



MINUTES
OAK BAY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2016 AT 5:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andrew Appleton
Rus Collins
Pam Copley
Brian Holl

Michael Low
Kris Nichols
Esther Paterson
Tim Taddy

MEMBERS ABSENT

-

STAFF PRESENT

Helen Koning, Chief Administrative Officer
Deborah Jensen, Manager of Planning
Roy Thomassen, Director, Building & Planning

Chris Hyde-Lay, Manager of Parks Services
Warren Jones, Director of Corporate Services
Krista Mitchell, Building and Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 pm.

2. Adoption of Minutes from November 1, 2016

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from November 1, 2016 be adopted as amended.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Adoption of Minutes from November 15, 2016

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from November 15, 2016 be adopted as amended.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

4. Approval of Agenda and Late items

The agenda was approved as presented, with the addition of one item under Item 5.

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from October 18, 2016 be adopted.
The motion was carried.
None opposed.

M. Low left the meeting at 5:08 pm.

5. New Business

- a. DVP00050 – 383 King George Terrace
To permit construction of a new single family dwelling.

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

- The proposal is to construct a new single family home with attached garage.
- The proposal is exempt from the Shorelines Development Permit Area as it is outside the 50 metre setback area.
- Requested variance of 10.36 metres is for contextual setback due to garage siting.

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

- Contextual setback is meant to have homes about same distance from street frontage.
- The water side of King George Terrace has irregular sized lots and owners want to push the house as close to the water as possible.
- The properties adjacent to the proposed home have detached garages in the front yard.
- The proposed home is only nonconforming with respect to the contextual setback with the two immediate neighbours.

Commission Comments

Commission members inquired about the proposed siting of the home, noting the siting may negatively impact ocean views of the neighbour.

C. Foyd advised the contextual setback shifts the home back on the lot, but that the proposed siting is outside of the 50 metre Shorelines Development Permit Area. He also confirmed no variance is required for paved surface.

Commission members inquired about the protected Chestnut tree and tree replacement requirements.

C. Foyd confirmed they would like to remove the tree and replace with two trees, species to be determined. He noted the tree has previously done damage to the neighbouring property.

C. Hyde-Lay confirmed replacement trees would need to be presentable, and consideration given to the characteristics of the site. He also noted the tree is healthy, with chestnut trees quite durable and able to tolerate a wide range of disturbances.

D. Jensen noted the District arborist indicates this is a healthy tree and does require some corrective pruning, but it is not considered a hazard tree.

M. Low returned to the meeting.

A Commission commented that consideration may have to be given for alternative sitings and variances in order to keep new development out of the development permit areas.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve DVP00050.

The motion was carried.

B. Holl opposed.

6. Old Business

a) Urban Forest Strategy Update

C. Hyde-Lay, gave a summary of the Urban Forest Strategy. Some of the comments were:

- Diamond Head, consultant, has produced recommendations and action items for the Urban Forest Strategy, which will be reviewed by the Parks, Recreation and Culture Commission.
- Currently have 33% tree canopy cover and objective is to have 40% canopy cover over the next 15 years. Action items to achieve this include:
 - 200 new trees planted on civic lands.
 - 4000 new trees planted on private lands.
 - Replace trees on public land.
 - Structural pruning and watering program.
 - Tree inventory program.
 - Species selection for climate change.
 - Update tree protection bylaw.
 - Zoning changes.
 - Mobile data collection (GIS).
 - Outreach / education program.
 - Invasive species volunteer program.
 - Encourage pervious parking materials.
- Biggest loss of trees is due to aging forest, not development, with about 80% loss due to dead, diseased and dying trees.
- Parks Department already collaborating well with the Building and Planning, Public Works and Engineering departments on development proposals.
- Strategy contemplates tying canopy cover with zoning types.

Commission members commented on the need to strengthen the tree protection bylaw, to look at the quality of replacement trees, and to have a homeowner education program.

C. Hyde-Lay commented there is significant public interest and proactive education produces great results with the help of grants and volunteers. He also noted there is currently a two for one tree replacement through development, with the type of tree dictated by the Parks Department.

b) Residential Infill Strategy – Next Steps

The Commission continued their review from the previous meeting, with Commission members noting the need to ask why are we doing this residential infill strategy and what we are trying to solve, that education is a key piece, and need to link the strategy back to the Official Community Plan and other documents such as the Urban Forest Strategy, Heritage Plan, and Complete Streets.

The Commission considered a series of action items in the context of five categories.

1. Education and Communication
2. Developing Options
3. OCP Alignment and Priorities
4. Consult Survey (from the OCP process)
5. Quick Wins for Council

Commission members noted we should not continue to redo and recollect information that has already been gathered, and that the Item 4 category should be to confirm those results.

A series of items identified at the previous meeting were categorized based on the five categories.

Category	Item
1	Understanding the value added and letting the community know.
2	Find options that don't impact the community (eg. suites) and find options that are acceptable to the community.
1	Clarify how residential infill can happen without impacting quality of life.
1	Create a broad understanding of why this is important to the citizens.
1	Change management strategy in order to help the population of Oak Bay understand what we are trying to do.
2	Identify a list of priorities for residential infill that includes neighbourhood preservation and green space.
3	Go back to the survey results in the OCP. Focus on the intention of the OCP (regarding infill) and align the zoning bylaw with the OCP.
1	Need to clearly state why we are doing this and how to go about it.
4	More definite demographic data is needed. Who is moving in and who works in the community?
5	Council to support moving ahead with plans by preparing bylaws that encourage or support the vision Council has.
5	Decide what is doable in the short term (suites) versus in long term and more consultation.
1	May want to explain the residential infill strategy as a risk management tool. We need to explain the change in terms of "burning platform" and use change management models.
1	Stepping back. Need to find ways to communicate effectively.
1	Seeing hostility and concern.
4	Consult with the public on what kinds of infill they would like to see in their neighbourhood.
1	Concern over density and traffic.
<hr/>	
1	<i>Education and Communication</i>
2	<i>Developing Options</i>
3	<i>OCP Alignment and Priorities</i>
4	<i>Consult Survey (from OCP process)</i>
5	<i>Quick Wins for Council</i>

A Commission member suggested the Commission review the OCP Section 6.2 Monitoring and Review prior to the next meeting.

T. Taddy and K. Nichols left the meeting at 7:08 pm.

7. Information Items

None

8. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the APC is scheduled for Tuesday, January 3, 2017.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:13 pm.