PUBLIC HEARING

2870-30
Cloverdale

“ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, NO. 9410”

PROPOSED REZONING FOR A 13-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 13-unit townhouse development. A DEVELOPMENT PERMIT will be considered for form and character. 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;
- Reports from the Director of Planning dated May 29, 2017, November 22, 2016 and August 18, 2016 recommending:
  - Approval of the rezoning application and the Development Permit;
  - That Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant for:
    - 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;
    - $14,000 to be provided to Saanich for use in the construction of a children’s water spray pad and permanent washrooms at Rutledge Park;
    - $14,000 to the Saanich Affordable Housing Fund;
    - $26,000 to the Saanich Transportation Fund for use either towards a future crosswalk on Cloverdale Avenue, or if an evaluation shows a crosswalk at that location is not warranted, towards a sidewalk on Savannah Avenue.”
  - Engineering Servicing Requirements;
- Excerpts from the Public Hearing of January 24, 2017 and from the Committee of the Whole meeting of September 12, 2016;
- Storm Water Management Statement dated August 7, 2015;
– Sustainability Statement dated received August 25, 2015;
– Advisory Design Panel Report dated December 23, 2015;
– Two letters from the Quadra Cedar Hill Community Association;
– Three letters from the applicant, including an attendance sheet and Questionnaire Submissions from an Open House held February 21, 2017; and
– 41 letters from residents.

APPLICANT:
Mr. J. Gill, SEBA Construction, stated:
– The Official Community Plan designates the area as a village centre and the proposed development conforms.
– With respect to the parking issues raised by residents, he pursued this problem and learned that tenants of an apartment building on Savannah Ave park on the street to avoid the parking fees required by their building. Saanich could perhaps assist these residents in some way.
– An intensive consultation process was undertaken and the design of the project was revised to better suit the neighbourhood.
– Changes include reducing the units from 14 to 13; removing walkways at the rear; increased separation between the blocks; parking on site for all units; increased bike parking; removing deck posts; adding a common area.
– There are no variances required and an additional community contribution is proposed.
– He would be willing to covenant the garages so that they are only used for parking of cars.
– The area has many amenities the proposed development will add additional features for the benefit of the community.

PUBLIC INPUT:
A. Beck, James Heights, on behalf of the Quadra Cedar Hill Community Association, stated:
– The association has participated since 2014 in consultation with the developer and community.
– Parking, density, and character of the neighbourhood were the main concerns raised.
– The developer responded to these concerns and the Association supports the project.
– The covenant offered by the applicant to ensure car parking in garages is supportable.

M. Danyal, Savannah Avenue, stated:
– He supports the construction of affordable housing in the area.

N. Stepushyn, Cloverdale Avenue, stated:
– The proposed development has been improved and now suits the neighbourhood.
– This is a family area which would benefit from better pedestrian connections to local parks; the proposed sidewalk and crosswalk will be welcomed.

D. Assenheimer, Tattersall Drive, stated:
– This is a good project
D. Stubbington, Downham Place, stated:
- He supports the project.

W. Bern, Quadra Avenue, stated:
- He supports the project.

C. Nash, Tattersall Drive, stated:
- The area should remain as single family and low density; he supports the existing Local Area Plan.

K. Parmar, Bethune Drive, stated:
- He supports the project.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Current Planning stated that it would not be difficult to enforce the suggested garage covenant; however, the zoning bylaw may be used for enforcement of this parking plan.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

**Motion:**

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

1. (a) The application to rezone from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RT-FC (Attached Housing Four Corners) zone be approved; and
2. (b) Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant for:
   - 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;
   - $14,000 to be provided to Saanich for use in the construction of a children’s water spray pad and permanent washrooms at Rutledge Park;
   - $14,000 to the Saanich Affordable Housing Fund;
   - $26,000 to the Saanich Transportation Fund for use either towards a future crosswalk on Cloverdale Avenue, or if an evaluation shows a crosswalk at that location is not warranted, towards a sidewalk on Savannah Avenue.”

Councillor Brice stated:
- This is an example of a good project where the developer and neighbourhood worked together.

Councillor Brownoff stated:
- She thanked the developer and the community for their consultation which resulted in a better development.
- Densification is anticipated in this area.

Councillor Sanders stated:
- She appreciates the improvements made to the project.
Councillor Haynes stated:
- He complimented the community association and neighbours for their contribution.
- The applicant has added a pocket park and engaged with interested parties.

Councillor Wergeland stated:
- Engaging the community resulted in a good project.
- The community contributions arising from this development will benefit the area.

Councillor Plant stated:
- It appears that a covenant will not be necessary to enforce the parking.
- He appreciates the consultation undertaken by the applicant.

Mayor Atwell stated:
He supports the application.
- The design of the project has been improved and makes sense for the area.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED.

Motion: “ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, NO. 9410”
Second and Third Readings

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Bylaw No. 9410 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That Bylaw No. 9410 be now passed.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That it be recommended that Council approve Development Permit DPR00619 on Lot 9, Section 63, Victoria District, Plan 4628, except that Part in Plan 15395 (1032 Cloverdale Avenue) and on Lot 8, Section 63, Victoria District, Plan 4628, except that Part in Plan 14267 (1042 Cloverdale Avenue) and on Lot 7, Section 63, Victoria District, Plan 4628, except that Part in Plan 14267 (1052 Cloverdale Avenue).”

CARRIED
PROPOSED REZONING FOR A RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION ON DEL MONTE AVENUE

To rezone Lot B, Sections 45 and 46, Lake District, Plan 9363 (5117 DEL MONTE AVENUE) from A-1 (Rural) Zone to RS-12 (Single Family Dwelling) Zone for the purpose of subdivision in order to create three additional lots for a total of four lots for single family dwelling use. A 5,696.7 m² portion of the land will be dedicated to Saanich as parkland. A COVENANT will be considered to further regulate the use of the lands and buildings.

The Clerk introduced the following:
- Notice of Public Hearing;
- Reports from the Director of Planning dated April 19, 2017, and April 22, 2016 recommending:
  - Approval of the rezoning application;
  - That Final Reading be withheld pending registration of a covenant for the following:
    - To prohibit subdivision of the subject parcel until the area shown as proposed park is dedicated to the municipality;
    - To limit dwelling size to the Gross Floor Area (R) under the RS-10 (Single Family Dwelling) zoning regulations (348m² non-basement gross floor area);
    - To require that buildings must be designed generally in accordance with the illustrative house elevations prepared by Victoria Design Group, dated stamped October 24, 2016;
    - To require that the dwellings on proposed Lots 1–4 are constructed to a minimum BUILT GREEN® Gold, EnerGuide 82, or equivalent energy efficient standard and include the necessary conduit and piping to be considered solar-ready for the future installation of solar photovoltaic or hot water heating systems;
    - To require the planting of two replacement trees in each front yard; and
    - To require shared driveways as shown on the site plan date stamped October 24, 2017.
  - That Option 1 in the report from the Director of Planning dated April 19, 2017 for the development of a typical sidewalk along Del Monte Avenue, be supported.
- Engineering Servicing Requirements;
- Excerpts from the Committee of the Whole meetings of May 15, 2017 and May 16, 2016;
- Revised Tree Retention Report dated July 18, 2016;
- Servicing Tree Impact Report dated April 27, 2015;
- Tree Retention Report dated December 18, 2014;
- Two letters from the Cordova Bay Community Association;
- Two letters from the applicant, including an Open House Summary held on June 24, 2015; and
- 23 letters from residents.

APPLICANT:

D. Smith, McElhanney Consulting Services Ltd., stated:
- This area was predominantly rural and has transformed over the years to a single family neighbourhood.
- An Environmental Site Assessment, along with a tree retention report and a geotechnical assessment were prepared in support of the application.
- The original proposal has been revised and now has fewer lots and dwellings and utilizes shared driveways with improved safety; the homes will comply with RS-10 Zoning.
- Secondary suites have been allowed in Saanich since 2014 and rental housing is needed in this area.
- Residents have expressed concern regarding parking; two additional stalls will be provided for every suite that may be created.
- 51% of the site is to be dedicated to Saanich for inclusion in Doumac Park.
- House design will be covenanted.
- The project aligns with Saanich planning policies.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Current Planning advised that tandem parking is permitted for suites; however, Council may impose additional restrictions if desired.

PUBLIC INPUT:
L. Bainbridge, Del Monte Avenue, stated:
- As a neighbour, she supports the proposed development.
- The applicant has responded to Council’s wishes.
- This area and Del Monte Avenue suffer from a lack of planning for traffic.
- She does not support the proposed sidewalk unless integrated into an overall plan.
- There is a concern now with rodents, garbage and a potential fire hazard with the existing dwelling on the unkempt lot.

D. Manak, Destrube Place, stated:
- The proposed lot sizes are in keeping with the rest of the area.
- The park dedication is a good offer to the community.

J. Klassen, Del Monte Avenue, stated:
- Residents oppose the development and wish to maintain the local character.
- It is premature to consider this application and any others on the ridge in such a piecemeal manner.
- Revisit and update the Local Area Plan especially for the Del Monte and Helvetia area which are under pressure for development.
- Loss of tree cover is a concern; a comprehensive replacement plan for trees is needed.
- Lack of alternate transportation and a pathway for residents in the area is a concern.

S. Ball, Helvetia Crescent, stated:
- Council has protected this neighbourhood from developments in the past as evidenced by applications which have been refused.
- Neighbourhood concerns have not changed over the years; these are large properties in an urban forest with narrow roads.
- More potential subdivisions are possible.
- If this one is approved, previous development plans will reoccur.
M. Legaton, Del Monte Avenue, stated:
- More housing is needed for the future.
- The applicant has tried to address most concerns raised and he supports the application.

G. Klassen, Del Monte Avenue, stated:
- A sawmill was situated on this property and the site could require a more thorough environmental assessment to determine any contamination which might preclude residential use.

D. Morris, Matterhorn Court, stated:
- He is the owner of the property and lived there for about 40 years.
- The previous sawmill made mouldings and there was not a problem with contamination.
- Any concern over loss of trees would be more than made up by the proposed new parkland.
- This is an ordinary development suitable for the neighbourhood which exceeds all the requirements of the municipality.
- He would like to reassure the residents that the area will not seem much different after this project is completed.

M. Parslow, Del Monte Avenue, stated:
- Similar issues have been raised at each previous development application.
- The area is car-centric but accessible to amenities and walking distance to schools.
- The Local Area Plan is out of date; he is comfortable with densification here and finds it appropriate.
- Residents need reassurance from Council regarding the future for the area; traffic concerns and tree canopy issues need to be addressed.
- Council should look ahead and create a positive movement toward appropriate densification.

A. Heron, Piedmont Gardens, stated:
- The property under application has been neglected and is now derelict, which is a bad environment for his family.
- The project will have an impact on his property and he is concerned.
- The proposed lots appear large but the impact on parking, traffic, the ravine, and safe routes to school is unclear.
- Perhaps three lots would be preferable.
- Infrastructure is needed before considering further development on the ridge.

H. Lewis, Rutli Meadows Place, stated:
- The residents' concerns over loss of trees, densification, traffic and inadequate egress from the ridge are valid.
- Improvements are needed before further densification occurs; bus service and good access on and off the ridge are priorities.

K. Krane, Helvetia Crescent, stated:
- She is opposed to the rezoning.
- The neighbourhood is different from other areas considered for subdivision since it is on a ridge.
- There are no sidewalks now so adding a limited section is not helpful.
– Council has been asked to address neighbourhood issues before continuing to consider new development.
– Public transit is inadequate.
– The area must be addressed as a whole for intelligent and sustainable development.

J. Lydon, Del Monte Avenue, stated:
– The proposed development will detract from the look of the neighbourhood, add traffic, and affect the tree canopy.
– Four houses are too many; the property needs development but in a more appropriate way.

**APPLICANT’S RESPONSE:**
– A Phase I environmental assessment on the sawmill site determined there was no evidence of contamination.

In response to questions from Council, the Development Coordinator, the Manager of Current Planning and the Chief Administrator advised:
– That the combined sidewalk design recommended as part of this project will maximize retention of the boulevard trees.
– The Local Area Plan for the area is scheduled for updating over the longer term. Moratoriums on development applications are not permitted by provincial legislation and all applications must be considered if submitted.
– The Ministry of Transportation has indicated it is aware of the Cordova Bay ridge traffic problem and will consider improved signaling.

**COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:**

**Motion:**
MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That:
1. (a) The application to rezone from Zone A-1 (Rural) to Zone RS-12 (Single Family Dwelling) be approved; and
(b) That prior to Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw, the applicant register a restrictive covenant for the following:
• To prohibit subdivision of the subject parcel until the area shown as proposed park is dedicated to the municipality;
• To limit dwelling size to the Gross Floor Area (R) under the RS-10 (Single Family Dwelling) zoning regulations (348m² non-basement gross floor area);
• To require that buildings must be designed generally in accordance with the illustrative house elevations prepared by Victoria Design Group, dated stamped October 24, 2016;
• To require that the dwellings on proposed Lots 1 – 4 are constructed to a minimum BUILT GREEN® Gold, EnerGuide 82, or equivalent energy efficient standard and include the necessary conduit and piping to be considered solar-ready for the future installation of solar photovoltaic or hot water heating systems;
• To require the planting of two replacement trees in each front yard; and
• To require shared driveways as shown on the site plan date stamped October 24, 2017.”

Councillor Wergeland stated:
- The proposed development is reasonable and a good land use.

Councillor Brice stated:
- This is a large lot with up to five lots possible in addition to the substantial park dedication. Four lots are proposed which could not be considered dense.
- The plan for RS-10 dwellings on RS-12 lots along with the parkland, amounts to a supportable project.

Councillor Haynes stated:
- He supports the application in this special neighbourhood.
- The streetscape will have trees obscuring the development as well as two additional trees on each lot and a large park dedication.
- Four houses are reasonable; this appears to be a quality project.

Councillor Plant stated:
- Four homes are supportable.
- Traffic issues are important to resolve and a sidewalk is needed to support the safe route to school.

Councillor Murdock stated:
- The parkland dedication is significant.
- This is a desirable area to live and the design of the proposed development will be appealing and only a modest increase in density.

Councillor Brownoff stated:
- The Ministry of Transportation has been repeatedly requested to look at the traffic issues at Haliburton Road and the provincial highway and this is under review.
- The existing house on the site is rat-infested and must be dealt with early.
- The expansion of parkland will add to the tree canopy.
- The safer, shared driveway is a good feature.
- The difference between three or four homes on the site will not be impactful and the covenant is good.

Councillor Sanders stated:
- The reduced number of lots, the shared driveways and covenanted house size are reasonable.

Mayor Atwell stated:
- There are difficulties on the ridge due to the road network and growth but this will not be greatly impacted by this development.
- He is sympathetic to the concerns of the neighbours but there may be other alternatives which will assist them.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED
Motion:

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Option 1 in the report from the Director of Planning dated April 19, 2017 for the development of a typical sidewalk along Del Monte Avenue, be supported.”

In response to questions from the Council, the Manager of Current Planning stated that the road will be looked at under the Saanich Active Transportation Plan as it is designated a safe route to school.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

2870-30
Del Monte

ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, NO. 9443
Second and Third Readings

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: “That Bylaw No. 9443 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Plant and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Bylaw No. 9443 be now passed.”

CARRIED

1110-30
Official Community Plan

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN BYLAW, 2008, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, NO. 9444

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE TILLICUM LOCAL AREA PLAN
To amend Appendix “M” of the Official Community Plan (Tillicum Local Area Plan) by deleting Policy 7.2 (a) and replacing it with the following: “Retaining A-1 zoning outside the Sewer Service Area along the north shore of Colquitz River estuary and Portage Inlet”.

2870-30
Portage Road

ZONING BYLAW, 2003, AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, NO. 9445

PROPOSED REZONING FOR A RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION AT 955 & 961 PORTAGE ROAD
To rezone Lot 5, Section 79, Victoria District, Plan 890, Except Part in Plan 3836 RW and Plan 776RW (955 PORTAGE ROAD), and Lot 6, Section 79, Victoria District, Plan 890, Except Parts in Plans 3836 RW, Plan 50827 and Plan 776RW (961 PORTAGE ROAD) from Zone A-1 (Rural) to Zone RS-12 (Single Family Dwelling) for the purpose of subdivision in order to create four additional lots for a total of six bare land strata lots for single family dwelling use. A DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT and DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT will be considered to require the lands and buildings to be developed in accordance with the plans submitted. Variances to lot depth and setbacks are requested. A COVENANT will also be considered to further regulate the use of the lands and buildings. An ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT forms part of this application.

The Clerk introduced the following:
- Notice of Public Hearing;
- Reports from the Director of Planning dated May 30, 2017 and December 19, 2016 recommending:
That the application to amend the Official Community Plan - Tillicum Local Area Plan, Policy 7.2 (a) not be supported;
- That the rezoning application not be supported.
- Engineering Servicing Requirements;
- Excerpts from the Committee of the Whole meeting of April 24, 2017 and minutes of the Gorge Waterway Initiative Steering Committee meeting of September 17, 2014;
- Tree Covenant Area Report dated November 28, 2014;
- Environmental Overview Assessment dated August 29, 2014;
- Ecological Features Report dated March 17, 2014;
- Sustainability Statement dated April 23, 2014;
- Stormwater Management Statement dated April 15, 2014;
- Tree Windthrow Study dated October 18, 2012;
- Native and Invasive Vegetation Assessment dated April 21, 2006;
- Two letters from the Gorge Tillicum Community Association;
- Five letters from the Portage Inlet Sanctuary Colquitz Estuary Society;
- One letter from the Gorge Waterway Action Society;
- One letter from the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure; and
- 36 letters from residents.

APPLICANT:
I. Sutherland, Artificer Development Corporation, 1715 Government Street, applicant and owner, stated:
- The objectives of his proposal for four additional lots on the properties were outlined and included addressing climate change, protecting the environment and sustainability, supporting social well-being, respecting neighbourhood character, and delivering on regional and local planning policies.
- Design of the proposed homes is sensitive to the character of homes in the area and although they are RS-12 lots, homes are sized to comply with RS-8 zoning.
- An bioswale treatment facility has been proposed which will treat runoff from Portage Road so that it does not flow into the river; rehabilitation of proposed natural state covenant areas is planned.
- Community consultation was done; a traffic study found that the project will have no impact on existing traffic.
- Secondary suites would be appropriate on the site as there is plenty of space for additional parking and a bus stop nearby; however, if this is not desired by Council, a covenant prohibiting suites would be acceptable.
- Basement construction was precluded due to the rocky terrain.
- Amenities arising from the development amount to approximately $20,000 per home.
- The project also offers a good transition from the adjacent townhouse development to the single family homes on the other side.
- No additional infrastructure is needed.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant stated:
- It is not certain that secondary suites would be included in the proposed homes; however, removing two lots from the project while including suites would not be financially feasible.
P. Lucey, consulting ecologist, stated:
- There are four changes daily between fresh and salt water in this area of the inlet; this is a challenging environment for the salmon and the repair to the riparian area proposed with this development, will assist in protecting the fish.

PUBLIC INPUT:
R. Weber, contractor, stated:
- He is a builder and will be working on this project.
- The design makes good social, ecological and financial sense, which is rare in the development industry.
- The environment will be improved and four houses added to the housing stock.

N. Dubé, Essen Road, stated:
- Traffic is an issue in the neighbourhood now.
- The existing A-1 zoning is suitable for the lot and area which has lots of wildlife.
- She would like to protect what is there and does not support this project.

E. Lyons, Portage Road, stated:
- He supports the project; it will transition well between the Capital Regional District (CRD) housing and the A-1 properties.
- It is well-designed with high environmental values.

J. Scott, Jason Scott Eco Design, stated:
- He commends the applicant for protecting the waterfront; not many developments do.

V. Blogg, Skeena Place, stated:
- It is preferable to preserve the A-1 zoning and low density as the community was intended.
- Current Local Area Plan (LAP) policies support this.
- Trees have been removed from the site already and replacements are not the same; root zones are not considered in the plan.
- The tree canopy and wildlife in the area must be protected.
- Over 2000 sq. lots are needed to maintain the existing character.
- Planning staff do not support the application.
- There is still the potential for further subdivision on these properties.
- Perhaps one additional lot per parcel would be acceptable but she does not support the present proposal.

N. Banks, Portage Road, stated:
- Planning policies for the area support low density.
- This project exceeds environmental requirements with state of the art environmental systems, and a private access road.
- The development offers a nice transition from townhouses to single family lots
- The applicant is a good developer with high standards.

E. Jardey, Portage Road, stated:
- If this application is approved, it could open the door to development on her lots.
- The area is unique and to be protected.
- The applicant has already taken down trees and put in a septic line.
- The property has been neglected for 20 years.
- It may be reasonable to add two new lots to the site which would offer sufficient greenspace.

G. Boyd, Essen Road, stated:
- She wants to keep the neighbourhood the way it is.

G. Blogg, President, Portage Inlet Sanctuary/Colquitz Estuary Society (PISCES), stated:
- The loss of habitat and greenspace which would result from this development is not supported; Saanich declared itself a Blu Dot community which should be respected.
- Many trees have been removed from this site over the years.
- Narrow Essen Road is used as a safe route to school.
- There are limited water resources in Greater Victoria and they must be protected.
- They are opposed to the project.

S. Dubé, Essen Road, stated:
- Since the commencement of the McKenzie Avenue interchange project, traffic flow has been altered.
- He is opposed to the project.

R. Wickson, Gorge Tillicum Community Association (GTCA), stated:
- His community has benefitted from infill development which transformed it from farmland to what it is today.
- Saanich must encourage quality developments like this; local amenities are improved through density.
- Damage from the new highway interchange is worse than anything which might result from this proposal.

M. Alford, Portage Road, stated:
- The inlet and its greenspace enrich the life of the city.
- Saving this property would be a tool to assist that process.

D. Farmer, Bute Street, stated:
- He supports the Planning Department position to reject this application.
- It is important to conserve greenspace and habitat in areas such as this one.
- It would not be appropriate to change the Local Area Plan to suit one development at the expense of the inlet.
- As a member of the GTCA, he feels the written support submitted by the executive does not represent the membership.
- Neighbours and PISCES will bear the impact of the development.

R. Waines, Arundel Drive, stated:
- The additional new residents living in the development may have a negative impact on the environment and creek.
In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Current Planning and the Chief Administrative Officer stated:

- The District of Saanich and the applicant have not been able to reach agreement on the interpretation of Policy 7(a) of the Tillicum Local Area Plan and therefore the proposed amendment was put forth to remove any possible conflict with the bylaw.
- It will be up to Council to determine whether the proposed development is an appropriate land use.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Councillor Wergeland stated:
- The environment will be protected with this development.

Councillor Haynes stated:
- The proposed bioswale and natural covenant areas will be beneficial.
- He doesn’t expect that a development on this property would lead to further development along the inlet due to the type of terrain.
- The applicant has made a significant effort to respect the environment.
- RS-8 size homes are to be built on RS-12 sized lots.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That the meeting continue past 11:00 pm.

CARRIED

Councillor Sanders stated:
- She will not support the application.
- The neighbours have attended to state their opposition to the development as they believe it is necessary in order to protect the local greenspace and habitats.

Councillor Plant stated:
- Staff do not recommend approval of the project.
- A four lot subdivision rather than the six proposed would be preferable.
- Suites would not be appropriate.

Councillor Brice stated:
- Other A-1 zoned properties in Saanich have been developed in a manner less appealing than this proposed development; however, after considering the views expressed at the Public Hearing, she will not support the project.

Councillor Brownoff stated:
- She will not support the amendment.
- A review of the Local Area Plan is planned which will assist the community in envisioning the future of their neighbourhood.
Councillor Murdock stated:
- Council might consider adjourning the hearing at this time which would allow the applicant to consider the views expressed at the Public Hearing and perhaps be receptive to reducing the number of units proposed.

Councillor Haynes stated:
- He could support an adjournment but recognizes that if this application is not to go forward, then the applicant may choose to sell the lots and it is uncertain what may be proposed in future.

Motion:

With the agreement of Councillor Haynes, Councillor Wergeland withdrew his motion to approve the amendment to the Official Community Plan.

MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Plant: “That consideration of the application for an amendment to the Official Community Plan-Tillicum Local Area Plan and the application for an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw to allow a proposed development at 955 and 961 Portage Road, be postponed, to allow the applicant to consider the comments made at the Public Hearing.”

Councillor Murdock stated:
- He would urge the applicant to consider, in particular, the comments made about reducing the number of lots, and to know that there is support for all other aspects of the proposal.

Councillor Plant stated:
- The postponement would give the applicant an opportunity to revise his application.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 11:15 pm.

............................................
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

............................................
MUNICIPAL CLERK