



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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Hope Burns
Pam Copley
Rus Collins
Brian Holl

Michael Low
Andrew Stinson
Esther Paterson
Tim Taddy

MEMBERS ABSENT

Kris Nichols

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Planner
Roy Thomassen, Director, Building & Planning

Loranne Hilton, Director of Corporate Services
Krista Mitchell, Building & Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:09 pm.

It was moved and seconded that P. Copley be elected as Chair.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

It was moved and seconded that H. Burns be elected as Vice Chair.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

2. Adoption of Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from December 1, 2015 be adopted.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented.

4. Presentations

None

5. Information Items

None

6. Old Business

None

7. New Business

a. Land Use Applications

- i. OCP00002 / ZON00019 – 1632 Yale Street
Official Community Plan amendment and rezoning to permit three small single family residential lots.

D. Jensen gave a brief overview of a proposed three lot residential development application for 1632 Yale Street. Some of the comments were:

- This proposal involves an Official Community Plan amendment, rezoning and development permit application to change the use of the property to permit three small single family residential lots at 356 m², 361 m², and 394 m² in size. The property currently houses a community hall.
- The change in use would require a rezoning from the current P-2 zone to a site specific residential zone.
- The application has been referred to a number of agencies. Island Health has provided comments on pedestrian activity in the neighborhood and the need for greater sidewalk width.
- There has been mixed feedback from the neighborhood, including both positive comments and concern about the scale of the proposed buildings.
- Working with the developer to maintain Byron Street as a pedestrian realm and provide access for existing residents. There is some concern as to where proposed Lot 3 will be accessed.

C. Supeene, Citta Construction, gave a presentation for the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- This is a small 1113 m² P-2 zoned property adjacent to RS-5 zoned properties. Existing building encroaches on church property, is in poor condition and beyond serviceable life; parcel size is too small to replace building with another institutional use.
- Site is appropriate for low impact infill residential development within an established neighborhood close to the village.
- Proposal has been discussed and refined through consultation with neighbourhood.
- Important to control density and scale, and maintain character of the surrounding neighbourhood while recognizing a preference for single family homes. Proposed development would be a site specific zone, with a density falling between the RS-5 and RM-1LD zones.
- Proposed lots are 361 m², 356 m², and 394 m² in size, with homes averaging 2000 ft². Lot coverage over all three lots at 32.8%, which is higher than the allowable 30% for RS-5, but lower than the allowable for RM-1LD zone. Combined floor area ratio of 0.54.
- Will preserve 10 of the 15 existing Garry oak trees, and plant eight Garry oak trees.

- St. Mary's Church functions as a community facility, so second hall is redundant. Discussions with church regarding play area improvements.
- Lot 3 to be accessed via Byron Street, with the laneway utilized for pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Discussing improvements to Byron Street for pedestrian access.

Commission Comments

Commission members asked whether this is a new form of housing that is occurring.

D. Jensen commented that the District is seeing some infill activity, but mostly through subdivision and existing lots that must meet floor area ratio and lot coverage requirements. She also stated there has been interest for various forms of multi-family development, and that the residential infill strategy, currently in its early stages, will provide for infill strategies as a whole.

Commission members inquired if the building plans, as submitted, are what will be built, and whether the proposed homes have basements.

D. Jensen confirmed that through the DP process, the final plans approved by Council would be the design that is built, and that the proposed homes do not have basements.

Commission members asked how much grading would take place, and whether the applicant would consider developing two lots instead of the three proposed.

C. Supeene replied that two lots are not an option, and that grading would be minimal as they will make use of retaining walls.

Commission members asked what the applicant had proposed for a community amenity contribution.

D. Jensen replied that staff had requested this information, but to date no proposal had been put forward by the applicant.

Additional comments from Commission members included:

- Need to consider OCP policy. Proposal does not offer affordable housing and does not promote aging in place through one level living accessibility. Floor area ratio exceeds the maximum.
- Questioned the benefit of losing institutional use, which can be difficult to obtain. Retaining site for institutional use could encourage local groups to stay in Oak Bay.
- There is opportunity for density close to the village. Lots are well placed and fit nicely into the neighbourhood.
- Significant amount of hard surfacing on the lots, both through buildings, patios and driveway areas.
- Questioned whether this is the appropriate time for consideration of this proposal given the residential infill strategy underway, where the proposal could be dealt with through a new zone rather than site specific.
- The City of Victoria allows small lots to a minimum of 260 m² lot area.

R. Thomassen stated the site could be used for another institutional use should the existing building be removed. If the land use is amended and the site rezoned, then the institutional use would be lost. He further commented that as a residential use, the site would still require rezoning as there is not enough lot area to accommodate a two lot subdivision through an RS-5 zone.

D. Jensen noted that the paved surface does exceed the hard surface requirements set out in the Zoning Bylaw.

In summary, the Commission members noted the following concerns:

- proposal exceeds lot coverage;
- loss of institutional use;
- concern regarding timing of proposed development in relation to residential infill strategy;
- no documented community amenity proposal;
- scale of buildings in relation to adjacent homes; and
- affordability.

The Commission members also noted a number of positive attributes with respect to the proposed development:

- proposed development speaks to small lot zoning;
- density is consistent with small lot zoning in Victoria;
- not removing an existing house to create new houses;
- neighbourhood is supportive; and
- development close to village is appropriate.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council deny OCP00002 / ZON00019.

The motion was carried.

Three opposed.

8. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the APC is scheduled for Tuesday, February 2, 2016.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 pm.