



Mr. K. Whitcroft, president, Quadra Cedar Hill Community Association, stated:

- At the neighbourhood meeting the majority of the people that attended were mainly interested in discussing the social problems associated with the rental properties owned by the applicant and not the proposed development itself.
- The applicants gave a brief presentation on the development and displayed a sketch of the west elevation of the building and a landscape plan; many people felt that the proposed development would be more tolerable than the present situation.
- There is limited opportunity for redevelopment in this area but the residents should not be forced to accept a development just to remove a social problem in their neighbourhood.
- If the property owners at 941 Cloverdale Avenue do not sell their property it will be overshadowed by the proposed development; if they do not receive fair price from the sale of their property it will be a burden on them to purchase another house in their price range.
- The Association supports Option 2 in the Planner's report to either reject or table the proposal pending submission of a more comprehensive site development that includes all seven lots.

Mr. D. Shulagen, 942 Cloverdale Avenue, stated:

- The neighbourhood feels like they are being blackmailed into accepting a development that is not suitable for their area.
- The proposed development is obviously not family oriented as the applicants are proposing to construct one and two bedroom units; he is concerned that this type of development will attract the same quality of tenants that are living in the applicant's rental houses.

Ms. P. McKinnon, 954/956 Cloverdale Avenue, stated:

- She is concerned that the proposed development will block her view of Rutledge Park; no renderings have been provided to show what the rear of the development will look like.
- At the neighbourhood meeting the applicant indicated that the units would be suitable for seniors and single professionals; it would be more appropriate to build larger units so that families could live there.
- The applicant also told them that he was going to demolish the existing houses with the exception of one and use it as an office during construction of the development; to date he has not done so and the residents feel like they have been misled.

Ms. P. Cohen, 400-3363 Glasgow Avenue, stated:

- The residents are very concerned with the social issue that exists in their neighbourhood and they want it dealt with.
- The community does not want a development with one or two bedroom units; they want a development that is suitable for families.
- Traffic and parking is already an issue in their area and the proposed development will further impact it; the extensive landscaping that is proposed for the corner of Inverness Road and Cloverdale Avenue will impact site lines.
- The community feels that the applicant has not been honest with them.

Ms. M. Bachmann, 3720 Ascot Drive, stated:

- She does not support the proposed development.
- The applicant made a promise to the community that he would clean up the social problems associated with his rental properties and he has not done so; the applicant has not shown good faith or good intentions.

Ms. C. Pickup, 977 Lovat Avenue, stated:

- She attended the neighbourhood meeting that was held in October; the applicant should have consulted with the residents before he put together his development proposal so he would know what their vision for the neighbourhood entailed.
- The proposed land use is not suitable for the subject property; the residents want a development that is in keeping with the neighbourhood and a comprehensive plan for all seven of the corner lots.
- The applicant should have dealt with his rental properties like he said he would; he needs to work with the community and come up with a proposal that enhances the neighbourhood.

Mr. P. Brown stated:

- His brother is the owner of 941 Cloverdale Avenue; their parents used to live at that address.
- The majority of the people that attended the community meeting did not support the proposed development.
- The applicant did not undertake a shadow study to see what the impacts would be, or consider how the proposed elevations and window placements would overlook adjacent properties; traffic impacts were also not addressed.

Mr. D. Rogers, 911 Cloverdale Avenue, stated:

- He has resided at his present location for the past 25 years.
- He attended the neighbourhood meeting; there were many references to land values based on properties in adjacent areas.
- The applicant has not taken any action to clean up the situation associated with his rental properties even though he said he would; he hopes that Council will reject the application.

Mr. M. Brown, 941 Cloverdale Avenue, stated:

- The property at 941 Cloverdale Avenue is actually owned by his wife; they have correspondence from the applicant offering to purchase their property although the tone of the letters is intimidating and they are not sure they are comfortable doing business with him.
- There are serious safety issues in the neighbourhood that need to be dealt with; he usually works at night but has not been able to do so because his wife does not feel safe being at home alone.
- He hopes that Council will reject the proposed development.

Mr. L. Anderson, 935 Stafford Street, stated:

- The majority of the people who attended the neighbourhood meeting were not in favor of the proposed development.
- He supports some kind of development on the subject property but not what is being proposed as it is not family oriented.

- He wants to see the neighbourhood treated fairly and he does not think the applicant has been honest; there should have been more community consultation.

Mr. C. Thomas, 2520 Wark Street, stated:

- Although he does not live in Saanich he has been a friend of the Brown family for many years; he does not think they have been treated fairly.
- He teaches architectural history at UVic and he thinks the demolition of the store at the corner of the subject property is a loss to the neighbourhood.

Mr. D. Brown, 941 Cloverdale Avenue, stated:

- He would like more information on the height of the proposed building in relationship to the sidewalk, access to the underground parking, the height difference between the parking level, and the proposed green space.

In response to questions and comments, Mr. D. Bazett, stated:

- The underground parking will be accessed by an interphone system.
- The small triangle area of green space will be incorporated into the adjacent lot and that will occur when the development takes place.
- The height of the building will be 42 feet from grade level at the front of the building.

The applicant, Mr. Soulotis stated:

- Since the October neighbourhood meeting he has issued eviction notices to the tenants of two of the subject rental properties; he is also pursuing demolition of the dwellings with Saanich staff.
- He has been trying to develop the subject property for the past two years but the owners of 941 Cloverdale Avenue will not discuss the sale of their property.
- The Browns' current dwelling is in such poor condition that it is unlikely that it can be brought up to building code standards; if they do not wish to sell then he will give them one of the three houses from the other lots at no charge.
- If the Browns do decide to sell their property to him, he will give them \$25,000 non-refundable upon acceptance of his proposal, and an additional \$400,000 in 45 days upon receipt of a building permit.

Councillor Gillespie stated:

- The applicant has been trying to develop the subject property for the past two years; he can understand the frustration of both the neighbourhood and the applicant.
- The neighbourhood has expressed their concerns with both the proposed development and the social issues that exist.
- He suggests that further consideration of the application be postponed for 60 days so the applicant and the Browns can discuss the proposal and come to some kind of resolution.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He does not support postponing the application; he would rather see the application rejected.

- He does not like the flat façade on three sides of the proposed building; he would also like a photo montage of what a development will look like from the Brown's property.
- He would like to see a more thoughtful and attractive design proposal and encourages the applicant to meet with the residents and come up with a proposal that is more in keeping with the neighbourhood.

Councillor Brice stated:

- She would prefer to see a development proposal for all seven of the corner lots rather than just five.
- She does not feel the proposed development is worthy of the neighbourhood; a huge investment was made with the creation of Rutledge Park.
- She can understand the frustration of the applicant and neighbours but the proposal does not enhance the neighbourhood; she supports rejecting the application.

**MOTION:**

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: "That the application to rezone Lot 17, Sections 7 and 63, Lots AM15 (DD 100316-l) except that part in Plan 7915, Lots 16, 18, and 19, Section 7, all in Victoria District, and Plan 2325 (914, 922, 930 Inverness Road and 931 & 935 Cloverdale Avenue) from RS-6 to RA-6, be rejected."**

Councillor Derman stated:

- He is not happy with the proposed development and neither is the community.
- It is not a high quality development and the street presence along Cloverdale Avenue is inadequate.
- Rutledge Park was a big investment for Saanich and brought a feeling of renewal to the neighbourhood; the proposed development does not enhance or improve the area.
- He supports rejecting the rezoning application; the applicant needs to work with the community on a proposal that fits their needs and is a suitable addition to the neighbourhood.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She is very familiar with the neighbourhood; the residents are not afraid of density in their area, it just has to be appropriate.
- The development at Scotia and Rutledge Streets is suitable for families and gives the appearance that families do in fact live there; the proposed development does not.
- She encourages the applicant to come back with a proposal that capitalizes on Rutledge Park and does not impact anyone's view of it.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She supports rejecting the application; the proposed zoning is inappropriate for the area.
- The façade of the proposed building does not relate to Cloverdale Avenue and the public amenity is inadequate; the issue of

overshadowing has not been addressed.

- Rutledge Park has renewed the neighbourhood and the developer needs to come up with a proposal that will blend with the neighbourhood and enhance it.

Councillor Ngai stated:

- She supports rejecting the application.
- It would have been nice to see a comprehensive plan for all seven of the lots.
- A development on the subject property could be a show piece for the community and form a gateway to the neighbourhood if it was suitable and attractively designed.

Councillor Gillespie stated:

- He thought it would be a good idea to postpone further consideration of the application so a more comprehensive plan could be considered.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- Redevelopment of the subject property should help address the social issues associated with the neighbourhood.

Mayor Leonard stated:

- He understands that it is difficult to focus on the land use for the subject property because of the social issues associated with it.
- He supports rejecting the application; the proposal is not very attractive and the street presence appears to confront the neighbourhood.
- The proposed development is too large for just five lots; he suggests the applicant reconsider his approach and come up with a proposal that is more suitable for families.

**The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED**

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Gillespie, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

.....  
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK