

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**MONDAY, AUGUST 17, 2009 AT 7:30 P.M.**

Present:

**Chair:** Mayor Leonard  
**Council:** Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Gerrard, Sanders and Wergeland.  
**Staff:** Tim Wood, Administrator; Carrie MacPhee, Manager of Legislative Services; Anne Topp, Manager of Community Planning; Dwayne Halldorson, Manager of Underground Services; and Maura Brothers, Senior Committee Clerk.

**APPEALS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE BYLAW**

Queenswood Dr.  
XRef: EPW65  
Subdivision,  
Development  
Variance and  
Sewer Service  
Area Extension

**2685 QUEENSWOOD DRIVE – SUBDIVISION, DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT AND SEWER SERVICE AREA EXTENSION – D’ARCY BOULTON.**

Appeal of the July 13, 2009 Council and Committee of the Whole decisions to not approve the following requirements for a proposed two lot residential subdivision: exemption of proposed Lot 1 from the 10 percent road frontage requirement under Section 944(2) of the Local Government Act, Development Variance Permit DVP2007-00007, and inclusion of the property in the Sewer Service Area providing the owner agrees to bear the full cost of extending the infrastructure required to service the proposed lots.

The applicants, Ms. I. Boulton and Mr. D. Boulton, 2685 Queenswood Drive made a presentation to Council. Ms. I. Boulton stated:

- The appeal is intended to address the gaps in the minutes of the Committee of the Whole meeting held July 13, 2009 and to provide further details on how the proposal for 2685 Queenswood Drive will provide protection for the natural state environment on the subject property.
- She and her husband are longstanding residents of the area and previously developed a single family home at 2681 Queenswood Drive, removing the invasive species on the property to allow native plants to return; similar work on invasive species removal has been done on the subject property.
- They have tried to be sensitive to their neighbours’ concerns regarding the proposed subdivision; for example, they changed the location of the proposed sewer access in response to the concerns of the Ockwells (2709 Queenswood Drive) and the Faulkners (2695 Queenswood Drive).
- On July 30, 2009, seven members of the Cadboro Bay Residents Association visited the subject property to discuss the proposal; since then, the Association has decided to provide a response of no comment.

Mr. D. Boulton stated:

- The current zoning and size of the existing lots at 2681 and 2685 Queenswood allows for the construction of a 10,000 square foot dwelling on each property.
- Though Mr. Faulkner has expressed some concerns regarding the development of Robin Street, it is one of the subdivision requirements that it be developed up to the property line between proposed Lot 3 and Lot 2.

- The proposed natural state covenant is unprecedented in scale for the area; a tree protection covenant is also proposed.
- The dwelling for proposed Lot 3 would be built to a maximum of 6,000 square feet, in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood; the one storey Frank Lloyd Wright design would face the covenanted area, which an arborist has confirmed would not be impacted by the proposed construction.
- The maximum dwelling size proposed for Lot 4 is 4,500 square feet; it would also be designed in the Frank Lloyd Wright style.
- The preservation of the environment would be better served by allowing this subdivision to proceed; furthermore, this proposal meets all criteria for waiving the minimum 10% highway frontage requirement and is in keeping with the Carboro Bay Local Area Plan.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. D. Boulton stated:

- The tree protection covenant area was not proposed as a natural state covenant due damaged trees and a lack of native vegetation.
- His letter dated August 11, 2009 should have indicated that the property is 500 m to the nearest bus stop and the drawing submitted this evening should show the dwelling on proposed Lot 3 as 3,200 square feet in size.
- There is a legal agreement with the owner of 2670 MacDonald Drive East to allow sewer service access through the property.

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That the following be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration: an exemption from the 10 percent road frontage requirement of the Local Government Act for proposed Lot 1 of a subdivision of Lot A, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 4830 (2685 Queenswood Drive); Development Variance Permit DVP2007-00007; and inclusion of the property in the Sewer Service Area for a proposed two lot residential subdivision."**

Councillor Derman stated:

- Though the location of the subject property will likely result in residents using vehicles for transportation, he believes that the application deserves consideration on the basis of the proposed protection for the existing urban forest.
- The applicant proposes greater protection for the existing urban forest than can be guaranteed under Saanich's existing bylaws.

Councillor Brice spoke in opposition to the motion and stated:

- During an appeal process, she looks for information that was not available to Council when the application was previously considered.
- Council has already had the opportunity to consider this application and made a decision.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The applicant has provided more detail on the proposal.
- The proposal is not for a townhouse or condominiums, which should be located closer to major centres; furthermore, the covenants proposed by the applicant will provide a benefit to the community.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- Like Councillor Brice, she was looking for something substantially different in the appeal to change her mind and the covenants offered by the applicant were discussed at the previous meeting.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- He agrees with Councillors Brice and Brownoff that he has not heard anything radically different that would prompt him to change his mind regarding the application.
- The Cadboro Bay Residents Association has provided no comment in regards to the application, though Council has received numerous pieces of correspondence from neighbouring residents.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She agrees with previous speakers that the applicants did not provide any substantial new information.
- The amount of correspondence received indicates that there is still opposition in the neighbourhood to the application.

Mayor Leonard stated:

- He supports the appeal, as he supported the application when it originally came to Committee of the Whole.
- He hopes the neighbours are aware that the status quo will not necessarily be maintained by defeating this application; the existing zoning allows for some development and it is likely a different house will be constructed at some point.

**The Motion was then Put and DEFEATED  
Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Gerrard and Sanders voting against**

Minutes

## **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Hunter: "That the Minutes of the Council and Committee of the Whole Meetings held August 10, 2009 and the Minutes of the Special Council Meeting held August 11, 2009, be adopted."**

**CARRIED**

## **BYLAWS**

ADM40 - Treasury  
Bylaw 9000

### **DRAINAGE CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT LOAN AUTHORIZATION BYLAW**

Final Reading of the "Drainage Construction and Improvement Loan Authorization Bylaw, 2009, No. 9000". To authorize borrowing of \$1,797,000 for wood stave drain replacement on Cherrilee Crescent, Derby Road/Camrose Crescent, and Garnet Road.

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: "That Bylaw No. 9000 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto."**

**CARRIED**

ADM40 - Treasury  
Bylaw 9001

**SEWER CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT LOAN AUTHORIZATION BYLAW**

Final Reading of the "Sewer Construction and Improvement Loan Authorization Bylaw, 2009, No. 9001". To authorize borrowing of \$1,500,000 for the Portage Lift Station.

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: "That Bylaw No. 9001 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto."**

**CARRIED**

ADM40  
Bylaw 9002

**ANIMALS BYLAW – HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENT**

Final Reading of the "Animals Bylaw, 2004, Amendment Bylaw, 2009, No. 9002". To amend Sections 6 and 13 to change references from "Lakeside Park" to "Whitehead Park".

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: "That Bylaw No. 9002 be adopted by Council and the Seal of the Corporation be attached thereto."**

**CARRIED**

ADM40  
Bylaw 8991

**COUNCIL PROCEDURE BYLAW – AMENDMENT TO SECTION 29 (ORDER OF BUSINESS AT REGULAR COUNCIL MEETINGS).**

Three Readings of the "Council Procedure Bylaw, 2007, Amendment Bylaw, 2009, No. 8991" and adoption of Council Policy, "Reports from Members of Council on Capital Regional District and Committee/Board Initiatives". Memorandum from the Manager of Legislative Services dated August 7, 2009 requesting that Council amend Section 29 to include Awards Presentations and Reports from Members of Council as items of business at regular Council meetings, and that Council adopt the accompanying policy which formalizes the current process.

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice: "That Bylaw No. 8991 be introduced and read."**

**CARRIED**

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice: "That Bylaw No. 8991 be read a second time."**

**CARRIED**

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice: "That Bylaw No. 8991 be now passed."**

**CARRIED**

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brice: "That Council adopt the policy 'Reports from Members of Council on Capital Regional District and Committee/Board Initiatives' ".**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

.....  
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**MONDAY, AUGUST 17, 2009 AT 7:55 P.M.**

Present: **Chair:** Councillor Gerrard  
**Council:** Mayor Leonard and Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Sanders, and Wergeland.  
**Staff:** Tim Wood, Administrator; Carrie MacPhee, Manager of Legislative Services; Anne Topp, Manager of Community Planning; Dwayne Halldorson, Manager of Underground Services; and Maura Brothers, Senior Committee Clerk.

West Saanich Road  
XRef: ADM40  
Amendment to  
Zoning Bylaw

**5575 WEST SAANICH ROAD – PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE P-1A ZONE TO PERMIT “SCHOOL” AS A PERMITTED USE – SANDRA EINARSON.**

Report of the Director of Planning dated July 24, 2009 recommending the Zoning Bylaw be amended to include “school” as a permitted use in the P-1A zone and to limit the gross floor area for a school to not more than 325 m2 to accommodate Island Montessori Kindergarten/Grade 1 program, and that final reading be withheld pending confirmation from the Vancouver Island Health Authority that the well and on-site disposal systems are adequate to accommodate the additional use.

The applicant, Ms. S. Einarson, Island Montessori School, stated:

- Island Montessori is primarily a licensed group daycare for children 30 months to school age that includes children from varying cultural backgrounds and family incomes; as well, over 25% of the children in the program have special needs including autism, seizure disorders, visual and hearing impairments, and brain injuries.
- It is important that the program retain certification as an independent school and not just a daycare in order to qualify for education funding and allow special needs children to smoothly transition into public school.
- The program was located at Doncaster Elementary School, but renovations to Doncaster will eliminate the space previously rented to Island Montessori; unfortunately, none of the other schools in the district have sufficient space available for the program.
- The First Unitarian Church of Victoria at 5575 West Saanich Road is

undertaking renovations to meet the licensing requirements for the program; the rural location will provide wonderful opportunities for both students and staff, including the potential for composting and a vegetable garden.

- Though many families left the program due to the change in location, there has been no problem acquiring new students, which indicates that the program is offering a much needed service.

In response to questions from Council, Ms. S. Einarson stated:

- Though the program is licensed to serve 47 - 53 children, the numbers are usually kept lower to accommodate the special needs students.
- There are now 38 families enrolled in the program at the new location.

## MOTION

**MOVED by Councillor Brice Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: "That a Public Hearing be called to further consider amending the Zoning Bylaw to include 'school' as a permitted use in the P-1A zone and to limit the gross floor area for a school to not more than 325 m2 to accommodate Island Montessori Kindergarten/Grade 1 program at 5575 West Saanich Road."**

Councillor Brice stated:

- This is an excellent program in a wonderful location, which will greatly benefit Saanich families; it is clear that this application has merit.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She thanks the applicant for bringing this program to Saanich and is pleased to see the potential for incorporating the outdoors into the program.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The rural setting will be good for the children in the program and she supports the proposed addition to the zoning.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He would like to compliment the applicant on the program and the First Unitarian Church of Victoria on welcoming the Island Montessori School into their facility.

Councillor Derman stated:

- There is an overwhelming social good to the program, but he would like the applicant to consider how to decrease the use of single family vehicles for transportation to and from the location – perhaps by encouraging car pools or running a dedicated bus to the school from a more central location.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- He agrees with the previous comments by Council; the program is a tremendous opportunity for the community and the only minor concern is the travel necessary to access the new location.

**The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED**

McKenzie Avenue  
Rezoning

**976, 980 AND 982 McKENZIE AVENUE – REZONING APPLICATION – ERIC BARKER ARCHITECT INC.**

Report of the Director of Planning dated July 31, 2009 recommending the rezoning from RS-10 to RA-6 and Development Permit DPR00377 be approved for a proposed 36 unit apartment building with underground parking, that a Conceptual Storm Water Management Plan be required prior to a Public Hearing, and that final reading and ratification of the Development Permit be withheld pending registration of a covenant to secure the contribution of \$43,200 to the Saanich Affordable Housing Fund and to require that two units must be fully-accessible for persons with disabilities. Report of the Advisory Design Panel dated February 27, 2009 recommending approval of the design.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Community Planning stated

- The term “visitable” refers to buildings that can be visited by those with mobility issues; the Zoning Bylaw now requires that new multifamily buildings meet this standard.
- The applicant also proposes to build two fully-accessible units in the development.

The applicant, Mr. E. Barker, Eric Barker Architect Inc., stated:

- The proposed development is for a 36 unit apartment building with underground parking.
- The subject property is located close to a neighbourhood centre, with transit stops and commercial properties nearby, making it a good candidate for densification.
- The single family properties adjacent to the proposed development are likely to be redeveloped into townhouses.
- Challenges include the busy traffic on McKenzie Avenue and the narrow, deep shape of the subject property.
- The proposed building has an irregular shape, rather than the traditional rectangle, which is set at an angle on the property; this shape and positioning will maximize open space on the site and reduce its impact on the Garry Oaks and the townhouses adjacent to the subject property.
- The building has a stepped design to make a scale transition to the neighbouring properties.
- Locating parking for the development underground allows for substantial open space on the site; as a result, the building can be circumnavigated without steps, eliminating accessibility issues.
- Landscaping will help screen the building entrance which is located further from Saanich Road than originally proposed, in response to requests by the Planning department.
- The stormwater from the roof and the underground parking runoff will be directed to separate raingardens.
- Units range from 830 to 970 square feet and will have either a deck or patio; each floor of the development will have a one bedroom unit.
- Variations in the decks, roofing and window frames will ensure that each building façade has a different appearance, as will the alternation of vertical and horizontal seamed metal panels; the use of cedar coloured hardiplank surfacing will visually link the building to

the residential character of the neighbourhood.

- The proposed building is not out of scale with neighbouring properties, due to the slope of the site, the stepped building design, and the substantial screening provided by existing vegetation.
- The shadow study indicates that the proposed building will not impact neighbouring properties, particularly during summer months.
- The owner has provided a fairly extensive list of sustainable features for Council's consideration, including dual-flush toilets and low-flow fixtures to reduce water consumption, the use of stormwater for irrigation, as well as a solar-assisted hot water system and exterior lighting; the amount of insulation and the percentage of recycled material to be used in construction are being considered.
- An increase in the amenity contribution to the Saanich Affordable Housing Fund is proposed by the owner, from \$1,200 per unit to \$1,500 per unit.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr. B. Forth, Forth Land Planning, stated:

- There will be significant landscaping on the street front, including four deciduous trees and other plantings; companion plants will be introduced to protect the nearby Garry Oaks.
- A hard surface amenity with seating will be located in the southeast corner of the property and a large grass amenity for residents will be located in the northwest corner; the walkway around the building allows residents with private patios to access the open space on site.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. E. Barker stated:

- Engineering staff preferred that the 2.5 m sidewalk in front of the development be placed against McKenzie Avenue in order to prevent short cuts.
- In the underground parking area, there will be five electric outlets available for scooters.
- The accessible units will be built with bigger bathrooms and better kitchen arrangements than would be provided in adaptable units.
- The recycling station will be located in the underground parking area and the compost facility in the barbeque area.
- The applicant would be willing to consider providing a few units within the development for affordable housing.
- There is substantial open space between the development and the single family dwelling to the west; a coniferous hedge is proposed to provide an additional buffer between the properties, but amendments would be possible if preferred by the adjacent neighbour.
- He would be willing to produce additional photo-montages for the Public Hearing indicating the perspective from the neighbouring properties.
- The owner would be willing to require that the strata council for the proposed development not be able to prevent rental of units within the building.
- The height variance will allow for the units to have 9 ft ceilings, which is now standard; the proposed building will also be placed to take advantage of the natural slope of the property.
- Meetings were held with the North Quadra Land Use Protection Association to discuss the original and current proposals.
- He attempted to meet with the residents of the neighbouring townhouses but they indicated they were not willing to enter into any

- discussions if the proposed building was over two storeys in height.
- The variance requested for the setback from the rear lot line will allow the irregular shape in building design and this will provide space for two bedroom units with sufficient windows, instead of the narrow and dark units produced by 75 feet wide rectangular apartment buildings.
  - As there is an open space between the townhouse closest to the north lot line of the subject property, it seemed like there would not be a significant conflict to place a patio opposite this space; however, the patio could be relocated if it was concern for the townhouse residents.

Mr. P. Chenier, President of the North Quadra Land Use Protection Association, 930 Tuxedo Drive, stated:

- Though the Association welcomes the affordable housing contribution and the accessible units offered by the applicant, the proposed development does not provide sufficient public amenities to offset the requested variances.
- The industrial appearance of the proposed building is not in keeping with the residential character of the neighbourhood and there are still significant concerns regarding the density, height, and positioning of the proposed building.

Mr. N. Chepel, #18 – 4021 Saanich Road, spoke in opposition to the application and stated:

- Additional vehicles in the area will worsen air quality and exacerbate road safety issues; furthermore the development will result in the loss of some trees and many shrubs currently on the property.
- The proposed height of 4 storeys is not in keeping with the residential character of the neighbourhood; 2 storeys would be more appropriate.

Ms. A. Barath, #19 – 4021 Saanich Road, stated:

- When the application for the proposed development was originally presented approximately a year ago, 23 residents signed a petition in opposition to the proposal.
- She understands that development is needed on the subject property but is concerned about the size of the proposal.

Mr. I. Goard, 4015 Saanich Road, spoke in opposition to the application and stated:

- The applicant did not take into account the impact the proposed development would have on his residence; it will dominate the site lines from the property and compromise their privacy.
- Though provided with information on the original proposal, no further details on the updated plans have been offered by the applicant.
- Development of some kind would be welcome on the subject property, but the proposed four storey building is too large.

Mayor Leonard stated:

- Though a four storey building on the subject property is within the expectations of the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), he questions the variances for the setbacks which bring the proposed building closer to adjacent neighbours.

- If the immediate neighbours are unwilling to consider any other land use than townhouses, it may be difficult to engage with the applicant; however, if they consider the possibility of a four storey development, there may be an opportunity for productive discussion in regards to the building design and siting.

**MOTION**

**MOVED by Mayor Leonard and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland: “That further consideration of the application to rezone Lot 1 and 2, Section 64, Victoria District, Plan 31934 and Lot B, Section 64, Victoria District, Plan 27745 (976, 980, and 982 McKenzie Avenue) from RS-10 to RA-6 and RS-14 to construct a 36 unit apartment building with underground parking subdivision be postponed to allow the applicant to amend the proposed design and conduct further consultation with adjacent residents.”**

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The applicant could consider requesting a variance on the front setback rather than the rear setback to reduce the impact on the neighbouring townhouses; consideration should also be given to buffering the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring single family dwellings.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She supports the motion to postpone consideration of the proposal as it will allow the applicant to address issues with the requested variances and to discuss the proposed design with adjacent residents.
- Further discussions should also be held with Engineering in regards to the proposed sidewalk, which would ideally be separated from a major roadway.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The proposed development does not respect transition zones; it can not be assumed that neighbouring properties will be redeveloped and residents should not be forced into redevelopment by a loss in property value.
- The subject property is a difficult site with constraints, which the applicant has creatively attempted to address; however, there may be too much building for the site and the proposal may be more appropriate for a larger property.

Councillor Brice stated:

- Though the subject property is in a good area for densification, the applicant should take seriously the comments made by the neighbouring residents this evening and attempt to address them by significant amendments to the proposal.
- When increasing density, Council wants to find projects that fit well into the surrounding neighbourhood and can serve as an example for future development; the industrial appearance of the proposed building and perhaps the scale, do not lend themselves to this standard of development.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The subject property is a good location for redevelopment, but the

proposal needs to fit with the community and existing neighbourhood.

- The applicant can consider the comments from this meeting and return with a mutually beneficial proposal.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- He has the impression that the applicant may be trying to force a large building on to an inappropriate site; he is particularly concerned with the proximity of the development to the adjacent townhouse complex.
- The accessible units are commendable, the landscaping is excellent, and the property is located close to a major centre; however, the applicant should consider how to amend the proposal to address Council's comments.

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

West Saanich Road  
Development Permit

**4808 WEST SAANICH ROAD – DEVELOPMENT PERMIT – DEREK AND YULIYA BRAATEN.**

Report of the Director of Planning dated August 4, 2009 making recommendations with respect to the removal of the Beaver Lake Store from the Community Heritage Register, and approval of Development Permit DPR00417 for a proposed commercial building for a veterinary office. Report of the Advisory Design Panel dated August 5, 2009 recommending approval of the design subject to consideration of the items outlined.

The applicants, Mr. D. Braaten and Ms. Y. Braaten, 4676 Boulderwood Drive, made a presentation to Council. Mr. D. Braaten stated:

- Though their intention was to renovate the existing building, they later discovered that it had suffered substantial structural failures which would make renovations prohibitively expensive; no heritage funding is available to defray the cost of these renovations.
- The site is narrow and long and the building is currently located at the lowest elevation, which causes drainage problems; the required 11 parking spaces should be located in this area, not the building.
- The septic field will occupy a third of the property at the rear of the site and the design is being reviewed by the Vancouver Island Healthy Authority.
- Easements needed to connect to the municipal stormwater system have been negotiated and registered with neighbouring properties.
- The proposal is compliant with existing development permit guidelines and zoning; the immediate neighbours support the proposal as well.
- The changes suggested by the Advisory Design Panel have been incorporated into the proposal.

In response to questions from Council, Ms. Y. Braaten, stated:

- The building has two different sections with differing façades and foundations, making it challenging to replicate.
- Though they were aware prior to purchasing the building that it was listed in the Community Heritage Register, it has not been designated which allows for more flexibility.

Mr. B. Shuya, President of the Saanich Heritage Foundation, 762 Ralph

Street, stated:

- The Sannich Heritage Foundation met with the applicants in July and do not support the application in its current form.
- The Foundation would prefer that the existing building be renovated, relocated on the site, or have a portion removed to facilitate access; however, if a new building is necessary, the applicants could use a design in keeping with the heritage character of the existing building.
- It is important to note that there are only a handful of commercial buildings currently in the Register, which continue to decrease in number.

Ms. S. MacPherson, 398 Goward Road, stated:

- Though she is sympathetic to the applicants, she is disappointed in the proposed design which is not in character with rural Saanich.
- She supports the comments made by the previous speaker.

Mr. H. Rebneris, 4764 Beaver Road, stated:

- He is sympathetic to the applicants and hopes there is some way of preserving the heritage character of the existing building, perhaps through reuse of the façade.
- Consideration could be given to relaxing the parking requirements and expediting the process to reduce construction costs.

## MOTION

**MOVED by Councillor Derman Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: “That further consideration of the application to remove the Beaver Lake Store from the Community Heritage Register and Development Permit DPR00417, Lot 15, Block 1, Section 106, Lake District, Plan 1763 (4808 West Saanich Road) for construction of a veterinary office, be postponed to allow the applicant to consult with the Saanich Heritage Foundation to revise the proposed design to be more in keeping with the heritage character of the existing building.”**

Councillor Derman stated:

- There are many heritage buildings and landscapes along West Saanich Road and he hopes that the applicants will work in good faith with the Foundation to create a better proposal.
- This building may be an example of demolition by neglect as a result of the lack of stewardship shown by the previous owners; neglect is an issue for heritage structures that needs to be addressed.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The proposed design is not appropriate for the property and he encourages the applicants to work with the Foundation to address the issues raised at this meeting.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She believes that postponing consideration of the proposal will allow the applicants to rework the design, which would hopefully incorporate retaining a portion of the façade.
- Council may be able to provide a parking variance to assist the applicants; moving or reducing the parking in front of the building will improve its appearance and the pedestrian environment.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The existing building has a lot of potential and is a landmark in a location of heritage significance to Saanich; the owner should take the heritage significance into account when revising their proposal.
- The Registry is a significant planning document and should be treated as such; other owners of heritage commercial buildings have invested significant funds towards restoration.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- It is unfortunate that the building has been neglected and he is sympathetic to the applicants whose property is surrounded by commercial buildings without value as heritage structures; however, it would be possible to replicate the existing heritage façade and the applicants need to amend their proposal accordingly.

**The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED**

Adjournment

On a motion from Mayor Leonard the meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

.....  
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK