

MINUTES of a regular meeting of COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE of the Municipal Council of The Corporation of the District of Oak Bay, held in the Council Chambers, Oak Bay Municipal Hall, 2167 Oak Bay Avenue, Oak Bay, B.C., on Monday, January 21, 2013, following a Special Council Meeting at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor N. Jensen, Chair
Councillor P. Copley
Councillor C. Green
Councillor J. Herbert
Councillor M. Kirby
Councillor K. Murdoch
Councillor T. Ney (entered at 9:40 p.m.)

STAFF: Municipal Clerk, L. Hilton
Deputy Municipal Clerk, M. Jones
Municipal Treasurer, Patricia Walker
Director of Building and Planning, R. Thomassen
Director of Engineering Services, D. Marshall

Mayor Jensen called the meeting to order at 7:12 p.m.

PARKS AND RECREATION SECTION: (Chair – Mayor Jensen)

1. 2013-20 OAK BAY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, Jan. 9, 2013
Re Minutes of Meeting

(Janet Barclay, Manager of Recreation Services, and Monty Holding, Chair of the Oak Bay Parks and Recreation Commission in attendance for this item)

The Chair of the Oak Bay Parks and Recreation Commission noted that the Commission was in support of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada – Victoria Centre’s proposal to designate Cattle Point as an Urban Star Park.

In response to various questions and comments from the Committee, Mr. Holding noted that it was his understanding that a letter from the municipality in support of the star park proposal would be needed. He confirmed that the year-end projections are currently being calculated and will be included in next month’s financial statements. Finally, Mr. Holding confirmed that additional information was provided by the Manager of Parks Services to clarify the data in the tree report.

MOVED by Councillor Copley

Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That the minutes of the meeting of the Oak Bay Parks and Recreation Commission held on Wednesday, January 9, 2013, and the recommendations contained therein, be adopted.

A member of the Committee spoke in support of the additional information in the tree report, the contribution from the Kiwanis Club for bicycle racks and the proposed star park designation. It was also suggested that consideration be given to separately identifying the removal of Garry Oaks in the tree report and to providing covering for the bicycle racks to be funded through the Kiwanis Club to increase the use of the racks during inclement weather.

The question was then called.

CARRIED

FINANCE AND PUBLIC WORKS SECTION: (Chair – Councillor Herbert)

2. 2013-21 MUNICIPAL TREASURER, Dec. 31, 2012
Re Monthly Financial Report

MOVED by Councillor Green

Seconded by Councillor Murdoch, That the November monthly financial reports be received.

CARRIED

3. 2013-22 DEPUTY TREASURER, Jan. 16, 2013
-- EXCERPT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES, Oct. 15, 2012
Re Municipal Wi-Fi Services

(Fernando Pimental, Deputy Treasurer, in attendance for this item)

In response to questions from the Committee, the Deputy Treasurer stated that Shaw's proposal would provide Wi-Fi Services in the three recreation centres and at the Municipal Hall. Mr. Pimental noted that the cost of providing free Wi-Fi service throughout the Municipality is not feasible. Other service providers, he said, could make application to provide Wi-Fi hotspots for their customers, but only Shaw has submitted a proposal at this time. He commented that Shaw representatives indicated that they would also be amenable to reducing the term of the proposed agreement from ten to five years, though there are benefits to the Municipality in making an agreement with a longer term. He confirmed that Shaw has been reliable in addressing service issues in the past.

MOVED by Councillor Murdoch

Seconded by Councillor Kirby, That it be recommended to Council that the Municipality enter into a five year agreement with Shaw for municipal Wi-Fi services as detailed in correspondence item no. 2013-22.

CARRIED

Mr. Pimental displayed examples of Shaw's Wi-Fi infrastructure and noted that the location for each piece of this infrastructure would be subject to agreement by the District. He confirmed that the external Wi-Fi infrastructure could be painted to match the colour of the lamp standards. The Wi-Fi services, he said, could be operational as early as March of this year.

4. 2013-23 DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING SERVICES, Jan. 15, 2013
2013-23-1 JOAN ARCHIBALD, Dec. 14, 2012
Re Parking on Larkdowne Road

The Mayor noted that this item has been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY SECTION: (Chair – Councillor Kirby)

5. 2013-24 DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING SERVICES, Nov. 28, 2012
-- EXCERPT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES, Nov. 19, 2012
Re Transportation Projects – Response to Proposal by Active Transportation Advisory Committee

The Director of Engineering Services reviewed his November 28, 2012 report, in response to proposals from the Active Transportation Advisory Committee, as per the request from the November 19, 2012 Committee of the Whole. Mr. Marshall described the rationale and the associated costs with respect to each of the four recommendations contained therein.

Gerald Smeltzer, Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC), Chair, provided an overview of the ATAC's response to the Engineering report, noting that there seems to be a disconnection between the report and the vision of Oak Bay Municipal Council as shown by the adoption of the Complete Streets Policy. He stated that the Complete Streets Policy envisioned a transportation network which benefitted all users and accommodated different transportation modes. The long-term benefits to the community of the proposals by the ATAC, he said, should also have been addressed in the report.

Mr. Smeltzer noted that the importance of walking, as both a means of transportation and community-building, was discussed at the recent Heritage Plan meetings. He commented that the ATAC had identified and investigated six potential sources of funding for the proposed projects which should be considered. He concluded his remarks by suggesting that documents submitted by advisory committees and reports by consultants should be provided on the municipal website in order to facilitate these kinds of discussions.

Charlie Etchell, ATAC, Vice-Chair, noted that, prior to the ATAC's November 19, 2012 presentation to the Committee, the ATAC contacted various stakeholders and that the ATAC includes members with significant experience with respect to transportation issues.

Mr. Etchell provided examples of comments from ATAC members and members of the community that he received in response to the Engineering report. Themes in these comments included that: sufficient solutions were not provided; it was not in keeping with the direction from the November 19, 2012 Committee of the Whole or the Complete Streets Policy; the long-term benefits of active transportation were not considered; and that alternate funding was not contemplated. One comment questioned the details in the Engineering report with respect to the proposed north/south pathway. Mr. Etchell stated that, with the exception of a comment noting that Council appears genuinely supportive of the proposals, the comments received on the Engineering report have not been positive. In concluding his remarks, he offered his thanks to the Committee for their support and noted his appreciation for the opportunity to speak at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Marshall emphasized that both the north/south pathway and the Oak Bay Avenue project are well beyond Engineering staff capacity, which is why he recommended in his report that, if Council wishes to proceed, consultants should be engaged to develop these projects.

The Committee made overall comments on the report, with some members noting that though the Engineering report was instructive and addressed the previous direction from the Committee, consideration also needed to be given to the greater context of the Complete Streets Policy and to exploring funding partnerships.

MOVED by Councillor Green

Seconded by Councillor Copley, That correspondence item no. 2013-24 be received.

CARRIED

Recommendation #1: East/West Cycling Corridor – Haultain Street/Foul Bay Road Intersection

In response to questions and comments from the Committee with respect to Recommendation #1, Mr. Marshall commented that the feedback he received from the traffic counts at the Haultain Street/Foul Bay Road intersection indicated that there were sufficient gaps in the traffic to allow cyclists to cross safely at this location. Alternatively, he noted, cyclists can dismount and use the crosswalk to the south.

Mr. Marshall noted that his recommendation focused on an additional push button for cyclists at the north end of the intersection and did not consider either installation of an additional crosswalk to the north of the intersection or augmenting the curbs to create infrastructure similar to the Richmond Road and Shelbourne Street intersections with Haultain Street. He stated that, although he was not aware of another location at which two crosswalks would be placed so closely together and that both additional options with respect to the intersection are likely not addressed by the Traffic Association of Canada's guidelines and manuals, consideration could be given to these additional options if the Committee so directed.

Greg Miller, ATAC, member, commented that there are conflicts for cyclists at the Haultain Street and Foul Bay Road intersection. He noted that the ATAC suggests that consideration be given to a second cross walk at the north of the intersection in conjunction with flashing beacons, and that consideration also be given to curb extensions. The report was inaccurate, he said, in stating that Haultain Street in Oak Bay is not defined as a bikeway by the Capital Regional District (CRD).

Carol Hubberstey, ATAC, member, commented that the CRD's bike count found that the Haultain Street and Foul Bay Road intersection: was the second busiest intersection in Oak Bay; was consistently active throughout the working day; and had a high female ridership. She noted that some research has shown that the two genders can have different levels of hesitancy with respect to cycling next to vehicles.

Members of the Committee commented on Recommendation #1 and it was noted that the intent of enhancing the intersection at Haultain Street and Foul Bay Road was to encourage cycling and increase cycling use by making it safer to cross the street at that location. A member of the Committee commented that using infrastructure in Oak Bay that is similar to the infrastructure used by the other municipalities along Haultain Street could help towards creating a regional cycling network.

MOVED by Councillor Murdoch

Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That Engineering Department staff be requested to provide an additional report to the Committee of the Whole which considers additional options for enhancing cyclist safety when crossing at the north side of the Haultain Street and Foul Bay Road intersection, including cost estimates.

CARRIED

Recommendation #2: Wayfinding Signs

In response to questions and comments from the Committee with respect to Recommendation #2, Mr. Marshall stated that his report contemplated wayfinding signs along the proposed east/west cycling corridor, including Haultain Street and Estevan Avenue, possibly as far as Beach Drive.

Carol Hubberstey, ATAC, member, stated that well-placed and purposeful wayfinding signage is essential.

Mr. Marshall commented that he has requested feedback from the ATAC with respect to the placement and design of potential wayfinding signage in order to ensure that any resulting signs will be well-placed and not clutter the landscape.

There was some question as to the total number of signs that might be required for the cycling corridor to Estevan Avenue, at a cost of approximately \$150 per sign.

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Green, That Engineering Department staff be requested to provide a report to the Committee of the Whole detailing the number, location and cost of the wayfinding signs proposed for Haultain Street.

A discussion ensued, with members of the Committee noting that most of the information requested in the motion had already been provided in the Engineering report, and that the total cost of signs could be amended in any referral to Estimates Committee to reflect the final number of signs needed for the corridor.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the motion be withdrawn.

MOVED by Councillor Murdoch,

Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That the total cost of wayfinding signs along the entire Haultain corridor to Estevan Avenue be referred to Estimates Committee.

CARRIED

Recommendation #3: North/South Pathway – Lansdowne Road to the University of Victoria

In response to questions from the Committee with respect to Recommendation #3, Mr. Marshall stated that not all, but some areas of the corridor would require extensive work to achieve the proposed pathway.

Various comments on Recommendation #3 were made by the Committee. One member expressed concerns with respect to the pathway concept and associated costs, questioning if the project made sense to undertake, while another member of the Committee expressed that this was an excellent project that could enhance access to Henderson Recreation Centre. It was suggested that the issues of land access be discussed with the other stakeholders, such as the Greater Victoria School District and the Parks and Recreation Commission, before proceeding to hire a consultant.

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Murdoch, That the Director of Engineering Services be directed to undertake an initial consultation process with the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Greater Victoria School District and the University of Victoria on the potential for land access and funding partnerships with respect to the proposal to establish a north/south pathway from Lansdowne Road to the University of Victoria and report back to the Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

A discussion ensued with respect to the timelines for the requested staff report and it was concluded that, given the need for responses from other organizations, it was unlikely this item would be considered within the 2013 budget deliberations.

Recommendation #4: Oak Bay Avenue Project

Neil Jackson, ATAC, member, commented that it is important that the community be involved in the Oak Bay Avenue Project and that consideration should be given to the formation of a steering committee to review the issues before hiring a consultant.

Gerald Smeltzer, ATAC, Chair, noted that the CRD's Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan indicated that Oak Bay Avenue was a first-year funding priority, with significant potential funding identified. This is one of the key reasons, he said, that the ATAC recommended consideration of this project.

Members of the Committee commented on Recommendation #4 and it was noted that, at some point, hiring a consultant could be supportable. It was also expressed that extensive consideration has been given to the potential redesign of Oak Bay Avenue over the years. One member mentioned that the accessibility issues with Oak Bay Avenue suggested that this project should be a priority and another member commented that consideration could be given to increasing the pace of the curb-drop program in order to enhance accessibility.

Discussion turned to the issue of proceeding with the Oak Bay Avenue Project while the Official Community Plan (OCP) renewal is still underway. One member expressed that the design of Oak Bay Avenue should follow the function as determined through the OCP, while some other members felt that proceeding with a steering committee was appropriate.

MOVED by Councillor Murdoch,
Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That staff be requested to draft guidelines and recommendations with respect to the establishment of a steering committee for the Oak Bay Avenue project.

A member of the Committee noted that the requested report with respect to Recommendation #3 and information on the potential steering committee for Recommendation #4 would help the Committee to prioritize the two proposals.

It was noted that the potential steering committee could have a mandate similar to that of the initial OCP working group and consider the elements, steps and timelines for the Oak Bay Avenue project. Representatives from the Oak Bay Business Improvement Association, the Oak Bay Tourism Committee and the ATAC were identified as possible inclusions in the steering committee.

Mr. Marshall highlighted that, though he was willing to participate in a steering committee to provide expertise with respect to the engineering elements of the Oak Bay Avenue project, consideration will also need to be given to the aesthetics of the design.

It was suggested that, as the ATAC has already given extensive consideration to the issues with respect to Oak Bay Avenue, and as the Engineering report has already identified several issues to be addressed by the project, the ATAC could be asked to report back on guidelines and recommendations in respect to the proposed role of an Oak Bay Avenue project steering committee for the Committee's consideration.

It was the consensus of the Committee that the motion be withdrawn.

MOVED by Councillor Murdoch,
Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That the Active Transportation Advisory Committee be requested to provide a report to a future Committee of the Whole meeting on guidelines and recommendations in respect to the proposed role of an Oak Bay Avenue project steering committee.

CARRIED

LAND USE SECTION: (Chair – Councillor Copley)

It was the consensus of the Committee that the order of the agenda be amended so that the rezoning and development permit application for the property at 1510 Clive Drive and 2280 Oak Bay Avenue be considered as the last item.

7. 2013-26 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, Dec. 24, 2012
Re Development Variance Permit Application - 2025 Crescent Road

The Director of Building and Planning provided an overview of the requested variances.

A representative for the application was present to respond to any questions.

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Green, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit with respect to 2025 Crescent Road, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2013-26, be brought forward to Council for consideration.

CARRIED

8. 2013-27 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, Dec. 24, 2012
Re Development Variance Permit Application – 2490 Dryfe Street

The Director of Building and Planning provided an overview of the requested variance.

Don Prittie, representative for the applicant, responded to questions from the Committee, noting that the basement garage has not been used for some time and that the space is quite small. He stated that it is his understanding that, in order to make the driveway functional again, either two tracks for tires would be placed or a larger area paved in order to accommodate a vehicle.

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Green, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit with respect to 2490 Dryfe Street, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2013-27, and with the understanding that the driveway on the subject property is to be reinstated, be brought forward to Council for consideration.

CARRIED

- 9 2013-28 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, Jan. 8, 2013
Re Development Variance Permit Application – 2311 Lansdowne Road

The Director of Building and Planning provided an overview of the requested variances and responded to questions from the Committee, noting that the variances are required for the proposed addition due to the size and topography of the lot and that the proposed addition would have been permitted under the previous Zoning Bylaw.

Michael Moody, Architect, and Paul Terstappen, Abstract Developments, were present to respond to any further questions.

MOVED by Councillor Murdoch

Seconded by Councillor Kirby, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit with respect to 2311 Lansdowne Road, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2013-28, be brought forward to Council for consideration.

CARRIED

10. 2013-29 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, Jan. 8, 2013
Re Development Variance Permit Application – 2092 Meadow Place

The Director of Building and Planning provided an overview of the requested variance.

Rob Davis, representing the applicant, was present to respond to any questions.

MOVED by Councillor Kirby

Seconded by Councillor Murdoch, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit with respect to 2092 Meadow Place, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2013-29, be brought forward to Council for consideration.

CARRIED

11. 2013-30 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, Jan. 16, 2013
Re Uplands Building Permit Application/ Building Permit Referral for
Property Listed on Community Heritage Register – 3110 Weald Road

The Director of Building and Planning provided an overview of his report, noting that, in order to prevent a substantial delay, the application has already been considered by the Oak Bay Heritage Commission and that the Commission recommended approval of the proposed alterations.

Russ Collins, Zebra Design, was present to respond to any questions.

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Green, That it be recommended to Council that the plans to renovate the existing dwelling at 3110 Weald Road, which is included in the Oak Bay Community Heritage Register, be approved as to siting and architectural design.

CARRIED

6. 2013-6 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, December 4, 2012
-- EXCERPT OF COUNCIL MINUTES, Dec. 10, 2012
2013-25 ANGUS MATTHEWS, Dec. 30, 2012
2013-25-1 ERNIE COCKAYNE, KIEKA & SUNETTE MYNHARDT Jan. 2, 2013
2013-25-2 ROBERT FARRELL, Jan. 4, 2013
2013-25-3 MELBA MOORE, Jan. 8, 2013
2013-25-4 EVELYN JONES, Jan. 15, 2013
2013-25-5 DANIEL AND THERESA GAUTHIER, Jan. 15, 2013
2013-25-6 BRIAN WENGER, Jan. 16, 2013
2013-25-7 LANCE & HELGA TRAYLEN, Jan. 16, 2013
2013-25-8 KOJI AND EMMA ZOLBROD, Jan. 16, 2013
2013-25-9 SANDRA GUILBERT, Jan. 16, 2013
2013-25-10 MARGARET & MICHAEL ASCH, Jan. 16, 2013
2013-25-11 GLEN MYLES, Jan. 16, 2013
2013-25-12 JOHN & ANNE NADIN, Jan. 16, 2013
2013-25-13 MICHAL OPALSKI & BARBARA SHELTON, Jan. 17, 2013
2013-25-14 ISABELLE TIANO, Jan. 17, 2013
2013-25-15 WILFRED AND VIRGINIA LUND, Jan. 17, 2013
2013-25-16 MICHAEL BROCK, Jan. 17, 2013
2013-25-17 ANGUS & SANDRA MATTHEWS, Jan. 17, 2013

2013-25-18 DAVID DESBRISAY & HENRIETTA LANGRAN DESBRISAY, Jan. 17, 2013
2013-25-19 ALMA KEENAN, Jan. 15, 2013
2013-25-20 DENNIS MCCARTHY, Jan 21, 2013
Re Rezoning/Development Permit Application – 1510 Clive Dr./2280 Oak Bay Ave.

MOVED by Councillor Murdoch

Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That correspondence items no. 2013-6 and 2013-25 to 2013-25-20 be received.

CARRIED

The Director of Building and Planning provided an overview of the proposal, as outlined in his December 4, 2012 report.

Nicole Roberts, applicant, stated that she has created a public outreach website, www.theclive.ca, on which information with respect to the proposal will be posted. Ms. Roberts noted that she also hosted a community meeting on January 9, 2013, at which there were 35 attendees, whose main concerns with the project were the density, parking and the impact of construction, including blasting.

Ms. Roberts commented that the proposed building has already been reduced by three units and the design modified in order to address previous concerns with respect to density and massing. She noted that she has contracted Boulevard Transportation Group to undertake a study of the parking impacts and proposed mitigation efforts for the proposal and that the executive summary of the report will be posted on the Clive website. She has committed to have a pre-construction community meeting, she said, to identify and address potential issues.

Two residents have created a document called the “Clive Consensus”, noted Ms. Roberts. She commented that she is inspired by this initiative and very supportive of a consensus-building approach, but that, while trying to be open-minded, she must also be forthright about which elements of the proposal can and which elements cannot be altered.

In conclusion, Ms. Roberts noted that this is a rare opportunity for urban stewardship and that the existing building is nearing the end of its useful life. She expressed that her hope with this application is to create an asset to the community.

Margaret Asch, resident, asked for clarification on the process and spoke in opposition to the proposal. She commented that she had hosted a residents’ meeting on January 14, 2013 at which approximately 80% of the residents of Clive Drive were in attendance. She noted that the Official Community Plan (OCP) renewal process is underway and that the proposal could set a precedent, which needs to be approached cautiously. She stated that she also has concerns with respect to parking and density.

In response to questions from the public, it was noted that consideration of the project may continue at the Committee level for some time and that a Public Hearing would be required at some point in the future if the project was to proceed.

Councillor Ney entered the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Andrew Harley, resident, spoke in support of the application, noting that he is looking to down-size and would like to remain within the municipality. He stated that it is hard to find good quality rental units in a modern building within Oak Bay.

Sandra Guilbert, resident, stated that spot zoning was the wrong approach and that the proposal is not in keeping with the OCP. She noted that the proposed setbacks and density are problematic. Though the rental and LEED (Leadership in Energy Efficiency and Design) elements are wonderful, she said, the proposal is not appropriate for this location.

Charles Sauer, resident, stated that is his understanding that the project exceeds the allowable density on the subject property. He commented that the proposal would set a bad precedent and that it is not recommended by staff. He noted that he would like to see a project come forward for this location in keeping with the OCP.

Helga Traylen, resident, spoke in opposition to the application, stating that it was too large and that parking would be an issue. She noted that the live/work component does not sound like a good idea and that the project overall was inappropriate.

Doreen Newell, resident, stated that the proposal was too dense for the location, the setbacks were inappropriate, and the parking insufficient. She noted that too much green space would be lost as a result of the proposal. Though redevelopment will occur on this property at some point, she said, the current proposal does not provide an acceptable transition from the commercial to residential area of Oak Bay Avenue. She noted that there are many rental properties in Oak Bay, some within close proximity of the subject property. In concluding her remarks, she commented that the application should not proceed until the OCP renewal is complete and that the Committee should follow staff's recommendation.

Eric Zhelka, resident, stated that he is one of the founders of Oak Bay Watch. He commented that the proposed building is too large for the subject property and that he has concerns with the application proceeding while the OCP renewal is still underway. He then read out an email from Gail Ross and Steen Jensen, expressing their opposition to the application due to the size and height of the proposed building, as well as the parking.

Michael Asch, resident, stated that the proposed setbacks are entirely out of keeping with the other residential and commercial buildings along Oak Bay Avenue. He noted that the application could set a precedent and that the proposed density is problematic. He questioned what if any compromise can be found given that the developer has indicated that the economics of the application will not allow for a change in the proposed density.

Angus Matthews, resident, noted that he had authored the "Clive Consensus" document. He commented that urban renewal and replacement of housing stock are important and that the existing building has accessibility issues and is of little heritage value. The insufficient parking and the proposed setbacks, he said, are significant problems with the application, but that the proposal has enough redeeming features that he would encourage the Committee to allow an opportunity for a revision of the design, through a collaborative process with the impacted residents. He noted that in order for the application to be successful, it will require amendments to the proposed density and parking, as well as some tight controls with respect to the live/work component.

Koji Zolbrod, resident, stated that the Committee should support the staff recommendation and that a LEED certification does not automatically mean that a building is environmentally friendly. He noted that the current proposal will result in the loss of green space and he questioned if the setbacks are appropriate. He commented that the building footprint should be reduced.

Hazel Braithwaite, resident, stated that she has some concerns with the proposal and that, in her experience, consensus-building in regards to developments is problematic as the developer's needs often conflict with what residents can endure.

She noted that businesses along Oak Bay Avenue have had to pay to reduce or eliminate parking. She urges the Committee to finish the OCP renewal process, as promised in the members' campaign platforms, prior to contemplating spot zoning.

Pat Wilson, resident, commented that a complete copy of the agenda package should be posted on the website. She noted that serious consideration should be given to the parking issues with respect to this application and that a definition is needed with respect to the live/work component of the proposal. She stated that safe and legal rental options are needed in Oak Bay.

David Desbrisay, resident, noted that parking often came up as an issue at the recent residents' meeting with respect to the proposal. Parking is an issue for this area, he said, as there are no sidewalks along Clive Drive and there has been an increase in traffic resulting from Ottavio's patrons looking for parking on the street.

In response to comments from the public, Ms. Roberts stated that, although open to working with the community, it would not be possible to reduce the size of the building without impacting the quality of application, including LEED certification. She commented that the residents could perhaps appoint some representatives to form a working group with her to discuss the proposal. The live/work component, she said, seemed like a good transition from the commercial to the residential area of Oak Bay Avenue, but that it is not an essential component of the project.

Gregory Damant, architect, responded to comments from the public, stating that it would not be possible to add underground parking as a ramp could not be accommodated given the size of the subject property. He noted that the parking as currently proposed is the best configuration possible, given the property size, the walkability of the location and size of the proposed units. He noted that consideration had been given to renovating the existing building either by adding a third floor or by an addition and that both options would be cost prohibitive. The floor space ratio permitted under the existing high density zone, he said, would not be sufficient for a rental building that would meet the economic needs of the applicant.

In response to questions from the Committee, Ms. Roberts noted that the current tenants of the building are primarily single female seniors. She noted, in consultation with other property managers in the area, that she expected the tenants of the proposed building would also be primarily older singles, with some couples sharing the two bedroom units.

She commented that there are accessibility challenges with the current building which make it problematic for those residents looking to age in place. The parking would be allocated to specific units, she said, with a parking stall designated for each two bedroom unit. Though the rents would be higher than they are currently, she stated, they would still be within market rental rates.

Ms. Roberts responded to further questions, noting that only three of the eight units in the current building have vehicles, although two of the units have two vehicles each. She stated that the current parking patterns in the existing building will be taken into account in the report by the Boulevard Transportation Group, as will the parking patterns of three different rental buildings in the region of similar size and density to the proposal. As a region, she said, density must be increased in the urban core, such as at the subject property, in order to meet the need for housing without expanding the urban containment boundary.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Damant stated that the rear setback is not ideal, but that in order to create a three-storey rental building on the subject property that accommodates parking, a specific size and configuration of building is required.

In order to reduce the impact on the adjacent residential property, he said, the north-east corner of the building has been stepped back. He commented that a light study to determine the impact on the adjacent residential property will also be undertaken.

Mr. Thomassen noted that, at some point, the applicant will need to confirm if the live/work component will be included in the proposal, as this will impact any proposed amendments to the Zoning Bylaw and Official Community Plan. He noted that there may be some building code issues to be addressed with the proposed live/work units as well.

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Kirby, That the rezoning and development permit application for the property at 1510 Clive Drive and 2280 Oak Bay Avenue be referred to a future Committee of the Whole meeting in order to consider the forthcoming parking study and sun study.

A discussion ensued, with members of the Committee commenting on the benefits and challenges of the proposal. It was noted that the consensus-building approach was innovative and that the community should be encouraged to pursue it. Concerns were raised with respect to parking, blasting during construction, loss of green space, setbacks, density and proceeding in advance of completion of the OCP renewal process.

The question was then called.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT:

MOVED by Councillor Green

Seconded by Councillor Kirby, That the Committee of the Whole meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 10:44 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Municipal Clerk

Chair, Parks and Recreation Section

Chair, Finance and Public Works Section

Chair, Active Transportation and
Community Section

Chair, Land Use Section