The proposed development will be improvement for the site; there is currently no on-street parking available on Boleskine Road for customers of businesses in the area.
 - There is concern that unbundling parking will result in increased on-street parking.
- O. Lalani, Whittier Avenue, stated:
- The existing building is an eyesore; the proposed development is supportable.
 - Adding density in this location is appropriate; it will allow residents to work and live in the same community.
 - There is a need for smaller, affordable housing; if housing is not available, people will move to other communities.
- M. Ikonen, Whittier Avenue, stated:
- The applicant reached out to residents to get feedback on design and the proposed revisions; the parking concerns in the neighbourhood pre-exist the application.
 - The onus should be on the municipality to enforce parking restrictions; the developer should not have to try to solve the existing parking problems.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:

- Consultation took place with the Mt. View Colquitz Community Association, the Gorge Tillicum Community Association and the Friends of Gorge.
- On-street parking during the day is a concern; the amount of commercial space in the previous application would have exasperated the parking concerns.
- A covenant will be registered to maintain the building as non-strata titled in perpetuity; the intent of unbundling the parking is to bring affordability to the units.
- BUILT GREEN® Gold energy efficiency ratings were designed for single family homes; wood frame buildings tend to perform well in terms of thermal.
- The cost of installation of HRV would be \$4K each; that would affect the affordability of units.
- The proposed building would be considered greater than the requirements for BUILT GREEN® Silver.
- Based on Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) data, rents under \$850 are considered affordable; rents may be more upon completion of the building depending on market value at that time; hydro costs are not included in rent.
- The number of vehicles can be determined through the tenant screening process.
- There is a commitment to rough-in for future implementation of photovoltaic cells.
- The parking lot is the same as the previously approved application with a mixture of asphalt, concrete and pavers; storm water management will be through an oil/grit separator and chamber.

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

- The engineering specifications for this application require two-hour time limited on-street parking; there may be the need to have more discussion at the Administrative Traffic Committee in terms of overall parking concerns in this neighbourhood and the impacts to residents and businesses.

Motion:

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

- a. **Development Permit Amendment DPA00874 amending Development Permit DPR00542 be approved; and**
- b. **Prior to ratification of the Amended Development Permit, the existing covenant be discharged and replaced with a new covenant to secure the following:**
 - **Construction to a minimum BUILT GREEN® Silver or equivalent energy and environmental performance standards;**
 - **Prohibit restaurant use;**
 - **Provision in trust of funding in the amount of \$3,500 per commercial unit (up to \$10,500) to building cycling end of trip facilities;**
 - **Provision of a minimum of 150 secure bicycle parking spaces (including 95 Class I spaces as per the Zoning Bylaw requirement) and 6 Class II (visitor) spaces (156 spaces in total);**
 - **Construction of the building with a total of 73 shared parking stalls to be assigned and managed by an onsite building manager in accordance with the Parking Management and Traffic Demand Management Strategy prepared by Watt Consulting Group dated August 19, 2016;**

- **Rough-in of the necessary systems to allow for future implementation of photovoltaic cells; and**
- **Prohibit conversion to strata units at any time in the future.”**

Councillor Brice stated:

- The parking concerns are valid; the proposed development meets Saanich's goals for densification, promoting alternative transportation modes and affordability.
- It would be preferable if the building was constructed to BUILT GREEN® Gold energy standards, this development is an asset to Saanich.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- He understands the neighbours' parking concerns; parking in Saanich needs to be addressed as a whole.
- There is a need to address affordable housing and workplace housing; a future that is more bike and active transportation centric and less car centric is appropriate.
- The proposed development will revitalize the area and extend the Douglas Corridor.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The parking challenges in this community are troubling; the neighbourhood is going through considerable changes in land use.
- There is a need for the municipality to look at parking management as a whole.
- Rental units in this area are badly needed; a better consultation process may have enhanced the application.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The property is run down and tired; she is disappointed that the proposed building will not be constructed to BUILT GREEN® Gold energy efficiency standards.
- There may be minimal impacts to the parking concerns because of the proximity to public transit and the Galloping Goose; this is an appropriate location for increased density.
-

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The property is badly maintained; this is an appropriate location for development as it is close to services, employment and transit.
- As high density areas in Saanich are developed, applicants should consider the inclusion of social spaces.
- The Administrative Traffic Committee are already seeing traffic challenges around Uptown Mall.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The applicant has a reputation of quality building; the area already has pre-existing parking issues.
- There is a need to have a policy that outlines the requirements for community amenities.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- This is a transitional time for the community; the neighbourhood is being revitalized.
- It is the ideal location for the development.

- On-street parking is a concern throughout all of Saanich.

Councillor Plant stated:

- Future applications should be considered on a case-by-case basis in terms of parking ratios.
- The addition of more affordable housing is appreciated.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: "That it be recommended that the overall parking concerns within this area be referred to the Administrative Traffic Committee."

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

- There is a need to look at a larger study area in terms of parking concerns; when traffic is enforced on one street, there is a tendency to push the same issues to nearby streets.
- Staff are currently reviewing parking issues in other neighbourhoods.

 Councillor Haynes left the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Mayor Atwell

- It would be helpful to have a sense of what the priorities of staff are.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- There are two proposed developments coming up on the Mt. View property.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

 Councillor Haynes returned to the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

The Director of Engineering left the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

1410-04
Report –
Planning

xref: 2860-25
Cedarglen/
Glendenning/
Lynnfield

1515 & 1517 CEDARGLEN ROAD; 4141, 4157, 4181 & 4185 GLENDENNING ROAD; 4173 LYNNFIELD CRESCENT – REQUEST FOR REMOVAL FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT DEVELOPMENT AREA

Report of the Director of Planning dated February 15, 2017 recommending that Council endorse Option 3 to adopt new mapping of the entire Woodland polygon based on upcoming developments and tree covenant areas for the reasons outlined in the report.

APPLICANTS:

J. Stark, Cedarglen Road, stated:

- There are approximately 50 Garry oaks on their property, along with lawn and garden; 90% of what is on the property was planted by the owner.

G. Stark, Cedarglen Road, stated:

- The EDPA restricts the use and enjoyment of properties; a dated aerial survey was used to determine the EDPA designations.
- The property consists of garden and lawn and has no sensitive ecosystems; it is appropriate to remove the property from the EDPA.

T. Pilkington, Cedarglen Road, stated:

- Saanich staff have visited the property; there is only lawn, garden, play areas and a shed on the property.
- Having unnecessary restrictions on the property is time consuming and stressful; the EDPA contributes to a decrease in property values.
- He is thankful staff are recommending removal from the EDPA Atlas.

R. Boyd, Lynnfield Crescent, stated:

- The vegetation has been cleared twice for subdivision on neighbouring properties and invasive species continue to grow back and migrate to their property.
- The biologist report states that there are no environmentally sensitive areas on the neighbouring property therefore there does not need to be a buffer on their property.

B. Johns, Glendenning Road, stated:

- Invasive species are a challenge on the property; over the years, the property was used for vegetable gardens and livestock.

M. Winstanley, Glendenning Road, stated:

- It is an ongoing battle to remove invasive species on the site; there is no intention to develop the property.
- Council are asked to consider the recommendation to remove the property from the EDPA.

H. Kamphof, on behalf of the owners, Lynnfield Crescent, stated:

- Immediately after the home was purchased, the owners started working on the property to remove the many invasive species on it.
- It is requested that the property be removed from the EDPA.

T. Lea, Cedarglen Road, on behalf of the applicants, stated:

- The subject properties are overwhelmingly dominated by invasive grasses; similar changes have taken place in Mount Douglas Park.
- Removal of invasive species has taken place over many years.
- In 2013, he created a map for the Glendenning properties when he was working on the assessment of a neighbouring property; the map was not based on ground verification.
- Ground verification has now been done and the condition of the properties meet poor ecological conditions following Provincial standards and the guidance document.
- The subject properties on Glendenning Road cannot be considered relatively unmodified rare fragile ecosystems.
- Under the existing EDPA bylaw, the relevant question becomes is there a Garry oak woodland sensitive ecosystem environmentally significant area on these properties; it is his opinion that the Garry oak ecosystem no longer exists.
- The properties on Cedarglen Road consist of manicured lawn, gardens and play structures; there are no sensitive ecosystems on them.

- There is a buffer zone on the property on Lynnfield because the adjacent property was mapped as having a Woodland Sensitive Ecosystem; the buffer runs through the house.
- The properties on Glendenning Road consists of lawn and invasive species; all properties are in poor ecological condition.
- The properties are similar to areas in Mount Douglas Park and would require substantial restoration efforts to return them to a natural state; they are not self-sustaining or viable ecosystems and are already highly degraded.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. Lea stated:

- The map created in 2013 was based on viewing the properties from above; ground verification was not done at the time nor was a guidance document used to verify that sensitive ecosystems existed; ground verification has now been done.
- The map created in 2013 was in relation to an adjacent property.
- Considerable effort would be needed for restoration.

PUBLIC INPUT:

K. Harper, Bonair Place, stated:

- Option 2 is supportable.
- The EDPA bylaw does not call for restoration; restoration is important but should be a community effort.

C. Lowe, Christmas Avenue, stated:

- Option 3 is supportable.
- The motion from the previous Council meeting to temporarily suspend single family zoned properties from the EDPA was disappointing.
- There has yet to be a compelling arguments to remove properties from the EDPA; the properties are not facing hardship nor is development planned.
- The proper process is to review applications for removal when development takes place; the EDPA does not affect property values.
- Aerial photos show that the properties are part of tree corridor that extends from Mount Douglas Park to Cedar Hill Golf Course.
- With some effort, the properties could be restored; if owners let their properties be overgrown with invasive species that provides them with the justification to apply for removal from the EDPA.
- There needs to be incentives for property owners to maintain and restore native ecosystems; the mapping needs to be updated.
- There is concern with the contradictions between the current mapping and the mapping provided in 2013; an independent review of the properties may be appropriate.

L. Adam, Mountain Road, stated:

- Owners have undertaken a great deal of effort in applying to have their properties removed; there is a need to protect sensitive ecosystems but not to the detriment of property owners.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

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

- Hundreds of thousands of dollars have not been spent by Saanich on legal fees in relation to the EDPA.
- There are approximately 2,200 Saanich properties in the EDPA and

approximately 60 have applied for removal from the EDPA.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Environmental Services stated:

- The 2013 report from Aqua-tex Scientific Consulting for the application for 1516 Mt. Douglas Cross Road states that the mapping was re-confirmed during a site visit; Mr. Lea advises that he did not field verify the adjacent properties.
- The staff recommendation was based on sufficient information and data showing the opinions of other biologists.
- Invasive species can grow significantly over time, so there could be a change to the percent coverage of native species.
- Where access was granted, staff visited the properties; however the time of year was not the most desirable for observing native species.
- The staff recommendation to remove properties and refine the mapping was made through a combination of observations including current land use, the residents' knowledge of the property, and pending development.
- There will be a significant break in the tree canopy and ecosystem value due to development; covenants are proposed for the properties for what will remain.
- If there are remnant ecosystems under tree canopy then there is more value in the tree canopy as part of a connection and these areas make the most sense for consideration for restoration; there is the need for a more holistic view of the mapped area.

Motion:

MOVED by Mayor Atwell and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That staff be requested to prepare an amendment to Plate 28 of Schedule 3 to Appendix "N" of the Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2008, No. 8940 for the removal of the Woodland at 1515 and 1517 Cedarglen Road, 4141, 4157, 4181 and 4185 Glendenning Road, and 4173 Lynnfield Crescent from the Environmental Development Permit Area Atlas, and that a Public Hearing be called to consider the amendment."

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Even after all of the efforts of the property owners to remove invasive species, the environmentally sensitive areas on the properties are degraded; invasive species on adjacent properties continue to spread to these properties.
- There is a need to focus on restoration of municipal parks.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The home owners have followed the proper process and made application for removal from the EDPA; a qualified professional biologist's report states that there are no sensitive ecosystems on the properties.
- Because of the amount of invasive species in the area, it is unlikely that restoration would be successful.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The biologist's report is a vital part of the decision-making process; the applicants have met the criteria of the application process.
- There are mapping errors on these properties; the applicants have been great stewards of their properties.
- Tree corridors are vital to the environment.

MOVED by Mayor Atwell and Seconded by Councillor Plant: "That the meeting extend past 11:00 p.m."

CARRIED

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Environmental Services stated:

- If there was a development proposal on properties that have been removed from the EDPA, the Tree Bylaw would not protect trees within the building envelope or service corridor.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The EDPA would help in the development stage to protect trees within the building envelope or service corridor; there is no protection at this stage under the Tree Bylaw.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- An environmental development permit would look at issues like tree protection in a building envelope or service corridor; the environmental area is not to stop development, it ensures that there is sensitive development.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- There is concern that there will always be lands with higher ecological value that would be more important to protect than the current application.
- He has the sense that it may be the underlying philosophy of the EDPA and the nature of the property that will continue to be what motivates the discussion and the vote.

Councillor Plant stated:

- He supports the findings of the biologist.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- There is a need to know what is being protecting, why it should be protected and how it will be protected.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
With Councillors Brownoff, Murdock and Sanders OPPOSED**

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Plant, the meeting adjourned at 11:08 p.m.

.....
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK