

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

- The delegation made some good suggestions in terms of alleviating the safety concerns identified; further consultation with MoTI would be appropriate.
- Preparing a report to Council will add to the timeline; it may be more appropriate, in terms of timelines, to have Council copied on correspondence with MoTI.
- Staff are currently in discussions with MoTI and it may be suitable to include these items in the discussions.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Staff could prepare a report for Council; these concerns could be included in current discussions with MoTI.

The Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- Typically ATC does not make recommendations to Council; staff can provide recommendations to Council.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The community has expressed concerns with aspects of the construction of the McKenzie Interchange; he looks forward to seeing the recommendations of staff.
- It is important to expedite timelines for receipt of the report.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- He is supportive of this item being referred to ATC; MoTI has created a challenge with the road closure at Portage Road.
- MoTI could participate in discussions so they are clear on the municipality's expectations for improvements to Admirals Road.
- It would be expeditious for Council to receive copies of correspondence rather than having staff prepare a report.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- Referral to the ATC is supportable; it is appropriate to keep Council informed regarding discussions with MoTI; it will also be important to keep the public involved in the process.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Council will be kept informed of the results of the discussions at the ATC.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- ATC will also communicate with stakeholders.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1410-02
Delegation

CORDOVA BAY VILLAGE VISION GROUP

Subject: Planning concept for generation of a Village Area Plan for Cordova Bay Village.

C. Millard, Cordova Bay Village Vision Group (CBVVG) and Dr. D. Hopkins presented to Council. They expressed the need for a Cordova Bay Village Master Plan as it is one of the fastest growing communities in Saanich with many active development applications pending. They also requested that a Saanich Urban Planner be hired to coordinate a full planning and modelling charrette for the Cordova Bay community.

In response to questions from Council, the delegation stated:

- The Cordova Bay Association for Community Affairs is aware of the requests of the CBVVG.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- It would be appreciated if the CBVVG would work "as one" with the Cordova Bay Association for Community Affairs.

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

- Discussions with the CBVVG took place and a number of items were discussed including the request for a Master Plan for the Cordova Bay Village and the concern over the proposed development application for the Cordova Bay shopping mall.
- In the near future, staff will be presenting options for Council to decide how to deploy resources for local area plan updates.
- Council cannot legally prevent an applicant from coming forward with a development proposal and Council would be legally obligated to adjudicate a development application on the property.
- No variances are being requested for the development application for the shopping centre.
- It may be appropriate to have facilitated consultation with the applicant and neighbourhood but consultation is at the discretion of the applicant.
- The Local Area Planning/Village Corridor Planning process could be expedited and Council could determine that this community be a priority; staff will present Council with options for the neighbourhood planning process at a meeting tentatively booked for June.

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

- If a form and character development permit application with no variances came forward, Council would have to provide clear rationale why it would potentially consider a postponement; if an applicant meets the requirements of a development permit, a permit would be issued.
- Applicants may still move forward with development applications while a review of Local Area Plans is being undertaken.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- Facilitated consultation to discuss options with the applicant of the shopping centre and neighbours may be appropriate.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That staff be requested to bring forward a report, at their earliest opportunity that would provide options for expediting the Cordova Bay community in the Local Area Plan, Villages, Centres and Corridors update.”

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Local Areas Plans are out of date; the staff report will be helpful for prioritization.

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

- Staff are preparing a report that will come forward tentatively in June.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- He is supportive of the motion; it is the right thing to do.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

 The Director of Engineering left the meeting at 7:57 p.m.

Minutes

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Council adopt the minutes of the April 24, 2017 Council and Committee of the Whole meetings.”

CARRIED

BYLAWS

2870-30
Saanich Road

ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT – NEW ZONE C-3U

Final Reading of “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2016, No. 9392”. To create a new Shopping Centre/Uptown zone.

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: “That Bylaw No. 9392 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”

CARRIED

2870-30
Saanich Road

3440 SAANICH ROAD – REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT

Final Reading of “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2016, No. 9393” and approval of Development Permit Amendment DPA00863. To rezone the subject property from C-3L (Shopping Centre/Major Liquor Retail) zone to C-3U (Shopping Centre/Uptown) zone for the proposed construction of 134 rental apartments and townhouses and 5,157 m² gross leasable area of retail commercial space.

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: “That Bylaw No. 9393 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Council approve and issue Development Permit Amendment DPA00863 on Lot A, Sections 7 and 9, Victoria District, Plan VIP85149 except part in Plan VIP85154 (3440 Saanich Road).”

CARRIED

2310-20
SVAP

xref: 1110-30
Official
Community Plan
Bylaw

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT BYLAW

Final Reading of “Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2008, Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 9419”. To update the appendices to include Appendix “O” Shelbourne Valley Action Plan, and make necessary housekeeping amendments as outlined in the amendment bylaw.

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Murdock: “That Bylaw No. 9419 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto.”

CARRIED

1410-04
Report - Planning

xref: 1110-30
Official
Community Plan
Bylaw

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW AMENDMENT – TEMPORARY EXEMPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA (EDPA)

Report of the Director of Planning dated April 27, 2017 requesting that Council provide direction to staff on:

- Bylaw Option No. 9422
- Bylaw Option No. 9427

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That Bylaw No. 9427 be introduced and read.”

Councillor Haynes stated:

- This option captures the original intent of Council’s discussions.

The Motion was then Put and DEFEATED due to a Tie Vote with Councillors Brownoff, Murdock, Sanders and Wergeland OPPOSED

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

- If neither bylaw option is approved for First Reading, this item would not move forward to a Public Hearing.

MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That Bylaw No. 9422 be introduced and read.”

Councillor Brice stated:

- The bylaw is supportable as it highlights the original intent; First Reading of the bylaw would start the process to exempt the properties from the Environmental Development Permit Area (EDPA).

Councillor Haynes stated:

- He is disappointed that the option to move forward with Bylaw No. 9427 was not supported; Bylaw No. 9422 does not capture the original intent but he will support it to ensure that the process moves forward.

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

- The consultant's report will be available no later than the end of June; the report has not been provided to staff.

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

- Council has directed that staff not play a role in adjudicating the consultant's report; the report will be brought forward to Council.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- It would be appropriate to wait to receive the consultant's report before making decisions on how to move forward and allow a full debate on potential changes to the EDPA bylaw.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He would support waiting for the consultant's report if he could be assured that the report and any subsequent consultation would be done in a timely manner; in the meantime, proceeding with Bylaw No. 9422 is supportable.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- It would be appropriate to wait for the consultant's report; further discussions will be needed once the report is received on how to move forward on the EDPA bylaw as a whole.
- It is not a good use of staff and resources to go through the process multiple times.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She also supports waiting for the consultant's report before moving forward with reviewing applications for removal from the EDPA; a great deal of staff time and resources have gone into reviewing applications for removal and once the report is received, more time will be going into reviewing the recommendations.

Councillor Plant stated:

- He supports the motion to proceed with Bylaw No. 9422 although he is disappointed that the option to proceed with Bylaw No. 9427 did not go forward.
- He is not confident that the consultant's report will be available before the end of June and whether staff and Council will be ready to act on it; in the interim, proceeding with Bylaw No. 9422 is supportable.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- He is supportive of proceeding with Bylaw No. 9422; this is a temporary solution to the requests for removal from the EDPA.
- There is a great amount of public expectation that a temporary suspension from the EDPA takes place.

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

PUBLIC INPUT ON COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS

Public Input on
Council Agenda
Items

Nil

RESOLUTIONS FOR ADOPTION

1310-40
CRD Traffic Safety
Commission

CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT (CRD) BYLAW NO. 4166, TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION ESTABLISHMENT BYLAW NO. 1, AMENDMENT BYLAW NO. 4, 2017

Request from the CRD that Council give consent to the adoption of Bylaw No. 4166, "Traffic Safety Commission Establishment Bylaw No. 1, 1990, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017".

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That Council consent to the adoption of the Capital Regional District Bylaw No. 4166, Traffic Safety Commission Establishment Bylaw No. 1, Amendment Bylaw No. 4, 2017, in accordance with Section 346 of the *Local Government Act*."

Councillor Plant stated:

- The CRD Traffic Safety Commission wishes to commemorate Constable Sarah Beckett's life by offering an annual memorial scholarship for youth entering a career in law enforcement.
- In order to amend the establishing bylaw, consent is required from 2/3's of the municipalities in the CRD.
- The intent is to award the first scholarship of \$2,000 in 2017.
- The scholarship would be funded through municipal contributions levied to the CRD Traffic Safety Commission.
- The CRD has offered scholarships in the past.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The Commission is to be commended in bringing this item forward; it is appropriate to move forward with recognition for Constable Beckett.
- A scholarship will enable a young person to enter into a career in policing.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The motion is supportable.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- This is a worthy tribute to Constable Beckett.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1410-01
Council
Proceedings

COUNCIL MEETING OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPAL HALL

Memorandum from the Legislative Manager dated April 26, 2017 requesting that Council consider changing the location of the May 13, 2017 Public Hearing.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Council authorize that the May 13, 2017 Public Hearing be held at the Garth Homer Society, or elsewhere in the municipality as required.”

In response to questions from Council, the Legislative Manager stated:

- If there was a need for a continuation of the Public Hearing, the motion would allow an additional meeting to be held outside the Municipal Hall; the Public Hearing is proposed to commence at 10:00 a.m. with room availability to approximately 6:00 p.m.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:38 p.m.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held May 1, 2017

2860-40
Mount Douglas
Cross Road

1542 MOUNT DOUGLAS CROSS ROAD – DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT AND REQUEST TO REMOVE THE SUBJECT DWELLING FROM THE SAANICH HERITAGE REGISTRY

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Council order a temporary protection for 60 days and request that staff further discuss possible options with the applicant/owner for the future development of the site that includes the retention, restoration and protection of the heritage dwelling.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Council not support the three requested variances of the Development Variance Permit application for 1542 Mount Douglas Cross Road.”

CARRIED

2870-30
Beckwith Avenue

980, 990, 1000 BECKWITH AVENUE – COUNCIL REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL REVIEW

MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That an Environmental and Social Review not be required for the development application at 980, 990, 1000 Beckwith Avenue.”

CARRIED

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That the regular Council meeting be adjourned and Council reconvene In Camera in Committee Room No. 2 in accordance with Section 90 (1) (a), (e) and (i) of the *Community Charter*.”**

CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Brice, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 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, MAY 1, 2017 AT 8:22 P.M.

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

1300-40 **MCPHERSON PLAYHOUSE**
The City of Victoria presented on the future of McPherson Playhouse.

- APPLICANT:**
Councillors M. Alto and P. Madoff, City of Victoria, and L. DeLarge (President), B. Smith (Past President) and R. Joynt (Manager of External Relations), the Royal & McPherson Theatres Society (RMTS), presented to Council and highlighted:
- The McPherson Playhouse is owned by the City of Victoria exclusively; the Royal Theatre is owned by the Capital Regional District (CRD) and its public support comes from the Districts of Saanich and Oak Bay and the City of Victoria.
 - Both theatres are managed by the Royal and McPherson Theatre Society (RMTS), a not-for-profit corporation; the governance structure is such that there is one Council appointee from each of Saanich, Oak Bay and Victoria, 3-5 Directors appointed from the CRD and 5-7 Directors elected from the community at large.
 - Over 53,000 people attended shows at the McPherson Theatre in 2016; over \$95,000 in discounts were provided to the community in 2016.
 - 10.6% of Saanich residents attended a show at the Playhouse in 2016.

- The RMTS has approximately 230 employees.
- Public investment in both theatres have been static since 1998; discounts are becoming more challenging to provide every year.
- Aligning theatre ownership and funding would benefit the entire region and allow the two theatres to work together; governance would be improved and efficiencies in the operation of the theatres could be identified.
- They are seeking consideration in having Saanich join in on the conversation about the future of the Royal and McPherson theatres; it is the hope that all municipalities in the region would participate in discussions.
- Arrangements have been made to present to all the municipalities in the region; once that is completed and feedback has been received, the group that have expressed interest in participating in discussions would be brought together to identify next steps and solutions.
- Opportunities to maximize the use of the two theatres through collaboration and cooperation would be explored.
- They will report back to Council on the results of the presentations with other municipalities.

In response to questions, the applicants stated:

- Although specific outcomes have not yet been identified, transferring ownership to the CRD may be a possible outcome of discussions; the results of the discussions with municipalities will help to guide decisions.
- From a management perspective, if both theatres were a combined service, it would allow more flexibility and offer the opportunity to build capacity.
- In 2014, an HVAC and boiler system were installed separate from the City of Victoria; no additional funding was requested for this work other than what was accumulated from regular grant monies and from the funds that the Society itself puts into the capital budget.
- The expectation is the group would look at financing and governance; approximately 15% of RMTS' operating costs is received from municipal funding.
- Expanding the theatres' capacity to do more work is a goal.

PUBLIC INPUT:

K. Johnson, Landis Place, stated:

- Council is urged to continue the conversation; further discussion is well worth the investment of attention.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Mayor Atwell: "That Council express an initial interest in discussions with the City of Victoria on the future of the McPherson Playhouse."

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- It would be difficult to become a funding partner; Saanich has its own infrastructure to support and maintain.

Councillor Plant stated:

- It is appropriate to continue with discussions; at this point, there has been no request for funding.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- Participating in discussions would allow for more information and is not binding.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- There is a need to be part of the conversation; Saanich has its own infrastructure that it must support.
- There is already a Saanich appointee to the Royal & McPherson Theatres Society Board.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- After presentations to other municipalities, the parties interested in participating in further discussions would meet to design the next steps of the process; if Saanich wished to participate in future discussions, there would be a need to designate a representative.
- Towards the end of June, the applicants will return to Saanich Council and give a summary of what was heard; at that time, Saanich could decide if it wished to participate.
- Discussions would be completed by the end of the year so that direction could be taken back to the CRD.
- It is not anticipated that recommendations would affect the 2018 CRD budget because sufficient discussions would not have been completed by that time.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Further discussion should take place with community theatres and how a comprehensive arts complex may impact them; a funding request would be a concern and would have to be referred to the Finance Standing Committee for discussion.
- She is also concerned that there is already an appointee to the Royal & McPherson Theatres Society Board.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- He would like to hear more about the expectations of Saanich and the results of the discussions with other municipalities, but, at this point, he does not feel comfortable going beyond that.

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That the motion be amended to add and participation will be considered following the receipt of information from the Royal and McPherson Theatres Society detailing their discussions with other municipalities and future expectations.”

Councillor Sanders stated:

- It would be appropriate to report back to Saanich Council once all the municipalities have had a chance to provide feedback.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- The discussions are worthwhile and will give some certainty to the RMTS.

The Amendment to the Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Councillor Plant stated:

- The CRD Arts Commission may need to be included in discussions; he is looking forward to hearing what other municipalities have to say.
- Discussions may result in finding a way to do business better.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- Public funding has not increased in 20 years.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The motion is supportable; she would be concerned if the results of the conversations include a request for a partnership funding agreement.
- Theatres are good economic generators for the surrounding community.

**The Main Motion, as Amended, was then Put and CARRIED
with Councillor Wergeland OPPOSED**

Amended Motion:

“That Council express an initial interest in discussions with the City of Victoria on the future of the McPherson Playhouse; and participation will be considered following the receipt of information from the RMTS detailing their discussions with other municipalities and future expectations.”

1410-04
Report –
Planning

1542 MOUNT DOUGLAS CROSS ROAD – DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT AND REQUEST TO REMOVE THE SUBJECT DWELLING FROM THE SAANICH HERITAGE REGISTRY

xref: 2860-40
Mount Douglas
Cross Road

Report of the Director of Planning dated March 6, 2017 recommending that Council amend the Saanich Heritage Registry by removing the subject single family dwelling; request the applicant document the building through photographs and provide these and any other associated archival information to the Saanich Archives; request that the applicant deconstruct the dwelling and reuse, or offer to others, the salvage material; and not support Development Variance Permit DVP00373 for a proposed new single family dwelling. Variances are requested for front and rear yard setbacks, and building height.

APPLICANT:

W. Peereboom, Victoria Design Group, presented to Council and highlighted:

- The property is a unique, triangular shaped lot which effects the rear yard setback; both the north and east boundaries become the rear yard.
- The building envelope permitted under the current zoning is small; the proposed dwelling will be stepped back from the street to reduce the massing.
- A small porch area with shading is proposed within the east rear setback area; there is no longer a need for a height variance.
- If the existing heritage home was to be retained, there would be a need to bring every aspect of the home up to the current Building Code.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:

- The property is zoned RS-18; the size of the proposed home is consistent with RS-12 zoning.
- The small building envelope, the shape of the lot and required setbacks result in hardship in terms of building on the property.
- The applicant was not involved in communications with the Community Association or neighbours.

PUBLIC INPUT:

S. Colwell, Saanich Heritage Foundation (SHF), stated:

- The existing dwelling is in the Saanich Heritage Registry; the SHF met with the applicant and determined that the dwelling is worthy of conservation and offers heritage value to the community.
- There are incentive options available to the applicant in exchange for conservation; these options should be fully explored before a decision is made to deconstruct the dwelling.
- The applicant should work with staff to develop a creative and respectful strategy to allow for preservation of the dwelling.

P. Summers, Mount Douglas Cross Road, stated:

- The existing heritage structure is worth preserving; it is important to try to save heritage properties.
- Tearing down a heritage dwelling to build a monster home is unacceptable; the size and visual impact of the proposed home is not within the character of the neighbourhood.
- The variances should not be approved; there is no hardship to the applicant.

N. Lewthwaite, Mount Douglas Cross Road, stated:

- The requested variances to alter the setbacks are not supportable; there is no hardship on the part of the applicant.
- A huge home on a small area of the property is not appropriate; there is concern with the potential to further subdivide the property.
- The proposed dwelling does not fit within the character of the neighbourhood; the existing home has heritage value and is worthy of protection.
- There are very few homes left in Saanich that represents that era; the existing home could be remediated and reclaimed.
- The applicant has not consulted with neighbours.
- There is also concern with the location of the new driveway, just past an "s" curve on Mount Douglas Cross Road; the location of this driveway could be hazardous and impede the flow of traffic.

R. Katz, Durrance Road, stated:

- Approving the variances may set precedence for other developers to ask for the same considerations.

K. Johnson, Saanich Heritage Foundation (SHF) and Hallmark Heritage Society (HHS) stated:

- The SHF and HHS are opposed to the demolition of the heritage home; over the past years, there are disturbing trends to demolish heritage homes.
- The Official Community Plan states heritage is valued and encourages preservation and management; it is important to protect existing resources.
- The existing home has historical significance and is an important reminder of the rural history of Saanich; it should be preserved and protected.
- Council is urged not to approve a demolition permit until a viable development application, with no variances, comes forward; the dwelling could be designated as a heritage structure as permitted under Provincial legislation.
- If the request to deconstruct is approved; the applicant should be asked to provide measured drawings of the original home and a full written and photographic record of architectural finishes; the building could then be deconstructed and materials be offered for reuse.

APPLICANTS RESPONSE:

- The owner did not have knowledge of the required setbacks when the property was purchased.
- It is a large lot with a small building envelope.

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

- As outlined in the report, Council has three options; approve a temporary protection order which would give 60 days for further discussion with the applicant and SHF members; compensate the owner and designate the dwelling as a heritage structure; or remove it from the Heritage Registry and allow the home to be deconstructed.
- The proposed location of the new driveway has been deemed to be satisfactory in terms of sight lines and the ability to move two vehicles on and off the site with reasonable safety.
- There are not many properties that have a similar shape; properties that have two rear lots lines are not uncommon.
- Historically, inclusion on the Saanich Heritage Registry was voluntary and if an owner requested removal, it was typically approved by past Councils.
- Without the variances, the approximate size of the home could be up to 346 square metres for a two-storey building and up to 519 square metres for a three-storey building.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**Motion:**

MOVED by Councillor Sanders and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That it be recommended that Council order a temporary protection for 60 days and request that staff further discuss possible options with the applicant/owner for the future development of the site that includes the retention, restoration and protection of the heritage dwelling."

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The heritage home is worthy of protection; there are options available to the applicant to preserve the home.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The motion is supportable; having further discussions with the applicant is appropriate.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She supports the motion; the applicant should recognize the concerns of the neighbours.
- Discussions should include the possibility of retention of the heritage building and opportunities that would benefit the retention.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- A temporary protection order is reasonable; further discussion is appropriate.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Motion: **MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That it be recommended that Council not support the three requested variances of the Development Variance Permit application for 1542 Mount Douglas Cross Road.”**

Councillor Haynes stated:

- A home as large as this should be located in an appropriate area and setting; neighbours and the Community Association do not support the requested variances.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The size of the proposed home is not supportable; the applicant should consider a smaller dwelling.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The requested variances are not supportable; the proposed dwelling is too large for the lot.

Councillor Brice stated:

- The applicant has committed in removing the request for a variance for building height.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

1410-04
Report –
Planning

xref: 2870-30
Beckwith
Avenue

980, 990, 1000 BECKWITH AVENUE – COUNCIL REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL REVIEW

Report of the Director of Planning dated April 7, 2017 recommending that Council endorse that an Environmental and Social Review not be required for a proposed subdivision to create 14 new lots for a total of 17 lots for single family dwelling use.

The Director of Planning stated:

- The Environmental and Social Review (ESR) process was put in place many years ago to identify the environmental and social impacts of complex zoning and subdivision applications; over the years, the need for (ESRs) have diminished as capacity of staff has increased and the quality and breadth of supporting information provided by the applicant has improved.
- If Council feels that it needs further information or that a different type/level of analysis is required, an ESR could be completed by a third party consultant; as part of that process, Council could provide direction on what analysis would be undertaken.
- Alternatively staff can be requested by Council to provide more detailed/specific analysis prior to the rezoning/subdivision application being brought forward to Council for review and consideration.
- The last ESR was requested in approximately 2002; having the option of requesting an ESR may be helpful in certain circumstances and may provide increased comfort for residents and Council that a particular issue has been fully examined.

PUBLIC INPUT:

H. Wolf, Kincaid Street stated:

- It is important to protect the land base for future farmers.

H. Charania, on behalf of the North Quadra Community Association, stated:

- The Community Association prefers that an ESR be completed; if Council determines that an ESR is not needed, Council and staff are urged to ensure

that all perimeters of the ESR are assessed during the application process.

- An independent consultant should be hired to ensure that an objective ESR is completed; the application process and the ESR could be done concurrently so as not to slow the application process down.

G. Holloway, stated:

- There could be environmental and social impacts on the Urban Containment Boundary as a result of development.

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

- In this case, Council is considering whether or not an ESR is required for the proposed rezoning/subdivision application; requests for changes to the Urban Containment Boundary would be reviewed as part of the standard application review process.

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

- The Environmental and Social Review Process Council Policy states that the selection of the consultant shall be made by the applicant and approved by the Director of Planning prior to the work commencing.

D. Chambers, Blenkinsop Road, stated:

- An ESR is required for this property to ensure that the environmental and social impacts on the neighbourhood are assessed.

M. Collins, Faithwood Road, stated:

- An ESR should be undertaken when there are any potential changes to the UCB being proposed.

L. Chambers, Blenkinsop Road, stated:

- Staff have the in-house expertise to complete an ESR.

K. Cherry, Queensbury Avenue, stated:

- An ESR is needed to explain the impact of development to the developer.

R. Katz, Durrance Road, stated:

- It would be beneficial for developers to have the results of an ESR.

L. Mari, Planster Consulting Limited, stated:

- It is premature to consider an ESR as no discussion has taken place with staff or with the community; having an ESR undertaken would take additional time and is unnecessary.

M. Henderson, Goyette Road, stated:

- If there has been no ESR done since 2002, she questions why one is being considered for this application.
- The potential social impacts extend far beyond the immediate neighbourhood.
- Having an independent consultant undertake the ESR would be preferred.

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

- An ESR has not been undertaken since 2002 although the policy is in effect; where an ESR for a rezoning application is not recommended by staff, Mayor and Council may request the matter be placed on a Council agenda for consideration.

Councillor Brice stated:

- A member of Council has requested that the matter of whether or not an ESR is needed for the subject application be considered.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

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

- The subject property is zoned A-1 (Rural).

Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That it be recommended that an Environmental and Social Review not be required for the development application at 980, 990, 1000 Beckwith Avenue.”

Councillor Plant stated:

- He had requested that the item be placed on the agenda for consideration; staff have the expertise to undertake the review of the environmental and social impacts as part of the regular application review process.
- When potential changes to the UCB are reviewed, there is a need to look at the UCB as a whole.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He supports the motion; an ESR is not required for this development application.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The information that is available through the regular application review process is sufficient, therefore an ESR is not required.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- The motion is supportable.

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

- Definitions of “major” or “minor” changes are not defined in the current UCB policies; this gives Council flexibility and discretion in considering an application on its merits; depending on Council’s decision, assent of the electors through a referendum or plebiscite may be needed.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The review process undertaken as part of the regular application process is in-depth; there are also other mechanisms that address potential impacts such as Sustainability Checklists.
- It is concerning that there is no definition of “minor” or “major” in the OCP policies; the motion is supportable.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- The documentation provided to Council in terms of environmental and social impacts has increased over time; the information on the social impacts of change may not be quantitative.
- He supports the motion; the potential social impacts of development need further discussion.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Haynes, the meeting adjourned at 10:37 p.m.

.....
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....
MUNICIPAL CLERK