

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, July 14, 2008 at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor C. M. Causton, Chairman
Councillor H. Braithwaite
Councillor A. R. Cassidy
Councillor S. F. B. Carson
Councillor P. Copley
Councillor J. D. Herbert
Councillor N. B. Jensen

STAFF: Municipal Clerk, L. Hilton
Confidential Secretary, K. Green
Director of Building and Planning, N. Beattie
Acting Director of Building and Planning, R. Thomassen
Director of Engineering Services, D. Marshall

Mayor Causton called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Nigel Beattie – Retirement from the District of Oak Bay

Mayor Causton acknowledged retiring Director of Building and Planning, Nigel Beattie, thanking him for his dedicated service to the Municipality, noting that Oak Bay Council enjoyed working with him and appreciated his ‘can-do’ attitude.

At this time, Mayor Causton also acknowledged Mr. Beattie’s perseverance with respect to seeing through the changes to the Floor Area Ratio Regulations.

Mr. Beattie welcomed and introduced Roy Thomassen as the new Director of Building and Planning.

FINANCE & REGULATORY SECTION: (Chairman – Councillor Braithwaite)

1. 2008-174 MUNICIPAL TREASURER, June 30, 2008
Re June 2008 Monthly Financial Reports

MOVED by Councillor Copley

Seconded by Councillor Carson, That the June monthly financial reports be received.

CARRIED

2. 2008-175 MUNICIPAL CLERK, July 10, 2008
2008-150 DOUG CLARKE, May 26, 2008
2008-175-1 GRAEME BLACK, June 8, 2008
2008-175-2 JOHN AND SANDRA BASTEDO, June 9, 2008
2008-175-3 RANDY AND TANNIS GREENCORN, June 16, 2008
2008-175-4 IAN MUNDAY, June 16, 2008
2008-175-5 KRISTINA STEWART, June 23, 2008
2008-175-6 SEBASTIEN LIENARD-BOISJOLI, July 10, 2008
2008-175-7 EDWARD HALE AND EDITH LOOKER, [Undated]
2008-175-8 SUSAN HARRISON, July 10, 2008
2008-175-9 SHEA PHILLIPS, July 8, 2008
Re Request for Amendment to Animal Control Bylaw – Keeping of Chickens

Councillor Braithwaite noted that at its June 2, 2008 meeting, in response to Mr. Clarke's request for an amendment to the Animal Control Bylaw to relax the setback requirements for a structure to house chickens, the Committee had invited public input on the request and on the keeping of chickens regulations in general at the July meeting.

At the invitation to the public to address the Committee on this issue, Doug Clarke, 1199 Hampshire Road, said he had an opportunity to read the correspondence attached to the agenda and he was pleased to see the positive and supportive comments received.

Responding to questions from the Committee, Mr. Clarke confirmed that a setback of 6 metres for construction of a chicken coop would be adequate for him to be able to keep chickens as proposed.

Members of the Committee indicated their support for an amendment to the Bylaw to reduce the required setback to make it easier for more residents to comply with the regulations and keep chickens, particularly in the interests of promoting local sustainability, noting that the correspondence received on the subject had been in support, as had comments received through discussions with their own neighbours.

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Copley, That staff be directed to draft an amendment to the Animal Control Bylaw to reduce the required setback from a backyard property line for a structure used to house chickens from 7.6 m to 6.0 m, to be brought forward to Council for consideration.

There was discussion regarding including a setback requirement from buildings on adjacent properties, however, as noted by the Municipal Clerk, that approach would not be desirable in that it would make an owners ability to keep chickens dependent upon the variable conditions of a neighbouring property.

A member of the Committee suggested that consideration should also be given to reducing the minimum required lot size with respect to keeping chickens.

MOVED by Councillor Jensen

Seconded by Councillor Copley, That the motion be amended to also reduce the minimum lot size required for keeping chickens on a parcel of land to 557.42 square metres.

DEFEATED

(Councillor Braithwaite, Carson, Cassidy, Herbert against the motion)

The question on the main motion was then called.

CARRIED

PUBLIC WORKS SECTION: (Chairman – Councillor Herbert)

3. 2008-176 DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING SERVICES, July 10, 2008
- EXCERPT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES, February 25, 2008
- Re Capital Regional District Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan: Uplands Combined Sewer Separation Design Proposal

The Director of Engineering Services drew attention to a previous Council resolution adopting a plan for the elimination of combined sewers in the two Uplands catchments, and a subsequent resolution to delay the implementation of the plan to investigate whether or not the Capital Regional District's sewage treatment strategy will result in a reduction of flows in the East Coast Interceptor Trunk Sewer and to determine if any reduced flows would free up enough capacity to accommodate peak combined sewer flows from the Uplands and reduce the incidence of storm event overflows to the 5 year return period required by the Municipal Sewage Regulation, which is the basis for the separation requirement.

Mr. Marshall indicated that both Kerr Wood Leidal Consulting Engineers and the CRD have determined that even with the CRD's sewage treatment strategy there would still not be sufficient capacity to accommodate existing combined flows in a 5 year storm event, and therefore, sewer separation in the Uplands is required.

There was further discussion regarding actual storm and sewer flow numbers and the observation was made by Councillor Herbert that through a number of meetings he has had with CRD staff on this issue, varying information has been received. He suggested that further information should be obtained to help demonstrate the need for the separation and assist the Committee in understanding the situation more fully and having questions answered prior to considering the implementation of the adopted sewer separation plan.

Mr. Marshall responded to various questions from the Committee with respect to possible other options for reducing the flows to an acceptable level, indicating that the Province had rejected Oak Bay's proposal for constructing detention facilities to manage storm water. He also advised that a significant portion of storm water is not generated on private property, therefore, individual onsite storm water management would not achieve the required reduction in overflows.

Following further discussion, there was consensus that clarification of the information presented by the CRD and Kerr Wood Leidal Engineering Consultants should be sought prior to making a decision on endorsing the design proposal provided.

MOVED by Councillor Braithwaite

Seconded by Councillor Copley, That correspondence item no. 2008-176 be deferred to a future Committee of the Whole meeting with CRD engineering staff in attendance to provide further information with respect to the Provincial Municipal Sewer Regulation and the CRD Core Area Liquid Waste Management Plan as they relate to the required elimination of combined sewers in the two Uplands catchment areas.

CARRIED

LAND USE SECTION: (Chairman – Councillor Cassidy)

4. 2008-177 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 8, 2008
Re Uplands Building Permit Application – 2835 Lincoln Road

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Jensen, That it be recommended to Council that the proposed changes in siting of the previously approved plans for the garage at 2835 Lincoln Road be approved.

CARRIED

5. 2008-178 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 8, 2008
Re Uplands Building Permit Application – 2800 Lincoln Road

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Braithwaite, That it be recommended to Council that the plans for the construction of a covered deck at 2800 Lincoln Road be approved as to siting and architectural design.

CARRIED

6. 2008-179 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 8, 2008
Re Uplands Building Permit Application – 3235 Midland Road

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Copley, That it be recommended to Council that the plans for the conversion of the existing attic space into an ensuite bathroom and dressing area, construction of a hip-roofed dormer and a skylight at 3235 Midland Road be approved as to siting and architectural design.

CARRIED

7. 2008-180 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 8, 2008
Re Uplands Building Permit Application – 2815 Lansdowne Road

MOVED by Councillor Herbert

Seconded by Councillor Carson, That it be recommended to Council that the plans for the construction of an attached garage/workshop at 2815 Lansdowne Road be approved as to siting and architectural design.

CARRIED

8. 2008-181 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 8, 2008
Re Uplands Building Permit / Development Variance Permit
Application – 2570 Nottingham Road

Councillor Cassidy commented that the applicant is requesting variances to accommodate a small addition to extend the kitchen at the rear of the house.

MOVED by Councillor Carson

Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That it be recommended to Council that the plans to renovate the dwelling and add an extension to the kitchen at 2570 Nottingham Road be approved as to siting and architectural design, subject to the issuance of a development variance permit, and further that a resolution authorizing the issuance of a development variance permit be prepared and brought forward to the next meeting of Council for consideration.

CARRIED

9. 2008-182 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 7, 2008
Re Development Variance Permit Application – 542 Oliver Street

Richard Hinchcliff, of M. R. Designs Ltd., explained that the applicant would like to construct a second storey bathroom that would require a second floor setback variance. Mr. Hinchcliff

added that with the staircase being located in the middle of the house it does not allow an additional bathroom to be located anywhere else.

MOVED by Councillor Carson

Seconded by Councillor Copley, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit for 542 Oliver Street, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2008-182, be prepared and brought forward to Council for consideration.

CARRIED

10. 2008-183 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 8, 2008
Re Development Variance Permit Application – 1684 Yale Street

Archie Willie, A. Willie Design, said the homeowners would like to construct a small addition at the back of the house to accommodate a bedroom on the top floor which requires variances to the gross floor area, occupiable height, building height, and setbacks, as shown in the plans attached to correspondence item no. 2008-183. Mr. Willie drew attention to the existing basement saying that it is under-height and is not habitable as it is. Mr. Willie noted that the existing porches and unusable decks, such as the one over the porte cochere, all add to the total allowable square footage of the home, resulting in the requested floor area variance.

A member of the Committee noted that although the applicant is requesting height variances for the proposed addition, it will not be any higher than the existing roof height.

MOVED by Councillor Carson

Seconded by Councillor Braithwaite, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit for 1684 Yale Street, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2008-183, be prepared and brought forward to Council for consideration.

CARRIED

11. 2008-184 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 9, 2008
Re Development Variance Permit Application – 565 Oliver Street

Ivana Tunklova, 565 Oliver Street, explained that the family's original plan to renovate their home to accommodate a family of five and a child with special needs changed when mould issues were discovered throughout the house. Ms. Tunklova said that they are now constructing a new dwelling and would like to request a variance to allow just one uncovered parking space to accommodate their one vehicle that they currently park in the driveway. Ms. Tunklova added that by not building the required covered parking space, the children could continue to have full use of their backyard and they would not need to remove any trees to accommodate a parking garage.

MOVED by Councillor Braithwaite

Seconded by Councillor Jensen, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit for 565 Oliver Street, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2008-184, be prepared and brought forward to Council for consideration.

Members of the Committee commented that although there is a requirement under the Parking Facilities Bylaw to have two parking spaces, one of which must be covered, there is no way to ensure that vehicles are in fact parked in the garage or on the driveway.

It was noted that a variance to allow only one uncovered parking space had been previously approved in relation to the original plan to renovate.

The question was then called.

CARRIED

12. 2008-185 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 9, 2008
Re Development Variance Permit / Subdivision Application – 1226
Roslyn Road

Councillor Cassidy said that the owner of 1226 Roslyn Road has applied for subdivision approval, however as noted in a letter from the Subdivision Approving Officer attached to correspondence item no. 2008-185, in order for the application to receive further consideration by the Approving Officer, variances would be required as laid out in the staff report.

John Young, 686 Island Road, and owner 1226 Roslyn Road, said his wish is to retain the existing 1912 home, which is currently a legal non-conforming triplex that is situated on what were originally two lots. Mr. Young noted that a key component to retaining the house and subdividing the property would include, as part of the renovations, removing the portions of the house that had been added sometime in the 1940's, replacing the cracked foundation to address where the house is sagging, and have it revert back to one-family dwelling use.

Members of the Committee expressed their appreciation of Mr. Young's plans to retain the character of the old house, and although it is not designated as heritage nor is it listed on the Community Heritage Register, felt that it does have some heritage merit.

MOVED by Councillor Jensen

Seconded by Councillor Copley, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit for 1226 Roslyn Road, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2008-185, be prepared and brought forward to Council for consideration.

Drawing attention to the owner's stated desire to preserve the existing house, members of the Committee inquired as to whether or not Mr. Young was amenable to entering into a covenant to protect the home from potential future demolition. He was encouraged to contact staff with respect to what typical covenant wording might look like in that regard, and advise of his interest after that time.

It was also noted that the Approving Officer would be seeking, among other things, a covenant from the applicant with respect to design approval for the new house on proposed Lot 2, and responding to questions from the Committee, Mr. Young indicated that was acceptable to him.

The question was then called.

CARRIED

13. 2008-186 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, June 30, 2008
Re Development Variance Permit Application – 2156 Brighton Avenue

Councillor Cassidy drew attention to the variances being requested due to the unusual narrowness of the property.

Gary Streight, Zebra Design & Interior Group Inc., in attendance on behalf of the homeowners, said that the legal non-conforming existing 1912 bungalow was found to have a decaying foundation and therefore the homeowners are proposing to build a contemporary, energy efficient, green platinum certification level status house. Although the new home will be smaller than the existing home, he said, variances would be required due to the size and unusual configuration of the lot.

It was noted that the surrounding neighbours have been notified and are generally supportive of the proposed plans and have expressed their appreciation that the new dwelling would sit back further on the lot.

Mr. Streight, responding to a question from a member of the Committee, confirmed that the existing garage would remain.

With the proposed design being quite contemporary, Mayor Causton felt it would be helpful to request the Advisory Design Panel to review the plans on the proposed project and report back to the Committee in this regard.

MOVED by Councillor Carson

Seconded by Councillor Braithwaite, That a resolution authorizing the Director of Building and Planning to issue a development variance permit for 2156 Brighton Avenue, as outlined in correspondence item no. 2008-186, be prepared and brought forward to Council for consideration, and further, that the plans be referred to the Advisory Design Panel for review and a recommendation to Council prior to final consideration of issuance of the development variance permit at its August 18, 2008 meeting, should the notification process be initiated at the July 21, 2008 Council meeting.

CARRIED

14. 2008-187 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, July 10, 2008
- - EXCERPT FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
MINUTES, April 7, 2008
2008-51 DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND PLANNING, February 13, 2008
2008-98 MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATOR, April 2, 2008
2008-187-1 ERIC HILDEBRANDT, April 7, 2008
2008-187-2 KEVIN LEE, April 7, 2008
2008-187-3 AARON SYMINGTON *et al*, [Undated]
2008-187-4 PADDY SYMINGTON, *et al*, [Undated]
2008-187-5 ERIC AND LESLIE HILDEBRANDT, April 23, 2008
2008-187-6 LORNA AND KEN CORRAIN, April 29, 2008
2008-187-7 DAVE AND TASSY PETTENUZZO, May 2, 2008
2008-187-8 PHIL SYMINGTON AND ERIC HILDEBRANDT, May 11, 2008
2008-187-9 LOUISE ROBERTS, June 11, 2008
2008-187-10 MONARCH HOLDINGS LTD., June 23, 2008
2008-187-11 MICHELLE VERMETTE AND PHILIP SMITH, June 26, 2008
2008-187-12 GLEN HARPER, July 13, 2008

2008-187-13 GLEN HARPER *on behalf of* MARIAM DAVIES, July 13, 2008
2008-187-14 MICHAEL AND BRENDA KELLY, April 23, 2008
Re Estevan/Dunlevy Rezoning and Development Permit Application

(Marie Freeman, Applicant, Dennis Rogers, BRCM Holdings, Frank D'Ambrosio and Terry Kopeck, D'Ambrosio Architecture and Urbanism, all in attendance for this item).

Marie Freeman, owner, noted that she initiated the project before the Committee, and commented that her father built the existing buildings back in 1955. She explained that she grew up in the area, and hoped to enjoy her retirement in the proposed development, which she felt would revitalize the Estevan Village area.

Ms. Freeman drew attention to the public meeting held on the proposed development, noting that many positive comments were received, which she handed to the Municipal Clerk for the record.

Frank D'Ambrosio, project Architect, noted that when the application last appeared before the Committee on April 7, 2008, various questions and issues were raised regarding the proposed commercial/residential development, which he noted they were prepared to address as follows:

Traffic Generation and Parking Study

Attention was drawn to the traffic and parking study undertaken by Bunt and Associates in response to questions regarding the anticipated increase in traffic and parking demand that could be expected as a result of the proposed development.

Richard Dixon, Bunt and Associates, introduced the study, noting that traditional methodology was used to create the report, and that the terms of reference were expanded to include study of the Musgrave Street and Dalhousie Street in addition to Estevan Avenue and Dunlevy Street.

As far as trip generation goes, said Mr. Dixon, the new development was expected to generate an additional fifty trips per day or five trips per hour in the average weekday pm peak hour, which, he said, is insignificant.

With respect to parking requirements, Mr. Dixon explained that the 17 stalls proposed would be, in their opinion, adequate based on their calculation of one stall per unit, plus five stalls for visitors and assigned daytime use for the commercial units.

Mr. Dixon noted that while they did not anticipate any significant impact to traffic or parking demand arising from the proposed development, the study does suggest consideration of alternative modes of transportation, which resulted in a recommendation for a traffic circle at the five-way intersection and the west end of the Village, along with curb extensions along Estevan Avenue to ease exiting from the angle parking stalls, and raised crosswalks to slow traffic down.

Councillor Braithwaite pointed out that, in her opinion, the type of commercial business would likely have some impact on the traffic generated, possibly increasing it from that projected in the study. Furthermore, she noted, the study did not seem to take into account providing parking for the employees of the commercial businesses. In response to the approach to less available parking encouraging alternative forms of transportation, she noted that while that was laudable, she may find it difficult to support such an approach as it impacts area residents.

Councillor Herbert agreed with some of the concerns raised, noting that the study did not seem to take into account numbers of people parking on the side streets now as residents and as customers. Mr. Dixon responded, noting that extensive on-site investigation had in fact been carried out, although not all of the data is included in the report.

Les Archer, Senior Transportation Planner for Bunt and Associates, was introduced by Mr. Dixon as having done most of the research for the report. Mr. Archer provided an overview of the type of investigation that was undertaken, including a study of Dunlevy Street in relation to Willows Galley. Mr. Archer noted the dates that he undertook his counts, and it was felt by some members of the Committee that perhaps data taken on different days might paint a different picture with respect to traffic and parking concerns.

Councillor Jensen indicated that the type of businesses that could occupy the commercial spaces could change at any time with or without the redevelopment, noting that he did not feel the type of business was relevant in respect to the land use decision to be made.

The focus turned to the parking required for the residential units, and Councillor Cassidy indicated that it may be difficult to meet the actual parking requirements of the residents based upon only one stall per unit. Mr. Archer responded, noting that the latest trend with respect to “go-green” initiatives is to provide one space per unit, making purchasers aware of the limit up front, as a way to discourage automobile use.

Mr. Dixon drew attention to various developments in the capital region that had taken the approach of encouraging infrastructure improvements for trails, sidewalks and paths versus creating additional parking, noting that there has been some success in that regard.

Underground Parking Feasibility

Mr. D’Ambrosio confirmed that while underground parking could be constructed, the cost of building it does not make it a viable option for the proposed development. The underground parking would also displace the storage facilities planned to be built underground, requiring them to be above grade and impacting the available floor area for the units, he said.

Liscombe Manor Comparison

Mr. D’Ambrosio drew attention to the comparison figures between the proposed development and the three storey mixed use Liscombe Manor building across the street, provided in the agenda materials.

Mezzanine

As requested by the Committee, said Mr. D’Ambrosio, options for relocating the Mezzanine have been explored. The change that resulted was to pull back the mezzanine from the east face of the building, reducing the apparent height of the building when viewed from the street, he noted.

Walkthrough at West Boundary

In response to the Committee’s request that options for retaining the existing walkthrough at the west boundary of the property be explored, Mr. D’Ambrosio noted that the plans have been revised to retain the walkthrough by pulling the ground level away from the boundary by .6 metres. He noted that while this would currently allow for a width of approximately 1.65

metres between the subject property and the adjacent property, should the adjacent property be redeveloped, this could possibly be reduced on the adjacent property side of the walkthrough.

Line of Sight Photographs

Attention was drawn to the line of sight views from the upper storeys of the proposed development in response to Committee's request, which were included in the applicant's submission.

Comparison of Existing to Proposed Development

It was noted that the current development consists of two, two-storey buildings with a combined total of two commercial/retail units, eight residential units and nine parking stalls, with approximately 928 square metres of floor area compared with the proposed three storey plus mezzanine building with four commercial/retail units, twelve residential units and seventeen parking stalls, with a total floor area of approximately 1819 square metres.

Ownership Model

Mr. D'Ambrosio confirmed that the units would be strata titled versus the current rental model.

Rain Garden

Included in the agenda package was an example of a development agreement for a similar type of rain garden (bioswale) installed in a City of Victoria development.

It was noted that the agreement provided did not seem to exactly reflect what the proposal was for the Estevan Village project, with a member of the Committee pointing out that the Municipality would, if the project were to proceed, be seeking continued maintenance by the property owner versus the three year period in the agreement provided.

Following the presentation of new information, discussion turned to questions and comment from members of the Committee.

Councillor Braithwaite noted her appreciation for various aspects of the design, noting, however, that she still has reservations regarding the overall height including the mezzanine.

With respect to the change to retain the walkthrough at the west boundary, Mayor Causton indicated his support for it being included, saying he feels it adds to the Village atmosphere.

Mayor Causton went on to voice his concerns regarding the size of the proposed development in comparison to the size of the Liscombe Manor building across the street, noting that the proposed development is significantly larger in terms of floor area.

Mr. D'Ambrosio agreed that the proposed development is indeed larger, however, from the front, the buildings look similar in size. The additional massing of the proposed development, he said, is concentrated in the back of the property over the parking area. He noted that with the lane to separate the development from the adjacent properties, he felt that the volume at the back of the building would not significantly impact those properties.

Concerns with respect to replacing current rental units with strata titled units were raised by Mayor Causton, and he noted that would be something Council would need to grapple with in respect to long term thinking.

Responding to the concerns raised by members of the Committee that approval of the proposed development may be seen as precedent setting in terms of its size, Mr. D'Ambrosio did not agree that would be the case. Each development, he said, should be considered on a case by case planning basis.

As for concerns about replacing rental units with strata units, Mr. D'Ambrosio pointed out that likely some of the units would be leased by the owners.

Noting that the hour had grown late, there was consensus amongst the Committee members to hear from members of the public.

Leslie Hildebrandt, 2405 Dunlevy Street, drew attention to the petition included in the agenda listing significant concerns about the proposed development, which was signed by 20 residents following the open house held by the applicants.

Ms. Hildebrandt said she would have liked to have some input with respect to the traffic study, noting that she would have suggested counts being taken on a weekend with hot weather, noting those are the times when traffic and parking volume is higher.

Ms. Hildebrandt went on to note that in her opinion the proposal does not adequately address the impact of the development on adjacent streets.

Responding to questions from a member of the Committee, Ms. Hildebrandt commented that some of the existing units in the buildings proposed to be redeveloped are empty, which would likely have an effect on the results of the traffic study.

John Robinson, 2560 Dalhousie Street, agreed that the Estevan Village needs some "sprucing up". However, he said, the proposed development represents a 100% increase in the number of storeys and 50% increase in the number of units, which if approved, creates a precedent for future redevelopment in the rest of the Village. The Village should be looked at as a whole, said Mr. Robinson, instead of on a piece meal basis.

In closing, Mr. Robinson noted that while the design looks nice, the building is too big for the site.

Judy McKay, 2400 Dunlevy Street, voiced her agreement with the comments made by Mr. Robinson, noting that at present she copes with parking and traffic. The proposed four storey building, she said, is worrisome in that it may lead to the rest of the Village being redeveloped with larger buildings. Two storeys plus the mezzanine is acceptable, she said, but four storeys is just too much.

Eric Hildebrandt, 2405 Dunlevy Street, drew attention to the Oak Bay Village, which, he said, is basically all two storey buildings. The proposed four storey building next to single family "bungalows" would appear overbuilt. He drew attention to the current two storey zoning which he felt should not be thrown out because a new development proposal has come along.

Glen Harper, 2567 Estevan Avenue, noting that he owns the Willows Galley at the corner of Dunlevy Street and Estevan Avenue across the street from the proposed development, which he noted he supports and is confident that whatever is accepted will be an asset to the community.

He said that a new building could do nothing but enhance properties on all sides, indicated that he also spoke for another owner next to the lane, who was unable to attend and speak for herself.

MOVED by Councillor Cassidy

Seconded by Councillor Braithwaite, That the meeting continue past the 11 o'clock p.m. hour of adjournment fixed by the Procedure Bylaw.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

With no further members of the public wishing to address the Committee, it was noted that all members of the Committee had not yet had the opportunity to provide their comments on the proposal, and that due to the late hour, further discussion should be held at another time.

There was consensus that at the July 21, 2008 Council meeting, when the minutes of this Committee of the Whole meeting are considered, Council members would take the opportunity to further discuss the proposal, with the applicants welcome to be in attendance to get a clear indication of additional information the Committee might desire if the application is to be explored further.

MOVED by Councillor Jensen

Seconded by Councillor Herbert, That correspondence items no. 2008-187 to 2008-187-14 be received.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT:

MOVED by Councillor Cassidy

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

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Municipal Clerk

Chairman, Finance and Regulatory
Section

Chairman, Land Use Section

Chairman, Public Works Section