

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM NO.2  
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**MONDAY, JULY 13, 2009 AT 6:45 P.M.**

Present: **Chair:** Mayor Leonard  
**Council:** Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Gerrard, Murdock, Sanders and Wergeland  
**Staff:** Tim Wood, Administrator

In Camera Motion **MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Gerrard:**  
**“That the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject matter being discussed relates to labour relations or other employee relations.”**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment On a motion from Councillor Derman, the meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

.....  
MAYOR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
SAANICH MUNICIPAL HALL, 770 VERNON AVENUE  
**MONDAY, JULY 13, 2009 AT 7:30 P.M.**

Present: **Chair:** Mayor Leonard  
**Council:** Councillors Brice, Brownoff, Derman, Gerrard, Murdock, Sanders, and Wergeland.  
**Staff:** Tim Wood, Administrator; Anne Topp, Manager of Community Planning; Von Bishop, Manager of Development and Municipal Facilities; Donna Dupas, Deputy Manager of Legislative Services; and Maura Brothers, Senior Committee Clerk.

Minutes **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**MOVED by Councillor Brownoff and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:**  
**“That the Minutes of the Council and Committee of the Whole Meetings held July 6, 2009 be adopted.”**

**CARRIED**

**BYLAWS**

Leyns Road  
Bylaw 9004

**4577 LEYNS ROAD (A PORTION).**  
First Reading of the “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2009, No. 9004”. Rezoning from RS-16 to RS-14 for proposed 2 lot subdivision.

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Gerrard:**  
**“That Bylaw No. 9004 be introduced and read.”**

**CARRIED**

Grange Road  
Bylaw 9005

**4051 GRANGE ROAD**

First Reading of the “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2009, No. 9005”. Rezoning from RS-6 to RS-4 and RS-2 for proposed 2 lot subdivision.

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Gerrard: “That Bylaw No. 9005 be introduced and read.”**

**CARRIED**

Boleskine Road  
Bylaw 9006

**433 AND 437 BOLESKINE ROAD/3385 AND 3389 WHITTIER AVENUE**

First Reading of the “Zoning Bylaw, 2003, Amendment Bylaw, 2009, No. 9006”. Rezoning from RS-6 to M-1DW for proposed two storey office/warehouse building.

**MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That Bylaw No. 9006 be introduced and read.”**

**CARRIED**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

*From the Committee of the Whole Meeting held July 13, 2009*

Queenswood Drive  
XRef: EPW65

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

Subdivision,  
Development  
Variance and  
Sewer Service  
Area Extension

Reports of the Director of Planning dated May 27, 2008 and June 11, 2009, further to a proposed two lot subdivision, recommending proposed Lot 1 be exempted from the statutory requirement to provide a minimum 10 percent perimeter road frontage under Section 944(2) of the Local Government Act, that Development Variance Permit DVP2007-00007 be approved, and that the property be included in the Sewer Service Area providing the owner agrees to bear the full cost of extending the infrastructure required to service the proposed lots.

**MOVED by Councillor Gerrard and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: “That Council not approve:**

- 1) 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); and**
- 2) Development Variance Permit DVP2007-00018 on Lot A, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 4830 (2685 Queenswood Drive).”**

**CARRIED**

Gordon Head Road  
Reduced Frontage  
Subdivision and  
Development  
Variance

**4305 GORDON HEAD ROAD – SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT APPLICATIONS – PATRICK BULMER.**

Report of the Director of Planning dated June 24, 2009, further to a proposed two lot subdivision, recommending proposed Lot 2 be exempted from the statutory requirement to provide a minimum 10 percent perimeter road frontage under Section 944(2) of the Local Government Act, that Development Variance Permit DVP00271 be approved, and that the owners be encouraged to pursue heritage designation of the registered dwelling, gazebo/summerhouse, and the (remaining) surrounding property.

**MOVED by Councillor Brice and Seconded by Councillor Derman: "That Council :**

- 1) **Approve an exemption from the minimum 10% perimeter road frontage requirement under Section 944(2) of the Local Government Act for proposed Lot 2 of a subdivision of Lot B, Section 45, Victoria District, Plan VIP73834, (4305 Gordon Head Road); and**
- 2) **Approve and issue Development Variance Permit DVP00271 on proposed Lot 1 of a subdivision of Lot B, Section 45, Victoria District, Plan VIP73834, (4305 Gordon Head Road)."**

**CARRIED**

Lochside Drive  
Rezoning

**4590 LOCHSIDE DRIVE – REZONING APPLICATION – MARK JOHNSTON, M.H. JOHNSTON & ASSOCIATES**

Reports of the Director of Planning dated February 27, 2008 and June 16, 2009, the latter recommending approval of the rezoning from A-1 to RS-10 and P4-N for a proposed six lot subdivision, and that prior to final reading a covenant be registered to prohibit registration of a subdivision plan unless the owner has completed or provided suitable performance security for the items outlined. Recommendation from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Advisory Committee meeting held March 19, 2009.

**MOVED by Councillor Wergeland and Seconded by Councillor Brownoff: "That Council not approve the application to rezone That Part of Lot 5, Section 7, Lake District, Plan 746, lying to the South West of the South Westerly Boundary of the former right-of-way of the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company as said right-of-way is shown on Plan 2 RW (4590 Lochside Drive) from A-1 to RS-10 and P4-N, for the purpose of subdivision to create five additional lots for single family dwelling use and 368 m<sup>2</sup> to be dedicated for park."**

**CARRIED**

In Camera Motion

**MOVED by Councillor Gerrard and Seconded by Councillor Derman: "That the following meeting be closed to the public as the subject matter being discussed relates to labour relations and or other employee relations."**

**CARRIED**

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Sanders, the meeting adjourned at 11:32 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, JULY 13, 2009 AT 7:39 P.M.

Present: **Chair:** Councillor Brice  
**Council:** Mayor Leonard and Councillors Brownoff, Derman, Gerrard, Murdock, Sanders and Wergeland.  
**Staff:** Tim Wood, Administrator; Anne Topp, Manager of Community Planning; Von Bishop, Manager of Development and Municipal Facilities; Donna Dupas, Deputy Manager of Legislative Services; and Maura Brothers, Senior Committee Clerk.

Queenswood Drive  
 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**

Reports of the Director of Planning dated May 27, 2008 and June 11, 2009, further to a proposed two lot subdivision, recommending proposed Lot 1 be exempted from the statutory requirement to provide a minimum 10 percent perimeter road frontage under Section 944(2) of the Local Government Act, that Development Variance Permit DVP2007-00007 be approved, and that the property be included in the Sewer Service Area providing the owner agrees to bear the full cost of extending the infrastructure required to service the proposed lots.

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

- The bylaw requires a permit for the removal of protected trees.
- She is not aware whether, as suggested by Mayor Leonard at the Committee of the Whole meeting on June 16, 2008, the applicant has pursued a written agreement with the owners of 2680 MacDonald Drive East regarding non-standard road access.
- A map is sent to the applicant indicating the location on the subject property where the notification sign should be placed; the sign should be placed on the subject property, which is located on Robin Street, not on Queenswood Drive, despite its street address.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Development and Municipal Facilities stated:

- Though a road width of 6 m is typically required, the applicant has submitted designs for a reduced width of 4 m with pull-outs for passing traffic.
- Robin Street could service 3 houses and is about 110 m long.
- The applicant submitted a report in February detailing the stormwater management proposed for this development, which staff found to be satisfactory.

On behalf of the applicant, Mr. N. Neate, a professional engineer with Delcan Corporation, stated:

- Attempts were made to create a method of using local topography to address stormwater management, as this would be more economical and more environmentally sound, but were ultimately unsuccessful.
- Stormwater and sewer infrastructure will be installed to the subject property southward through a right-of-way, which will divert around the stand of arbutus and fir trees located on the southeast corner of 2670

MacDonald Drive East.

- The pipes will meet up with the existing sewer infrastructure under MacDonald Drive East, with the stormwater heading under the pavement and turning south to access the existing infrastructure at 2661 MacDonald Drive East.
- Sending the stormwater infrastructure under the pavement on MacDonald Drive East will avoid the existing trees on the boulevard.
- The rain garden on the proposed lot is not indicated on the design drawings as there is sufficient space to locate it anywhere.
- The applicant supports the reduced size of building envelope and the natural state covenant indicated in his most recent submission.

The applicant, Mr. D. Boulton, 2685 Queenswood Drive, stated:

- It is his understanding that in the next phase of the process, he would view the subject property with an arborist and Saanich staff to identify which trees need to be removed.

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

- There are no protections currently in place for trees on this property, which could be problematic if the property was sold.

Mr. E. Daily, past president of the Cadboro Bay Residents Association 2923 Mount Baker View Road, stated:

- The current president of the Association, Ms. I. Stewart, sent him an email to be read to Council indicating that the applicant has not yet presented the proposal in person to the Association due to timing problems and that the plans submitted in lieu of a presentation did not address certain sewage treatment issues.
- As a resident, not an Association member, he has reviewed the subject property and supports the application.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, stated:

- He questions why this application is identified as a Queenswood Drive address when the property is located on Robin Street.
- Development should be located in major centres to reduce vehicle use and preserve green space, urban forests and existing ecosystems for future generations.
- If the proposed development proceeds, the entire property should be under natural state covenant to connect with the existing covenant bordering this property.

Mr. M. Faulkner, 2695 Queenswood Drive, stated:

- The 41 trees to be removed for the proposed development are unacceptable, especially the eight trees which will need to be removed from the road allowance which border his property.
- He is concerned regarding the proposed watermain installation as those adjacent to his property have broken in the past; he also is unsure whether a rain garden will sufficiently address stormwater run off from the proposed development.

Mr. E. Barker, 2658 MacDonald Drive East, stated:

- Now that proposal has been amended so that the trees bordering MacDonald Drive East will not be disturbed by the construction of storm

drains, he has no objections to the application.

The applicant, Mr. D. Boulton, stated:

- He hopes to build a total of three homes on Queenswood Drive over the next 15 years; all of which will be in keeping with each other and the ambiance of the neighbourhood, which is in his best interest as he intends to live in one of these homes.
- He thanks those Councillors who visited the subject property to assist in their understanding of the proposed development.
- The proposed lot sizes would be 0.75 ha which would fit well with other lots sizes in the area.
- The proposal is in keeping with the Cadboro Bay Local Area Plan (LAP) and the criteria to establish a panhandle lot has been met.
- A few years ago, he subdivided a lot on Queenswood Drive, almost half of which he dedicated to a natural state covenant; however, in order to construct a dwelling with a driveway and appropriate services, over 51 trees needed to be removed which is more than the amount being requested for this proposal.

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

- He lives in the cottage currently existing on the property which has old wiring and insulation; though it is too old to keep in the long term, he has no immediate interest in replacing it.
- The cottage was constructed in approximately 1947 and is not a particularly high quality building; there is little in it that could be reused, except the floors which he will be keeping for his own use.
- He is unsure why Council does not have plans which show the jog of 10 to 15 ft in the servicing running through 2670 MacDonald Drive East, but it was created with an arborist in order to retain as many trees as possible in the stand of trees on the southeast corner.
- He will replace the eight boulevard trees to be removed, of which one is dead and another is an overgrown holly bush; however, the trees are being removed to meet Saanich's road requirements for a traffic roundabout, which he feels are unnecessary and not in keeping with the needs of the residents.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Development and Municipal Facilities stated:

- The proposed design includes a new watermain under the asphalt portion of Robin Street with a fire hydrant at the end.
- The Building Code requires that there be access or turning at the end of a road for fire trucks; the requirements for turn around on Robin Street have been reduced as far as staff feel comfortable.
- A "hammerhead" turn, not a turnaround, is being required.
- The existing property has an address on Queenswood Drive presumably because Robin Street has not existed officially for long enough to acquire a street sign; as part of the subdivision process, new street numbers can be created with Robin Street addresses.

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

- There was an addendum report submitted on June 12, 2008 which clarified that the 300 m<sup>2</sup> mentioned in the May 27, 2008 report referred to

the approximate building footprint, not the gross floor area of the proposed dwelling.

- The Queenswood Drive addresses were likely retained for convenience; through the subdivision process, some changes will be made to Robin Street, including new street addresses and signage.

**MOTION**

**MOVED by Mayor Leonard and Seconded by Councillor Wergeland:**  
**“That it be recommended that Council:**

- 1) Approve 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);**
- 2) Approve and issue Development Variance Permit DVP2007-00018 on Lot A, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 4830 (2685 Queenswood Drive); and**
- 3) Approve the property’s inclusion in the Sewer Service Area providing the owner agrees to bear the full cost of extending the infrastructure required to service the proposed lots;**

**And that the Approving Officer be requested to consider during the subdivision review process:**

- 1) A covenant to protect Area “A” as a Natural State Area;**
- 2) The site of the dwelling on proposed Lot 1 to be located approximately as shown Figure 2 in the Director of Planning’s report dated May 27, 2008; and**
- 3) A covenant for tree preservation to require that the trees remaining on proposed Lot 1 located outside the proposed building foot print and not identified for removal by an arborist and Parks staff be protected.”**

Mayor Leonard stated:

- Two homes located on 65,000 ft<sup>2</sup> should not be considered dense.
- The applicant has put forward mitigation efforts thoroughly and in good faith.
- The lot sizes will be 50% larger than the minimum for the area and are considerably larger than those to the south.

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- The proposed development will see 41 trees removed from the urban forest which contradicts policies 6.4 and 6.6 in the Cadboro Bay LAP that indicate respectively support for preservation of ecosystems and a contiguous urban forest; the blasting and excavation from construction of and servicing to the proposed dwelling would further impact the ecosystem and urban forest on this property.
- Purchasing a property with the hope of subdivision is a gamble; he has not heard the community support necessary to approve the application.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She agrees with the statements by Councillor Gerrard.

- There was not sufficient public input on this development, perhaps due to the location of the notification sign on Robin Street; there is also discrepancies between what the applicant has proposed at this meeting and what has been submitted to date.

Councillor Murdock stated:

- He agrees largely with the preceding statements made by Council, especially in regards to the Carboro Bay LAP and the urban forest.
- This development will require the future occupants to have a car; Council should be looking for opportunities to locate density in major centres and not allow sprawl into natural areas and ecosystems.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She would be more supportive of the proposal if the tree protection covenant had been included with the application; as well, she would have preferred the applicant to provide a concept design for the dwelling to be constructed later on proposed Lot 2.
- The location of the notification sign on Robin Street is problematic, as is the removal of 41 trees.

Councillor Derman stated:

- Though the property is distant from service centres, the application has an environmentally benefit in that it would provide for substantial additional protection to the urban forest, beyond what is provided for in Saanich's bylaw.
- The requirements by Saanich for changes to Robin Street as a result of the application are unnecessary.
- The owner might consider a different, more detailed application which placed more of the property under a natural area covenant.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- The application provides significant protection for the urban forest, especially considering the size of the lot; furthermore, this property is not as far from major centres as other locations for single family homes.
- Greater relaxation of Saanich's road requirements should have been considered for this application.

**The Motion was then PUT and DEFEATED, with Councillors Brownoff, Derman, Gerrard, Murdock and Sanders voting against.**

Gordon Head Road  
Reduced Frontage Subdivision and Development Variance

**4305 GORDON HEAD ROAD – SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT APPLICATIONS – PATRICK BULMER.**

Report of the Director of Planning dated June 24, 2009, further to a proposed two lot subdivision, recommending proposed Lot 2 be exempted from the statutory requirement to provide a minimum 10 percent perimeter road frontage under Section 944(2) of the Local Government Act, that Development Variance Permit DVP00271 be approved, and that the owners be encouraged to pursue heritage designation of the registered dwelling, gazebo/summerhouse, and the (remaining) surrounding property.

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

- Since the laneway on to which the proposed driveways will access is a lot

owned by Saanich, it is legally required that proposed lot 2 have direct access to a public road; as a result, proposed Lot 2 will need to be a panhandle with legal access to Gordon Head Road.

- There are several issues which would prevent future owners from subdividing proposed Lot 2, including its size and a lack of access.

In response to questions from Council, the Manager of Development and Municipal Facilities stated:

- It is likely that the driveway pillars could be retained, as the intent is only that the driveway be removed and replanted.

The applicant, Mr. P. Bulmer, 4305 Gordon Head Road, stated:

- His property had previously been subdivided in approximately 2002, in accordance with the Gordon Head Road Planning Study guidelines.
- He has worked closely with the Saanich Heritage Foundation and planning staff to put together this application.
- The "Tigana" pillars were installed in partnership with his neighbour who was a previous resident of the house when it was so named.
- He plans to live in the existing house and is meeting with the Saanich Heritage Foundation to discuss having it heritage designated.
- He has a personal commitment to heritage and had the summerhouse moved to the property approximately 10 years from Arbutus Road to preserve the structure; the summerhouse, which was designed by Hubert Savage, will be retained.
- There are a few protected trees on the property, including a Chinese Elm and a Pacific Dogwood; covenants were placed on a few other trees during the original subdivision in 2002 which would not have been protected otherwise.

In response to questions from Council, the applicant, Mr. P. Bulmer stated:

- For the roof renovation, consideration is being given to cedar shingle, but it is very expensive and does not last as long as other materials.
- He is not intending to personally undertake building on the Proposed Lot 1, but will be including a building scheme for potential buyers, some of whom have expressed interest in constructing a small Arts and Crafts style dwelling.
- The "Tigana" pillars could be retained, or moved to address safety concerns.
- He will be discussing the addition of dormers to the existing dwelling with the Saanich Heritage Foundation; if added to the north side of the structure they would likely not be visible to the public.
- Saanich ownership of the lane allows the public to be able to view the heritage elements of the property which has been included on tours by the prior Saanich Archivist.

Ms. B. Tabata, member of the Gordon Head Residents' Association, 4151 Torquay Drive, stated:

- The Association has no concerns regarding this application, but do have some issues with Saanich's notification signage requirements; the signs would be more helpful if they showed the location of the proposed lots within the subject property to be subdivided.
- The referral of this application to the Association from Saanich only indicated a subdivision and not that a variance would be required.

Mr. B. Shuya, president of the Saanich Heritage Foundation, 762 Ralph Street, stated:

- He is very pleased to hear that the applicant is willing to pursue designation of the existing dwelling, which is currently included on the Heritage Register; the support building, referred to as a gazebo is also included on the register.
- The applicant could consider designating the support building and the property itself to ensure no further development.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, 1044 Inverness Road, stated:

- Though he congratulates the applicant on seeking heritage designation for the existing dwelling, he would like to remind Council that this development is in a car-oriented location.

**MOTION:**

**MOVED by Councillor Gerrard and Seconded by Councillor Sanders: "That it be recommended that Council :**

- 1) Approve an exemption from the minimum 10% perimeter road frontage requirement under Section 944(2) of the Local Government Act for proposed Lot 2 of a subdivision of Lot B, Section 45, Victoria District, Plan VIP73834, (4305 Gordon Head Road); and**
- 3) Approve and issue Development Variance Permit DVP00271 on proposed Lot 1 of a subdivision of Lot B, Section 45, Victoria District, Plan VIP73834, (4305 Gordon Head Road);**

**And that the owners of 4305 Gordon Head Road be encouraged to pursue heritage designation of the registered dwelling, gazebo/summerhouse and the (remaining) surrounding property."**

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- She is pleased to see that the applicant is willing to pursue heritage designation and is happy to support this application.

Councillor Derman stated:

- It would be wonderful if consideration could be given to designating the entire property.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- She compliments the applicant on his stewardship of this 1910 house and she likes that another structure will not obstruct the public's view of the house from the laneway.

**The Motion was then PUT and CARR**

Lochside Drive  
Rezoning

**4590 LOCHSIDE DRIVE – REZONING APPLICATION – MARK JOHNSTON, M.H. JOHNSTON & ASSOCIATES**

Reports of the Director of Planning dated February 27, 2008 and June 16, 2009, the latter recommending approval of the rezoning from A-1 to RS-10 and P4-N for a proposed six lot subdivision, and that prior to final reading a covenant be registered to prohibit registration of a subdivision plan unless the owner has completed or provided suitable performance security for the items

outlined. Recommendation from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Advisory Committee meeting held March 19, 2009.

Mr. M. Mawson, 7942 Polo Park Crescent, Saanichton, on behalf of the applicant stated:

- This application has been underway for some time.
- In addition to consultation with Saanich Planning and Engineering staff, discussions on the application have been undertaken with the following: the owners of adjacent properties; Blenkinsop Valley Community Association; Broadmead Area Residents' Association; Capital Regional District (CRD) Parks staff; Lochside Elementary School Parent Advisory Committee (PAC); School District #63 staff; Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition; and Saanich Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Advisory Committee.
- The consultation process resulted in some modifications to the application which have improved the project; it is now more broadly supported by the majority of the groups involved.
- The number of proposed lots has been reduced from eight to six and increased in size to 1,000 m<sup>2</sup>, which conforms to the lot sizes in the adjacent Broadmead neighbourhood.
- The applicant is prepared to implement the following staff recommendations: limit the size of the homes the proposed lots; dedicate an addition to the existing park strip buffer; and pay the five percent cash-in-lieu park contribution based on the total value of the property.
- A native tree planting program will be undertaken by the applicant on the property, under direction by Parks staff, to ensure that if trees die or become dangerous they will be replaced with healthy specimens.
- The applicant will undertake works to improve the student drop-off and pick-up functions that currently impact the parking lot at the front of Lochside Elementary School by creating a new staff-only parking lot which will be accessed off Lochside Drive and will free up 20 parking spaces for general use; these additional spaces will remove the congestion from the school's Lochside Drive frontage, which negatively impacts other road and trail users.
- Lochside Elementary School's Parental Advisory Committee and School District #63 have both endorsed the concept for the school improvements; if the application is approved, construction will be undertaken as quickly as possible at times that will not be disruptive.
- There are also improvements proposed to Lochside Drive, including widening the road to 6 m and installation of a separated concrete sidewalk from the south boundary of the site to Royal Oak Drive.
- This property has never been used for agricultural purposes and was deliberately left out of the agricultural land reserve due to its lack of potential; the lower portion of the site suffers from poor drainage, while the treed westerly portion has bedrock very close to the surface.
- Lochside Drive serves as a constructed buffer to the farm lands in the Blenkinsop Valley and the property to the east side of the Lochside right-of-way adjacent to the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) boundary has a natural buffer with dense growth.
- The proposed residence closest to the ALR boundary is over 40 m distant, which is greater than the recommended minimum separation distance of 30 m.

- The applicant can work with Saanich staff during the subdivision process to facilitate communication to prospective residents that nearby farm operations and trail use are to be expected in this area.

In response to questions from Council, Mr. M. Mawson stated:

- The applicant is willing to covenant the seven items recommended in the Director of Planning's supplemental report dated June 16, 2009 and would propose to expand on some covenant protection along the rear boundaries of properties.
- The driveway for proposed Lot 1 would be off Lochside Drive, using the existing break and the subdivision alignment for the sidewalk would take over the existing driveway.
- The existing house on the property would be deconstructed.
- Saanich requires that the extensive driveway from the Quailwood Place property be closed.

Mr. W. Rowley, 1085 Quailwood Place, stated:

- He is opposed to the development based on noise, design issues and the rural/agricultural integrity.
- The noise produced by the construction for the proposed development would disturb the area residents and users of Lochside Elementary School.
- The applicant has not met with the neighbourhood since April 11, 2007 to share the changes to the proposed development.
- The 3700 sq. ft. proposed dwellings are an average of 48% larger than the houses on Quailwood Place and Quailwood Close, making them out of character with the surrounding area.
- The arborist's report for the original proposal indicated that the majority of the trees on the subject property would need to be removed and an updated arborist report for the amended proposal has not been provided; of special concern are the trees on the west side of the property which provide privacy and sound buffering to Quailwood Place and Quailwood Close.
- In light of climate change and sustainability issues, the property's current A-1 rural zoning should not be changed to RS-10 to accommodate high density residential housing.
- Instead of balancing urban and rural needs, this Council has actively encouraged urban growth and subdivision, excepting their recent decision on Holland Avenue.
- At the All Candidates Meeting held on November 3, 2008, the candidates were asked what development in the Blenkinsop Valley meant to them; all referred to the Blenkinsop Valley as a jewel that demands protection.
- Irrelevant of its inclusion in the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB), if Council considers this property as located in the Blenkinsop Valley, they should want to preserve the valley's integrity and maintain the property's current A-1 zoning.

Mr. N. Mogensen 3760 Crestview Road, stated:

- As it is similar to the property to the south, which grows and sells raspberries, and has previously kept poultry and pigs, it is likely the site of the proposed development could be used for food production.

- Climate change and food availability issues mean that local arable lands should be preserved.
- Land should not be developed this far from major centres.

\*\*\*\*\*

Councillor Murdock left the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. J. Kelly, 4796 Spring Road stated:

- This development is relatively small, located close to schools, trails and the bus, with dwellings approximately the same size as those in the surrounding an area.
- The applicant has consulted the appropriate stakeholders.
- After years of dropping children off at Lochside Elementary, it would be welcome to see the proposed improvements.
- He believes the development will enhance the Lochside Trail.
- He supports this application as it is a good location and a well-designed development.

\*\*\*\*\*

Councillor Murdock returned to the meeting at 9:29 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. B. Loucks, representing the Blenkinsop Valley Community Association, 4160 Glendenning Road, stated:

- The Community Association reviewed information referred to them by Saanich and met with the developer two years ago.
- The proposed development is not supported by the Community Association, as it will erode the buffer between the ALR and the residential homes in Broadmead provided by the large properties on the west of Lochside Drive; policy 14 of section 5.11 of the Official Community Plan (OCP) supports the buffering of rural and agricultural lands from adjacent urban residential development.
- This part of Lochside Drive serves as the Lochside Trail's northern gateway to the Blenkinsop Valley; the proposed development will negatively impact the trail through loss of vegetation and rural ambience, which is contrary to Policy 10.10 in the Blenkinsop LAP.
- The proposed subdivision is not in character with the other properties on this section of Lochside Drive; as the other properties are outside the UCB this discrepancy will likely remain permanent.
- Reduction in local food production could become a problem in the future, and land which is zoned for agricultural use should be preserved.
- The proposed development is not in keeping with Blenkinsop Valley LAP policies 5:10, 6.1 and 6.2 or the Community Vision.

Ms. L. Farey, 837 Blakeney Place, stated:

- She supports the application and the location of the proposed development.
- The proposed improvements to Lochside Elementary School will increase children's safety.

Ms. M. Thompson, 5247 Hanover Place, stated:

- She supports the improvements to Lochside Elementary School and

commends the developer for the proposed improvements to Lochside Trail as well.

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

- She would like to speak strongly against the application.
- The proposed development is contrary to the Regional Growth Strategy (RGS), the regional Green and Blue Spaces report, and all Saanich policies on urban containment and sustainability.
- This property should not have been included in the UCB, but it should retain its A-1 zoning, which is the same as the adjacent properties; these lands were meant to serve as a buffer to the agricultural properties to the east.
- Previously, farmland has not been protected in Saanich, especially in Gordon Head and Cordova Bay
- Cars tend to increase their speed on paved roads, so the lane is safer in its present condition; the value of removing trees to putting sidewalks in rural areas or to widen the road is questionable.
- If members of Council support the OCP statements on sustainability, retaining rural areas and providing buffers for agricultural land, they should not approve the proposed development.

Ms. K. Chrabaszcz, 1880 Wenman Place, stated:

- She fully supports the application.
- As a regular user of Lochside Trail and Lochside Drive, she feels the improvements suggested will be beneficial and enhance safety.

Mr. P. Kraeling, 4440 Shore Way, stated:

- He supports the application, especially the improvements to the trail and the school.

Ms. K. Larson, 1907 San Juan Avenue, stated:

- She supports the application.
- A similar subdivision near Rogers School was excellent for the neighbourhood, allowing children to live near and walk to school.
- The proposed improvements to the school are very important for safety reasons.

Mr. G. Potter, Vice-President of the Broadmead Area Residents' Association, 4453 Sunnywood Place, stated:

- The Association has been discussing this proposal with the applicant for seven years.
- As of a meeting with the applicant on May 22, 2009, the majority of the Association's concerns have been addressed especially in regards to the number of lots proposed in the subdivision.
- The widening of the trail and the improvements for Lochside Elementary School will be beneficial for the Broadmead Area.
- The Association supports the application.

Ms. N. Chambers, 4317 Blenkinsop Road, stated:

- Unlike a previous speaker, she strongly dislikes the development near Rogers School.

- She would like to congratulate Council on the OCP, the RGS, Healthy Saanich and the recent decision on Holland Avenue.
- The decision to move the subject property inside the UCB was unacceptable as this lot has a significant impact on agriculture, biodiversity and potential food production; rezoning this property would also have a negative impact on these issues.
- This property provides a wetland filter area and natural buffering to the ALR; rezoning it would destroy these benefits and allow for a domino effect of development to other nearby properties.
- The biodiversity on this property helps to promote pollination and thus agriculture.
- The proposed development will impact the trail and will increase the number of vehicles on Lochside Drive near the school, especially during peak hours.
- The dwellings in the proposed development will be sizable, and likely too costly for parents of children attending Lochside Elementary School.
- This is one of the last country roads in Saanich and the proposed development will destroy that rural ambience.
- She asks that Council not rezone this property.
- Another neighbouring resident, Ms. P. Roberts attended the meeting to express her opposition to the development, but had to leave earlier due to transportation issues.

Mr. E. Low, 3982 Blue Ridge Place, stated:

- He is opposed to this application.
- The proposed development will require removing trees from the property; existing trees should be preserved to address climate change as they store more carbon than young, newly-planted trees.

\*\*\*\*\*

Councillor Gerrard left the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

- Creating a staff-only parking lot on the west side of the school will require removing the grass and paving the area; instead, the school should be discouraging vehicle use to reduce traffic and increase student safety.
- This development is not sustainable as there are no services for residents nearby, meaning that residents will likely use vehicles for travel, contributing to traffic issues and carbon emissions.

Mr. R. Grant, 4201 Prospect Lake Road, stated:

- He supports the application.
- This is a small piece of property which is unlikely to produce much in the way of agriculture; furthermore, if it was used for agriculture, the property would be cleared of trees.
- The proposed development has green spaces and is laid out well on the property; construction is likely to be completed within a year and the noise is unlikely to disrupt school activities with the windows closed.
- The proposed dwellings will likely be priced similarly to other homes in the Broadmead; the current residents should allow others to have a similar opportunity to live the area.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Councillor Gerrard returned to the meeting at 9:50 p.m.  
\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. D. Chambers, 4317 Blenkinsop Road, stated:

- He opposes the application, specifically the proposed rezoning.
- In order for fruit and vegetables to be produced, flowers need to be pollinated; unfortunately disease, pesticides, herbicides and larger-scale agriculture are negatively impacting bee populations.
- Most of the seed used in agriculture is not produced locally; it is important that existing local seed production be protected and this development will not address that issue.
- Neighbouring property owners whose lots have not been used for agriculture in the past are starting to grow crops and consider buffering; developments, such as the one proposed by the applicant reduce buffer land and wildlife habitat.
- As native bees live in small cavities within trees, it is crucial that land with trees buffer agricultural properties.

Ms. A. Barclay, 4335 Blenkinsop Road, stated:

- The key issue in regards to this application is the proposed rezoning from agricultural to residential use.
- The message being sent to the students of Lochside Elementary School should be that buffering agricultural land to ensure food production is of greater importance to our society than parking lots.

Mr. E. Polinsky, 4198 Glenndenning Road, stated:

- He is strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning.
- A subdivision with vehicles exiting on to the trail will not be safer for users and in the Blenkinsop LAP, Policy 10.10 indicates that consideration should be given to the "potential impacts of new development adjacent to the regional trail".
- The parking in the proposed subdivision for visitors is insufficient.
- The subject property serves as a buffer zone between the residential properties in Broadmead and the adjacent agricultural land.
- The importance of agriculture in this area is indicated in Policy 5 in the Blenkinsop LAP
- The School Board, not the applicant, should be responsible for addressing the traffic issues at Lochside Elementary School.

Ms. K. Low, 3982 Blue Ridge Place, stated:

- She is opposed to the application.
- The proposed development does not comply with the Saanich Vision in the OCP.
- Instead of providing additional parking and infrastructure for vehicles as is proposed by the applicant, improving safe walking/cycling routes to Lochside Elementary School would be more in keeping with Saanich's commitment to reducing our community's carbon footprint and greenhouse gas emissions.
- The proposed development is located too far from major centres, according to the 2009-2013 Strategic Plan and the RGS.
- With its current zoning, the subject property has the potential to be used for agriculture, which would address five of the ten community values

identified in the OCP; the proposed development would only address two of these values.

- Saanich has already exceeded the 2026 target for single-family dwellings per hectare with the Urban Containment Boundary; instead of approving this application, Council should focus on the other goals in the OCP and the Blenkinsop LAP that have not been achieved.

Mr. C. Edge, Executive Director of the Canadian Homebuilders Association, stated:

- The land in Saanich currently being farmed was forest at one time that was cleared for agricultural use; developers do not “sink their teeth” into this land any more so than farmers.
- It is necessary not to look only at the needs of those who already have homes; a broader and more balanced perspective is needed.
- In order to reduce reliance on vehicles and incorporate light rail transit, density needs to be created.
- The contribution made to our society by developers and builders should not be ignored; additionally, the builder for this application has been trained for Built Green standards, which is commendable.

Mr. B. Jones, 300 Hector Road, stated:

- He supports the application and sees the potential for six families to occupy the subdivision, possibly with food-producing gardens.

Mr. D. Mann 1089 Quailwood Place, stated

- He has waited for eight years to speak to Council regarding the proposed development and is concerned that interested parties might not be able to attend this meeting due to conflicts with their summer holidays.
- Though the applicant has reduced the number of proposed lots, the proposed dwellings have increased in size and the location remains inappropriate for development.
- The subject property has standing water and mud in evidence from early fall to late spring, which drains from adjacent properties into nearby ponds and Lochside Creek; radical changes to the existing drainage pattern will be required for development and will disrupt the habitat of the wetland wildlife in the area.
- Building residential property next to agricultural lands will be problematic due to noise and other byproducts of agricultural use.
- The development will result in the removal of trees and an increase in vehicle traffic along the Lochside Trail; the applicant has stated that there will be no interruption to the trail during construction which seems to show a lack of understanding how disruptive construction activities can be.
- At an All Candidates Meeting held at Lochside School, when asked about the subject property, all candidates expressed support for retaining and protecting the recreational and agricultural nature of this property and the Blenkinsop Valley in general.

Ms. S. Jack, 3926 Hobbs Street, stated:

- She confirms the previous speaker’s recollections of the All Candidates Meeting held at Lochside School and urges the members of Council to reject the application.

Mr. K. Whitcroft, member of the Saanich Environmental Advisory Committee, 1044 Inverness Road, stated:

- The subject property is a wetland which has a critical role for the natural environment; there are attempts underway to restore destroyed wetlands due to their importance.
- Smaller trees should be protected as they will take the place of larger trees as they die off.
- Ecosystems regulate our environment, clean atmospheric gases, maintain genetic diversity, sustain the water cycle, recycle nutrients and pollinate crops; they are crucial to our survival and it is important to demonstrate this to the students of Lochside Elementary School.
- Green building is very important, but location is also an important consideration.
- Buffering reduces the need for pesticide use on agricultural lands.
- Development should be located in major centres in order to preserve what remains of the natural environment.

Mr. G. Parker, 1078 Quailwood Place, stated:

- He is a member of the Saanich Board of Variance.
- He has met with the applicant, walked the subject property and reviewed documentation related to this development collected over eight years.
- A sewer engineering report undertaken on behalf of the applicant dated May 30, 2001 states that the property has a 0.5 grade; however the supporting geospatial data indicates a 5 m rise and handheld Global Positioning System device used at the property indicates a rise of 7.15 m.
- It appears that the basis for moving the subject property into the UCB was the assumption that it could be serviced by gravity; this assumption may have been made on the basis of faulty data.
- This property is a water catchment area for surrounding properties.
- When Council made a motion on May 27, 2002 that no environmental or social review was required, staff indicated that due to an error not all interested residents were contacted; this error has persisted to this day and as a result public participation has not been perfect.
- In September 11, 2002 the LAP recommendation to Council was justified because a recent survey indicated that a gravity-fed sewer was not possible.
- The subject property is a strategic location that has implications beyond the proposed development.
- The improvements proposed for Lochside Elementary School will not stop problematic behaviour by parents dropping-off and picking-up students.
- Both the OCP and the Blenkinsop LAP indicate that no infrastructure should be built to the ALR; however this development requires significant infrastructure, as is indicated by the number of dwellings that need to be constructed in order for the applicant to receive sufficient returns on his investment.

Ms. I. Block, 27-4125 Interurban Road, stated:

- She opposes the application.
- Saanich Council has traditionally recognized that although the Blenkinsop Valley could easily be developed for residential use it must be protected for agriculture.
- There is some confusion regarding the date of the most recent update to the Blenkinsop LAP, as well as contradictions between the documents

provided by the applicant and the servicing requirement whether or not the proposed development requires additional servicing infrastructure.

\*\*\*\*\*

Councillor Gerrard left the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

- The report from the Director of Planning refers to Lochside Drive as an active transportation corridor which is incorrect and the extent of the proposed expansion is excessive.
- The School Board should be responsible for any improvements to the parking lot at Lochside Elementary School and for ensuring all safety requirements are met.
- If approved, this application could set a precedent that would negatively impact the Blenkinsop Valley.

\*\*\*\*\*

Councillor Gerrard returned to the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ms. B. Lund, 1194 Sunnybank Court, stated:

- When the Lochside Elementary School PAC voted in favour of the proposed improvements, only 20 members were in attendance.
- There have been communication problems between the applicant, school staff and the School Board.
- As a professional biologist working on biodiversity, she is concerned about the bees in this area and the buffer zone for adjacent agricultural lands.
- Though the employment produced by construction is beneficial, the location proposed for this development is problematic, in part due to the site's drainage properties.
- Most parents at Lochside Elementary School will not be able to afford to live in the proposed subdivision; instead the dwellings could likely be purchased by older retired persons who may not be comfortable with having children nearby.
- The additional parking lot may not be necessary as previously the school has worked with Safer City in the past to reduce the number of vehicles on site; the changeover in parents means that the message gets lost.
- It is important to clarify that the decision to allow the improvements to Lochside Elementary School can only be made by the School District, not the PAC.

Mr. D. Larson, 1907 San Juan Avenue, stated:

- He supports the application.
- The location of the proposed development is within walking distance of the Royal Oak shopping centre.
- Saanich needs smart growth in order to provide sufficient taxes to fund municipal amenities.

Mr. M. Hawes, 4571 Lochside Drive, circulated copies of a photograph showing traffic issues on Lochside Drive and stated:

- Though it has the feeling of a trail, Lochside Drive is a public roadway; the portion next to the subject property is heavily used by cyclists, pedestrians and vehicle traffic – some of which is produced by working farms in the area.
- His farm uses Lochside Drive to move hay during harvest time with three

bale wagons; it is not sufficiently wide for cyclists to pass his wagons, creating frustration and hostility by other road users.

- Saanich's development of the Lochside Trail has caused a significant increase in cycling traffic and the resulting safety issues need to be addressed.

Mr. W. Schrader, 917 Maltwood Terrace, stated:

- He supports the application.
- As a frequent trail user, he has seen the safety issues discussed by the previous speaker.
- The traffic flow of Lochside Elementary School is non-functional and the proposed changes would be a great improvement.
- All users of Lochside Drive would benefit from the road widening.
- The applicant has a positive reputation in the region and has covered all necessary factors for a six lot subdivision.

Mr. T. Fournier, a worker on Madrona Farm, stated:

- He does not support the development as he does not see any environmental or safety benefits.
- Food security is an issue on Vancouver Island and rezoning agricultural land makes neighboring properties more expensive for potential farmers.

In response to comments from the public, Mr. M. Mawson, on behalf of the applicant, stated:

- The noise produced by constructing the proposed development would have only a minimal impact on the school; construction would last months, not years, and would be primarily undertaken in the summer.
- The size of lots proposed for this development does not represent high density, and the dwellings will be less than allowed under the proposed zoning.
- The subject property is within the UCB and the Sewer Service Area, which means that it was considered as being a potential development site when the RGS was adopted; any attempt to develop the adjacent lands would be much more difficult as they fall outside the UCB and the Sewer Service Area.
- In a study undertaken by Boulevard Transportation, only 9.5 trips would be produced by the proposed development in peak morning and afternoon hours; the traffic produced by Lochside was much more significant and at times would have made access for emergency vehicles impossible.
- Wildlife has found their own corridors through the Broadmead area despite other developments.
- The parking at Lochside Elementary School was raised by Saanich as an issue that had to be addressed as part of the processing of any application on the subject property.
- Lochside Drive is a dedicated road that must be made compatible with the various users currently accessing it.
- There is standing water on the subject property, not because it is a wetland in the traditional sense, but because there are several drain pipes in the park area which direct water onto it and it is not served by an adequate ditch.
- The applicant engaged the services of a professional engineer to prepare the development submission for Saanich's review; as a result, it is hard to

imagine a significant error in regards to gravity service and gradient, but if that were the case, the Approving Officer would have grounds to deny the subdivision.

- The School Board has provided approval for the proposed improvements to Lochside Elementary School.

Councillor Derman stated:

- The applicant has an excellent regional reputation as a leader in green building practices, which makes it surprising that no further consultation was undertaken with the Blenkinsop Valley Community Association or the residents of Quailwood Place over the last two years.
- The rationale for moving the subject property inside the UCB is unclear and though the site may have limited agricultural potential, it does serve as a buffer to an agricultural area of increasing significance.
- The proposed changes to Lochside Drive will make it less safe as traffic tends to increase speed on wider roads and would change the rural nature of the interface with the Blenkinsop Valley.

**MOTION:                    MOVED by Councillor Derman and Seconded by Councillor Sanders:  
“That the meeting extend past 11:00 p.m.”**

**CARRIED**

Councillor Murdock stated:

- There is a benefit to preserving the buffer between residential and agricultural lands.
- Though 6 lots is not unreasonable density in other areas, it is not appropriate in this location of priceless agricultural value.
- He shares Councillor Derman’s concerns about the lack of consultation by the applicant over the last 2 years.

**MOTION:                    MOVED by Councillor Murdock and Seconded by Councillor Sanders:  
“That it be recommended that Council not approve the application to rezone That Part of Lot 5, Section 7, Lake District, Plan 746, lying to the South West of the South Westerly Boundary of the former right-of-way of the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company as said right-of-way is shown on Plan 2 RW (4590 Lochside Drive) from A-1 to RS-10 and P4-N, for the purpose of subdivision to create five additional lots for single family dwelling use and 368 m<sup>2</sup> to be dedicated for park.”**

Councillor Gerrard stated:

- The applicant, a reputable developer who builds to green standards, has reduced the density of the proposed development and addressed Lochside Elementary School’s parking issues at the direction of Saanich.
- Another application was unanimously rejected by Council recently on the basis that it was not within the UCB and Sewer Service Area; however the subject property is within the UCB and Sewer Service Area and is not located within the ALR.

Councillor Wergeland stated:

- He does not recall speaking against a development on this particular property.
- The site of the proposed development is within cycling distance of services.

Councillor Brownoff stated:

- The developer has a good reputation and she is also surprised about the lack of consultation after a two year delay.
- She does not support this application based on the rezoning and the letter from the School Board takes no position on the application.

Councillor Sanders stated:

- The location for the property is not appropriate for the proposed development as it serves as buffer between residential and agricultural lands.
- The School Board should address the traffic and parking issues at Lochside Elementary School.

Mayor Leonard stated:

- It is understandable that the amenities proposed for Lochside Elementary School have inspired support for the application; it is important to note that this property has not been farmed and there are no intentions to do so.
- The size of the lots proposed is problematic given the subject property's proximity to the Blenkinsop Valley.

Councillor Brice stated:

- She commends the applicant on a complete and professional presentation; however the proposal does not transition well between the Broadmead Area and the Blenkinsop Valley.

**The Motion was then PUT and CARRIED, with Councillors Gerrard and Wergeland voting against.**

Adjournment

On a motion from Councillor Brownoff, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

.....  
CHAIR

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

.....  
MUNICIPAL CLERK