

- Correspondence from the Cadboro Bay Residents Association; and
- Four letters from residents.

APPLICANT:

K. Jardine, on behalf of the owner of the property, presented to Council and highlighted:

- The intent is to subdivide to build a new home on the western side of the property; originally, the property was two separate lots and in 1963, the lots were combined.
- The trees on the boulevard and in the yard would be protected; the owner has provided written agreements with adjacent neighbours to protect and maintain the existing hedges on the east and west sides of the property.
- There is a commitment to construction to a minimum BUILT GREEN® Gold standard or equivalent.
- Consultation took place with neighbours and the Cadboro Bay Residents Association and they are supportive.
- The proposed new modest two storey home fits within the character of the neighbourhood.

PUBLIC INPUT:

J. Donaldson, on behalf of the Cadboro Bay Residents Association, stated:

- The Residents Association supports the application.
- He is pleased that the hedges could be protected without a covenant; a covenant would remain on title in perpetuity.
- He questions if the municipality received legal advice in relation to the covenant.
- Small fee simple lots could be considered for Cadboro Bay Village in the future.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE:

- The applicant has entered into agreements with adjacent neighbours for future replacement of the hedges should the hedges die or be damaged; he would bear the costs to either replace the hedges or build a fence in order to ensure the privacy of the neighbours is maintained.

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

- The covenant to secure the hedges was raised during the original development proposal; legal advice has been provided on using a covenant to secure hedges on this and other properties; a covenant is the only means by which to guarantee that the hedges are maintained in perpetuity.
- Based on feedback from Council, staff suggested that the applicant get written verification from neighbours stating that they support not having the hedges protected by covenant; the neighbours have provided written confirmation that an agreement has been made between all properties to maintain the hedge without a need for a covenant.

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

- Motion:** **MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:**
“That:
1. the application to rezone from RS-10 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone be approved; and
 2. Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw and ratification of the Development Variance Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant requiring that new dwellings on proposed Lots 1 and 2:
 - conform to a minimum BUILT GREEN® Gold, EnerGuide 82, or an equivalent level of energy efficient building design and construction standard and are designed to be solar ready; and
 - that the side yard setbacks be increased from 1.5 m minimum required by the Zoning Bylaw to 2.0 m on the west side of proposed Lot 1 and 2.5 m on the east side of proposed Lot 2.”

In response to questions, the Director of Planning stated:

- The covenant for conformance to BUILT GREEN® Gold or equivalent and for the side yard setback would be directed to the Approving Officer as a part of the subdivision process.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- A covenant to protect and maintain the hedges is not appropriate.

Councillor Brice stated:

- This is a sensible development; it fits within the character of the neighbourhood.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

- Motion:** “ZONING BYLAW, 2003 AMENDMENT BYLAW, 2017, NO. 9449
Second and Third Readings

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That Bylaw No. 9449 be read a second time.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That Bylaw No. 9449 be now passed.”

CARRIED

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
“That it be recommended that Council approve Development Variance Permit DVP00375 on Lot B (DD 327049-I), Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 1592 (2558 Killarney Road).”

CARRIED

The Public Hearing was adjourned.

Motion: **MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Council waive the requirement that a delegation not be scheduled for the last Council meeting of the month where an Open Forum is held, as outlined in Section 52 (b) of the Council Procedure Bylaw, and allow the delegation to present.”**

CARRIED

DELEGATION

1410-02
Delegation

FRIENDS OF CUTHBERT HOLMES PARK

Subject: Presentation relating to the McKenzie Interchange and its effects on Cuthbert Holmes Park

J. Anderson, Friends of Cuthbert Holmes Park, outlined the concerns that the group has with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI) in relation to the work that is being undertaken on the McKenzie Interchange project. There is concern that construction is encroaching on Cuthbert Holmes Park and that further review by Saanich is needed for construction of a berm.

The Director of Planning stated:

- MoTI has advised that more information will be coming forward with respect to the berm; she will advise Council and Mr. Anderson when MoTI relays further information.

Minutes

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Council adopt the minutes of the July 17, 2017 Council meeting.”

CARRIED

NOTICE OF MOTION

1410-04
Report - Council

Notice of Motion received from Councillor Haynes that Council reaffirm its declaration of June 6, 1983 that the District of Saanich is a nuclear weapon-free zone (NFWZ) and bans the use, development, testing, production, manufacturing, acquiring, possession, stockpiling, transferring, receiving, threatening to use, stationing, installation or deployment of nuclear weapons and any assistance with prohibited acts including financing their development and manufacturing, or permitting the transit of them through the District of Saanich. This motion will be presented at the August 14, 2017 meeting.

BYLAWS FOR FINAL READING1110-30Firearm and Bow
Discharge
Regulation Bylaw**FIREARM AND BOW DISCHARGE REGULATION BYLAW**Final Reading of "Firearm and Bow Discharge Regulation Bylaw, 2017, No. 9414". To update the provisions of the bylaw to align with the *Right to Farm Act*.**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:
"That Bylaw No. 9414 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the
Corporation be attached thereto."****CARRIED****BYLAWS FOR FIRST READING (SUBJECT TO A PUBLIC HEARING)**2870-30

Feltham Road

1654 FELTHAM ROAD – REZONING TO RS-6

First Reading of "Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 9450". To rezone from RS-10 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone for the purpose of subdivision to create one additional lot.

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Sanders:
"That Bylaw No. 9450 be introduced and read."****CARRIED**2150-20

Walter Avenue

574 WALTER AVENUE – REZONING TO P-4N

First Reading of "Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 9451". To rezone from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to P-4N (Natural Park) zone in order to establish and operate the land as a natural park.

**MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff:
"That Bylaw No. 9451 be introduced and read."****CARRIED**2870-30Cordova Bay
Road**4623 CORDOVA BAY ROAD – REZONING TO RS-12**

First Reading of "Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 9452". To rezone from RS-18 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RS-12 (Single Family Dwelling) zone for the purpose of subdivision to create one additional lot for single family dwelling use.

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice:
"That Bylaw No. 9452 be introduced and read."****CARRIED**

2870-30

Arbutus Road

2474 ARBUTUS ROAD – NEW ZONE P-30/R

First Reading of “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 9453”. To create a new Personal Care, Office and Research Zone – P-30/R.

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Bylaw No. 9453 be introduced and read.”

CARRIED2870-30

Arbutus Road

2474 ARBUTUS ROAD – REZONING TO P-30/R

First Reading of “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2017, No. 9454”. To rezone part of the site from P-3 (Personal Care) zone to P-30/R (Personal Care, Office and Research) zone in order to allow a former care facility building on the site to be repurposed to accommodate office and research uses of ocean and climate scientists.

MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That Bylaw No. 9454 be introduced and read.”

CARRIED**PUBLIC INPUT ON COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS**

Public Input on
Council Agenda
Items

K. Harper, Bonair Place

Draft Report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. (EDPA)

- A meeting to receive further input on the report should be held in the fall; there is the need for broad public feedback.

M. Benson, Sea View Road

Draft Report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. (EDPA)

- In order to get valuable feedback from the public, the meeting to discuss the report should be held after September; the management and administration of the EDPA bylaw should also be considered.

J. Kushner, Tudor Avenue

Draft Report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. (EDPA)

- Holding a meeting after September to receive public input on the report is encouraged; this will allow for meaningful input.
- A definition of development should be included in the public consultation process as opposed to being developed internally; a committee of recognized professionals should be established to define the measures, standards and processes to be used for the revised bylaw.
- The committee could also have the role of an appeal board; having third party oversight may mitigate the perceived lack of objectivity.

A. Bull, Wilkinson Road

Draft Report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. (EDPA)

- A stand-alone meeting to discuss the report should be held after September; the work suggested in the report needs to be done carefully and slowly with the involvement of land owners.
- Biodiversity strategies, removal of buffers and the EDPA atlas, and funding for restoration and planting of native species in Saanich parks is supportable.
- Stewardship is missing from the report; this is a crucial piece if the community is to be involved in protecting and supporting improved

biodiversity in Saanich.

- There is no detailed critical analysis of the implementation of the bylaw; the definition of development needs to be clearly defined.
- There is a need for a professional committee of practicing scientists to bring together the objective measures and standards needed for the bylaw; the bylaw needs to be scientific, defensible, objective and fair if it is to be successful.

A. Bickerton, West Burnside Road

Draft Report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. (EDPA)

- The Diamond Head report has been professionally done; stewardship is missing from the report.
- The EDPA is unfair to property owners.

G. Tripp, Cordova Bay Road

Draft Report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. (EDPA)

- Further discussion on the report should be delayed until the public has had time for proper review; some surveys were incomplete because the questions did not permit the property owner to address what they perceived were concerns.

C. Thomson, Prospect Lake Road

- The strategy to review the EDPA is appreciated; more information in relation to the elimination of the EDPA atlas and buffers would be helpful.

REPORTS FROM COUNCIL

1410-04
Report - Council

AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPTION ADMINISTERED BY CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT (CRD) HOUSING

Further to the Notice of Motion from the July 17, 2017 Council meeting, verbal report from Councillor Brice recommending that Council contact Capital Regional District (CRD) Housing and request that they provide a clear process that will allow Saanich staff to suggest the dedication of affordable units as a viable alternative to developers.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Haynes: "That staff be requested to contact Capital Regional District (CRD) Housing and request that they provide a clear process that will allow Saanich staff to suggest the dedication of affordable units as a viable alternative to developers and that CRD Housing be asked to provide sufficient information to allow developers to give serious consideration to incorporating affordable housing into their development proposals. Information should include the minimum number of units for possible consideration, a straightforward application process, an ongoing administration process and key contact information for CRD Housing personnel. Saanich's communication to CRD Housing will include a strong statement in favour of the option of including Affordable Housing administered by CRD in future multi-family development options that come to Saanich for approval."

Councillor Brice stated:

- More information on the services and funding available through CRD Housing is needed; having affordable units incorporated into development proposals would be appropriate.
- Clarification on what type of program CRD Housing would be prepared to enter into would be helpful; the program would have to work for developers, the public, the municipalities and the CRD.
- Once a response is received from the CRD with viable options, staff could then engage with the development community, and when multi-family projects are proposed, CRD Affordable Housing would be part of those projects.
- An integration of affordable housing units with market housing units is desirable.
- CRD staff are familiar with the needs and challenges of the development community and have a record of including them in their processes.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The development community may have creative ideas on how to embed affordable housing into development.

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

- Saanich staff are currently preparing a report on affordable housing and have consulted with CRD staff; a meeting is being scheduled with core municipalities to see if there is a benefit of working collectively on affordable housing strategies.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Having affordable housing units within new development is appropriate; it should be considered at a regional level.
- For units to be affordable, Housing Agreements must be long term and there has to be a reputable manager.
- The CRD could undertake managing affordable housing units but they will have to decide how many units they could manage.
- Having affordable rental or ownership options should be considered.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- As of June 2017, there was \$449,000 in the Affordable Housing Fund; funds were used for the Pacifica Housing development on Douglas Street and Rosalie's Village.
- Funds are also committed for the Cool Aid development on Quadra Street.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Most developers cannot manage housing units; CRD has the staffing and expertise available.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The CRD has the expertise to manage affordable housing units.

Mayor Atwell stated:

- It would be appropriate for municipalities within the CRD to better align policies and outcomes.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

REPORTS FROM DIRECTORS

1410-04
Report – Planning

xref: 2860-25
EDPA Report

INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA (EDPA) DRAFT REPORT FROM DIAMOND HEAD CONSULTING LTD.

Report of the Director of Planning dated July 12, 2017 recommending Council receive the draft report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. for information, and provide direction to staff as to how it wishes to proceed with the draft report and the Environmental Development Permit Area.

The Director of Planning stated:

- The report from Diamond Head Consulting (DHC) was received in late June 2017; Council are requested to direct staff on how they wish to proceed.

J. Allen, Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. presented to Council and highlighted:

- The intent of the review was to improve the EDPA bylaw; consultation took place with nine other municipalities and with members of the public.
- Draft recommendations were presented at Open Houses and members of the public were given the opportunity to comment.
- Development of a Biodiversity Conservation Strategy would help staff when making decisions; improvements to and clarification of definitions is needed.
- There are objectives in the Official Community Plan (OCP) that could feed into the EDPA and support it.
- Owners of small lots face constraints; flexibility in the process is recommended to allow staff and property owners to work together.
- Instead of the EDPA Atlas, a text based description for flagging properties that may contain Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) may be appropriate.
- It should be recognized that different properties have different values; a qualified environmental professional (QEP) could make an assessment if or what buffer may be required.
- It is appropriate to work with land owners and developers to meet objectives and for it to be a “win-win” situation.
- ESAs in urban areas are not always pristine but that does not mean they do not have value.
- Development of a standard report template for QEPs will also assist staff with the examination and evaluation of the reports.
- Saanich should “lead by example” and municipal property not be exempted from the EDPA.
- Stewardship is valuable and should be supported.

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

- DHC engaged with stakeholder groups and other municipalities; the responses were weighted and general themes and issues were identified.
- 2-3 recommendations were identified for each theme and presented at Open Houses.
- Saanich’s EDPA bylaw is not that different from other municipalities’ bylaws.
- Of the nine municipalities surveyed, almost half utilize dedicated in-house experts to review QEP reports.
- It would be helpful to have a standardized approach and a clear understanding what is to be evaluated.
- A QEP report should not be considered alone; two QEPs could assess a site and come up with varying opinions.
- It is valuable to have an in-house expert to review reports and to have a

standardized template and direction.

- An ESA does not have to be pristine to have value; each property should be considered individually.
- It is important not to make the EDPA onerous for property owners.
- Municipal property should not be exempted from the EDPA.
- There may be a need to engage neighbouring municipalities to work on a framework to look at biodiversity for the entire region.

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

- The PowerPoint presentation from DHC will be posted to the website.

Mr. Allen stated:

- A separate policy could be developed for the control of Invasive Species and could be linked to the EDPA bylaw.

MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That Council receive the draft report from Diamond Head Consulting Ltd. for information and direct staff to schedule a stand-alone meeting in October 2017”.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Holding a meeting in October will ensure that broad public input takes place.

Councillor Haynes stated:

- Holding a meeting in October is appropriate; this will allow the item to be debated by a full Council.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

.....
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....
DEPUTY 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, JULY 24, 2017 AT 9:36 P.M.

Present: **Chair:** Councillor Sanders
Council: Mayor Atwell and Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Haynes and Wergeland
Staff: Sharon Hvozdzanski, Acting Chief Administrative Officer/Director of Planning;
 Lesley Hatch, Acting Director of Engineering; Sharon Froud, Deputy
 Legislative Manager; and Lynn Merry, Senior Committee Clerk

1410-04
 Report -
 Planning

xref: 2870-30
 Alderwood
 Street

1649 & 1653 ALDERWOOD STREET – SUBDIVISION, REZONING AND DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT APPLICATION

Report of the Director of Planning dated July 11, 2017 recommending that Council support the application to rezone from RS-6 (Single Family Dwelling) zone to RS-4 (Single Family Dwelling) zone for a proposed subdivision to create one additional lot, for a total of three parcels and that Final Reading of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw be withheld pending registration of a covenant for the items outlined in the report. Variances are requested for lot width.

APPLICANT:

P. Jawl, Blair Street Properties and C. Pringle, Cadillac Homes, presented to Council and highlighted:

- The application is to subdivide to create one additional lot to build a total of three homes.
- The public pathway has already been built and existing services are in place.
- The proposed dwellings will be approximately 2,000-2,200 square feet and each will have a secondary suite.
- The proposed development will include the necessary conduits to be solar ready, be constructed to a BUILT GREEN® Gold standard and will fit within the character of the neighbourhood.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Nil

COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS:

Motion: **MOVED by Councillor Haynes and Seconded by Councillor Brice: “That a Public Hearing be called to further consider the rezoning application on Lot 5, Section 56, Victoria District, Plan EPP65180 (1653 Alderwood Street) and Lot 22, Section 56, Victoria District, Plan 18261 (1649 Alderwood Street).”**

Councillor Haynes stated:

- The proposed development will increase the housing stock; the addition of the public pathway is appreciated.

Councillor Brice stated:

- This is an appropriate location for infill; it is close to schools and the Shelbourne centre.

Councillor Sanders stated:
- The public pathway is appreciated.

The Motion was then Put and CARRIED

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

.....
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....
DEPUTY MUNICIPAL CLERK