



**MINUTES**  
**OAK BAY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2016 AT 5:00 PM**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Andrew Appleton  
Brian Holl  
Michael Low  
Kris Nichols

Esther Paterson  
Andrew Stinson  
Tim Taddy

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Pam Copley

Rus Collins

**STAFF PRESENT**

Deborah Jensen, Planner  
Krista Mitchell, Building & Planning Clerk

Roy Thomassen, Director, Building & Planning

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 pm.

**2. Adoption of Minutes**

The Chairperson noted the Advisory Planning Commission is a committee of Council and all meetings are open to the public; however, public participation is not in this forum, but at later stages of the development process.

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from June 7, 2016 be adopted.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

**3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items**

The agenda was approved as presented, with the addition of two items under Item (6) Information Items.

**4. Old Business**

None.

## 5. New Business

### a. DVP00045 – 2215 Dalhousie Street

To relax parking requirements to allow for one uncovered parking space.

D. Jensen gave a summary of the application. Some of the comments were:

- Request is to remove the covered parking requirement, which also requires a variance to one parking space.
- Replacing the existing non-conforming deck in the backyard and requesting a total side yard setback variance.

N. Banks, applicant, presented the application. Some of the comments were:

- Original house is sited skewed on the property and does not meet side yard setback requirements, so is nonconforming.
- Basement area designed as garage is being utilized as living space, and is too small for a garage.
- Have looked at alternatives for on site parking, but would result in removal of a significant hedge that provides privacy to the owners and the neighbour.
- There is very little pressure on this street for on street parking.
- Neighbours are supportive of the application.
- The existing garage is used as living space.

### ***Commission Comments***

Commission members asked for clarification regarding the proposed variances, and confirmed the neighbours have no concerns about parking.

N. Banks stated the variances will be for the non-conforming setbacks and parking, advising the deck was constructed with a building permit in 1972.

D. Jensen noted that no correspondence has been received for this application.

R. Thomassen confirmed that a building permit process is still required for works previously done on the property.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DVP00045.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- b. ZON00003 / DP000007 / HAP00005 – 1701 Beach Drive  
To permit redevelopment of Glenlyon Norfolk School (GNS).

D. Jensen gave a summary of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing to remove buildings constructed in the 1960's and construct a new building, relocate the original Rattenbury coach house, and replace the kindergarten buildings located on the south end of the site.
- Applications involve discharging a land use contract, consideration of the Shorelines and Watercourses Development Permit Areas, and completion of a Heritage Alteration Permit.
- A public hearing is required for discharging a land use contract, followed by Council consideration of the development permits and heritage alteration permit.
- The land use contract is very specific to the use and siting of buildings on the site. It sets out building locations and dimensions, as well as landscaping.
- The land use contract restricts use of the property to a school, whereas the P2 zone allows for a range of uses and sets out requirements for siting and density.

C. Rowe, applicant, gave a presentation of the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Preserving the mature trees and vegetation, improving the overall performance of the site, and increasing green space.
- The view corridor will be left mostly untouched and improved.
- The Rattenbury building will be maintained and preserved, the coach house will be dismantled and relocated on the site, non Rattenbury buildings will be removed and replaced, and two kindergarten buildings will be constructed but need setback variances.
- The site has been substantially paved over time, and the proposed development will utilize permeable pavers and stormwater management techniques.
- 24 underground parking spaces, bicycle parking and showers will be provided for staff. This reduces staff parking on Beach Drive. 20 to 30 bicycle stalls will be available for students. Short term parking on Beach Drive will be increased.
- Proposal has been designed based on P2 zoning with minimal variances requested. The development is below the maximum P2 zoning requirements for height, site coverage and density. School student and staff population is not being increased.
- North side yard setback is being increased between new building and adjacent apartment building. There is no immediate neighbour to the south.
- The amount of building located within the Shorelines Development Permit Area is being decreased from 16% to 13% coverage.
- Artificial turf to be used for durable play surfaces.
- Heat recovery system to be used with improved energy efficient buildings.
- There will be no impact to Bowker Creek as there is no drainage from GNS through to the creek.
- Province has mandated that all land use contracts be discharged by 2024.

### **Commission Comments**

Commission members inquired as to current stormwater treatment and flood construction levels, and potential health issues with artificial turf.

C. Rowe indicated he was not aware of any existing stormwater collection, but new kindergarten buildings will have a green roof, the site will have increased landscaped areas, and there will be a storm drain connection to the municipal system. C. Rowe also advised that the main floor level is above flood construction level, with only the parking and storage below the level, that stormwater will be treated, and that there are no proven health effects as a result of artificial turf.

Commission members inquired about two separate kindergarten buildings instead of one building, and whether there were concerns about the proposed access and adjacent driveway located immediately beside each other.

C. Rowe noted two buildings provide for future adaptability, break down massing on the site, and open up the view between the buildings. He also stated the historical view to the ocean is important, and there are no negative impacts on direct neighbours.

C. Rowe advised that, with relocation of the coach house, sight lines will be opened up for the driveways.

Commission members inquired about access for emergency vehicles, and whether alternative treatments had been explored for the shoreline area that did not include artificial turf. A Commission member also commented that there is complete understanding regarding the purpose and use of this site, but that there will be few opportunities to rehabilitate this amount of shoreline area, and there are other possibilities for providing more natural treatments for the play areas.

C. Rowe advised the artificial turf play area would be pervious with full drainage beneath, and that other play area alternatives such as limestone had not been fully explored, but the current play area becomes very muddy in the winter. He also advised they are attempting to maintain the garden setting, but the site is congested and they are trying to find a balance.

A Commission member stated that this is a very difficult site and the proposal is a great improvement over what is currently there, and that it is important to keep the school functioning as a long term community member and the compromise makes sense given the complexity of the site.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ZON00003 / DP000007 / HAP00005.

The motion was denied.

E. Paterson, B. Holl, K. Nichols, A. Appleton opposed.

A Commission member commented the overall plan is very good, however the primary concern was with the artificial surface for the play area within the Shorelines Development Permit Area and restoration of the shoreline itself, and not with the buildings. The treatment proposed for the Shorelines Development Permit Area needs to be consistent with the goals outlined in the Official Community Plan.

A Commission member stated the proposed development has many benefits and it is being denied on the basis of one element.

A Commission member stated this is an exceedingly important project and a well done design, noting the school is a key resource for the community and the design can be revised to address the concerns.

## **6. Information Items**

A Commission member inquired about the District purchase of land on Monterey Avenue.

R. Thomassen confirmed the District of Oak Bay purchased a residential property on Monterey Avenue, which is in need of repair, but no future plans for the site have been determined.

D. Jensen provided information on the Residential Infill strategy, noting the June 28<sup>th</sup> Designers Workshop was well attended with discussions focussing on neighbourhood character, infill types, and parking requirements. She also noted public engagement will begin in September with an online survey forthcoming, and information will be regularly vetted through the Advisory Planning Commission.

## **7. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the APC is scheduled for Tuesday, September 6, 2016.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:39 pm.