

**AGENDA**  
**SAANICH ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**  
Saanich Municipal Hall, Council Chambers  
Via MS Teams  
March 2, 2022 at 3 p.m.

---

**In light of the COVID-19 pandemic and to ensure social distancing, this meeting is closed to the public and can be viewed/heard via MS Teams. Please note that MS Teams callers are identified by their phone number which can be viewed on screen by all attendees at the meeting.**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

- February 2, 2022
- February 16, 2022

**3. 3834 OPHIR STREET**

Application by Sam Ganong, Formwell Homes Ltd.

This application is for a development permit to rezone from RS-6 to a site specific zone to construct a 14 unit townhouse development, and to subdivide a portion of the property and rezone this portion to a park zone to allow this to be dedicated to parks.

**Legal Description:** Lot H, Section 40, Victoria District, Plan 16992

**Planning File:** DPR00802

**Planning Staff:** Lauren Mattiussi, Planner

**\*Adjournment \***

Next Scheduled Meeting: March 16, 2022 at 3 p.m.

Note: Please confirm your attendance to Nancy Chaggar at [nancy.chaggar@saanich.ca](mailto:nancy.chaggar@saanich.ca)

**MINUTES**  
**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING**  
Saanich Municipal Hall, Council Chambers  
Via MS Teams  
February 2, 2022, at 3:00 pm

Chair: Keith Davidoff

Present: Illarion Gallant, Greg Gillespie, Andy Guiry, Jacy Lee, Nicholas Standeven

Regrets: Brad Forth, Janine Wigmore

Staff: Lauren Mattiussi, Planner, Current Planning; and Tara Da Silva, Senior Committee Clerk

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Committee Clerk called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

**ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Chair of the Advisory Design Panel for 2021 (by unanimous vote): Keith Davidoff

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**MOVED by J. Lee and Seconded by N. Standeven: “That the Minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held on December 15, 2021, be adopted.”**

**CARRIED**

**ADP REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

T. Da Silva, Committee Clerk, presented and highlighted to the Panel:

- Council adopted the revised Terms of Reference on January 10, 2022.
- The purpose of the revision is to include two specialist architect design professions that will have experience designing multi-family, mixed-use and/or large commercial projects up to 24 stories in height that are located in prominent, highly visible locations in major centres.
- The Planning Department will determine at which meetings these specialists are required.
- When invited, these members are included in the total number of voting members for establishing quorum. In all other cases, quorum is established based on the eight other members appointed by Council.

**4201 TYNDALL AVENUE**

Application by Cadillac Developments Ltd. and Tri-Eagle Development Corporation (Travis Lee). This application is for rezoning and a development permit to construct 36 apartment units over three apartment buildings and 22 stacked townhouses units within three buildings.

**Legal Description:**

- Lot A, Section 53, Victoria District, Plan 38089

**Planning File:** DPR00879; REZ00695

**Planner:** Lauren Mattiussi, Planner

**Comments from the Planner:**

- The subject proposal is to rezone, amend the OCP, and redevelop the property located at 4201 Tyndall Avenue.
- The property is approximately 5,035 m<sup>2</sup>, and it is located midblock on Tyndall Avenue between San Juan Avenue and San Pedro Avenue.
- The property is designated as Neighbourhood within the OCP from which the allowable uses for this designation include low-density single-family dwellings to four-storey apartment buildings.
- The property is currently zoned P1, Assembly Use, but the applicant has applied to rezone the property to the RM-6, Residential Mixed Use Zone.
- The rezoning would allow for the construction of 3 residential apartment buildings and 22 stacked townhouses within three separated townhouse blocks.
- The proposal includes a common amenity building that will house two units on the upper storey and bike storage on the ground level.
- All residential buildings will be three storeys in height except the common amenity building, with two levels.
- The development will add 58 units to the Gordon Head area, with a unit type break down of 32 bachelor suites, 13 one-bedroom units, two two-bedroom units and 11 three-bedroom units.
- Surface level parking is being proposed for 53 vehicles, including one visitor parking stall, one accessible parking stall and secure bike parking.
- Alternative transportation options include bus stops within 200 m of the subject property and a sidewalk running along the subject property's frontage.
- Saanich does not require the installation of bike paths along this frontage of Tyndall Avenue as part of improvement requirements.
- The property is within 200 m of Lambrick Park and about 1km from Hillcrest Elementary and Torquay Elementary Schools.
- Variances requested to support this proposal include:
  - Reduce the building setback from the from the property line for the apartment buildings;
  - Increase the allowable height of a townhouse unit;
  - Reduce the amount of required residential and visitor parking spaces; and
  - Bicycle parking as the spaces proposed does not comply with Saanich Bicycle Parking Standards for Class 1 secure stalls.
- 17% or 852 m<sup>2</sup> of the 5,035 m<sup>2</sup> total site area is proposed as outdoor open space.
- This space does not include parking or structures but does include a playground area, barbeque amenity area and pedestrian pathway connections.
- Six of the 28 trees on-site will be retained, and 22 will be removed.
- The proposed landscaping plan shows 43 proposed trees on-site, planted or retained as part of the development.
- The subject property is within the Gordon Head Local Area of the Official Community Plan and is not included within Map 5.2 as having multi-residential redevelopment potential or subdivision potential.
- Policy 5.5 of the Gordon Head Local Area Plan reads as follows:

- Use development permits to ensure that new multi-family developments respect the scale of adjacent uses, and the environment character of Gordon Head.
- Staff would like feedback from the panel regarding the height and massing of the proposed buildings.
- Staff would also like feedback regarding the amount of impervious area that is proposed to speak to the policy objectives related to maintaining the environmental integrity of the site.
- Staff feel that a reconfiguration of the proposed buildings may allow greater opportunities for landscaped areas and wider pedestrian connections throughout the development.

**Comments from applicant /owner:**

Travis Lee, Tri-Eagle Development Corporation; Cam Pringle, Cadillac Developments Ltd.; Joe Newell, Joe Newell Architect Inc.; and Brad Forth, Forsite Landscape Architecture; presented to the Panel:

- Marlowe is a new master-planned community being designed in Gordon Head.
- The 58 new homes create an opportunity for first-time homeowners and young families to own a home and build equity.
- Recent projects done by Cadillac Developments and Tri-Eagle include Blair Avenue homes, Galaxy Place homes, Alberg Estates and Doncaster Microsmart Living.
- Marlowe's design focuses on enhanced pedestrian and biking experiences to lower monthly transportation costs.
- Nearby amenities to the proposed project include:
  - Lambrick Park Sports Fields;
  - Gordon Head Rec Centre;
  - Lambrick Park Secondary School;
  - Gordon Head Middle School;
  - Torquay Elementary School;
  - University of Victoria;
  - University Heights Shopping Centre; and
  - Tyndall Soccer Fields.
- The existing site is the Gordon Head United Church, and the adjacent houses are mostly two-storey single-family dwellings.
- A variance on the front yard setback is requested for the three proposed apartment buildings.
- New street trees will be added to Tyndall Avenue, but some of the existing trees will be retained.
- The buildings at the proposed development will have a row of accent trees to create a visual appeal.
- The townhouses will have an accent garden in each of them, including a small tree.
- Of the 58 units, one unit within apartment Buildings 1 and 3 is fully accessible, and wheelchair-accessible parking stalls are adjacent to both of these units.
- The upper floors within the three apartment buildings are studio suites for single occupancy.
- The same pallet of materials is used on all buildings, but different colours allow for visual distinction.
- The amenity building has two one-bedroom suites on the second floor, which are accessed by ground-level entrances on each side of the building.
- There is an outdoor kitchen with a barbeque and counter space; an accessible washroom for residents; a bicycle room with 27 floor mounted bike racks and 33 wall mounted racks; and the recycling and storage area.

- The studio suites within the apartment buildings will be fully furnished.
- Shadow studies were conducted to better understand how the site's shadows may appear throughout the year.
- Since the parking will be at surface level, the cost is much less on the homeowner than underground parking.

**In response to questions from the Panel, the Applicant stated:**

- There are two points of entry to the site from the municipal sidewalk for pedestrians.
- An internal walkway within the development allows pedestrians to access the side entrances for each apartment building and townhouse.
- The proposed site is approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$  covered in asphalt with a few play areas.
- The current footpath is not connected to the strata lane in the proposed site plan, but a revision could be made if requested.
- There is the potential to bring in another pedestrian pathway from the sidewalk to the entrance of Building 2.
- Current transportation trends show that the parking plan should stay as proposed, but if biking or transit becomes more prevalent, the parking could be redesigned to allow for more landscaping.
- Each building on the plan is a Part 9 building with lower cost and is more efficient to build than one larger apartment building.
- The windows of the apartment buildings mostly face either the front or back of the building, but some windows face the side yards that are not at the natural eye level, thus retaining privacy.
- There will be a conduit that holds four electrical outlets for electric vehicles every four parking spots.
- The picnic area near Building 1 may be removed to improve permeability.
- The canopy around the playground may be adjusted to ensure the tree cover does not produce too much shading.
- Adding another pathway between the amenity building and Townhouse 15/16 will be investigated.
- The parking study supported the plan as currently proposed, but the parking consultant may be re-engaged to potentially add permeability.
- The garbage and recycling program will be managed by pulling out the containers by hand to the parking lot to be removed.

**Comments from the Panel:**

- It appears that the existing condition of the site has a greater extent of impermeable surfaces.
- The proposal seems to reflect a net improvement to the site, but there are opportunities to reduce hard surfaces on site.
- Apartment Buildings 1 and 3 could have the side pedestrian pathways removed to enhance the identity of those buildings and instead improve the street edge condition by increasing the number of pedestrian pathways from the sidewalk to the buildings' front doors.
- The applicant team was challenged to look at different opportunities to reduce the amount of continuous parking and implement some additional landscaping.
- A recommendation was made to remove the residents' picnic area in the northwest corner and instead implement soft landscaping to increase the amount of permeable surface.
- Between Buildings 1 and 3, the proposed trees' crowns may have to be lifted to reduce the likelihood of overcrowding.
- More permeable parking should be installed as there is not a lot of permeability on the

- site.
- The access to the play area and the amenity building is tight. Accessibility could be improved by adding an access point between Townhouse 15/16 and the amenity building.
- The potential success of the resident picnic area by Building 1 was questioned due to its location.
- The sidewalk next to Building 3 was praised as improving pedestrian safety.
- The streetscape view might be less monotonous if there was more variation in the building heights.
- The varying uses of the amenity building were commended as being creative.
- The lack of green space on the backside of Townhouse 9 through 14 was raised a potential concern.

**MOVED by N. Standeven and Seconded by A. Guiry: “That it be recommended that the design to construct 36 apartment units over three apartment buildings and 22 stacked townhouse units within three buildings at 4201 Tyndall Avenue be approved subject to consideration of:**

- **Additional pedestrian connections from the Tyndall sidewalk to Buildings 1, 2 and 3;**
- **On-site connection between the strata lane and the common outdoor kitchen area; and**
- **Increasing the permeable surface in the strata lane or relocating permeable area from elsewhere on site (specifically the picnic area) to the strata lane.”**

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**CHAIR**

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**COMMITTEE SECRETARY**

**MINUTES**  
**ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL**  
**Saanich Municipal Hall, Council Chambers**  
**Via MS Teams**  
**February 16, 2022 at 3:00 p.m.**

A/Chair: Nicholas Standeven

Present: Illarion Gallant, Jacy Lee, Brad Forth, Dorian Resener; and Janine Wigmore (3:20 pm).

Regrets: Keith Davidoff, Greg Gillespie, Andy Guiry

Staff: Sarah de Medeiros, Senior Planning Technician; Tara Da Silva, Senior Committee Clerk; and Nancy Chaggar, Senior Committee Clerk.

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Senior Committee Clerk called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

**NOMINATION OF CHAIR**

Nicholas Standeven was nominated as Acting Chair for this meeting.

**3920 SCOLTON ROAD**

Application by Jane Howard.

This application is for a development permit to convert an accessory building to a garden suite on a large lot. Variances are requested for rear yard setback and interior side yard setback.

**Legal Description:** Lot 2, Section 44, Victoria District, Plan 5460

**Planning File:** DPR00930

**Planner:** Sarah de Medeiros, Senior Planning Technician

**Comments from the Planning Technician:**

- The proposed garden suite will be built as a second storey to the existing accessory building.
- The proposed garden suite is 92.9 m<sup>2</sup>, and the lot size is 1,031 m<sup>2</sup> which is within the bylaw requirements.
- The applicant is seeking variances for the rear and interior setbacks of 1.55 m. The required setback for a two-storey garden suite on a large lot is 3 m for the rear and interior setbacks.
- The Planning Department seeks comments on building design, privacy and impact to adjacent neighbours, and how landscaping may help mitigate those impacts.

**Comments from applicant/owner:**

Tim Rodier, Outline Home Design, presented to the Panel on behalf of the applicant/owner. It was noted:

- The existing accessory building is a garage and was completed in 2016.
- One of the options considered was to tear down the existing accessory building and start

from scratch; this would be a wasteful process. The applicant then explored adding a second storey to the garage as it sits on a large enough lot; however, this option requires variances for setbacks.

- There are existing cedar and laurel hedges along the north and west sides of the property, offering privacy to adjacent lots.
- One of the goals for this project is to remain minimally invasive on the site.
- The proposed garden suite is a small and functional one-bedroom suite with a deck and stair access to the yard below.
- The design intends to keep the two-storey accessory building as a sub-dominant structure to the main house. The roof design is inset and remains well within the required setbacks.
- The northwest (rear) side has potential for a kitchen sink that would overlook the neighbour's yard and could be a frosted window.
- The building height is currently set at 6.0 m; the applicant does not intend to exceed the allowable height limit of 6.5 m.

**In response to questions from the Panel, the applicant stated:**

- The property has three indoor garage spaces: one at the front and two at the back (accessory building). The tenant may use one of the empty garage spaces or the bay at the back.
- The proposed deck could be aligned to the required 3 m setback; this would be an easy revision to make.
- A wall-mounted HVAC system on the lower half of the accessory building would not be an ideal location given the 1.55 m setbacks on the rear and side. If the applicant chooses to install HVAC, more thought and consideration will be put into its location.
- The cedar hedges along the north of the property will grow tall enough to provide privacy from the kitchen window within the next couple of years.

**Comments from the Panel:**

- The Panel appreciates the design and clever reuse of the existing accessory building.
- The quality of the drawings is excellent and provides adequate details for design and functional requirements.
- It is suggested that a tree be planted between the two decks (of the main home and garden suite) and a hedge or other plantings along the amenity space to create privacy.
- The design is not suitable for someone in a wheelchair.
- Efforts to reduce concerns of overlook and privacy are appreciated.
- The window at the kitchen sink adds value, connection to the outdoors, and natural light. There is an opportunity to install a dormer window or something higher to reduce the overlook onto the adjacent property to the north.
- The porch lighting may inconvenience the neighbours to the north.
- A wheelchair user could have a stairlift installed to access the upper deck.
- The applicant should consider taking a bit of space from the bedroom to increase the size of the bathroom.
- The deck's solid guard rail provides added privacy.
- Some consideration should be given to bedroom storage.



**MOVED by J. Lee and seconded by I. Gallant: “That it be recommended that the design to convert an accessory building to a garden suite at 3920 Scolton Road be approved subject to consideration of:**

- 1. Increased separation between the residences’ outdoor amenity spaces using landscaping (such as a tree or hedges);**
- 2. Aligning the deck at the three metre setback;**
- 3. Locating any HVAC systems appropriately to mitigate any noise disturbances to neighbours;**
- 4. Location and type of porch light fixtures to minimize light cast-off;**
- 5. Widening the bathroom to increase accessibility;**
- 6. Provision of storage in the bedroom;**
- 7. Provision of a frosted window in the kitchen to increase privacy; and**
- 8. Potential for future installation of a wheelchair lift.”**

**The Motion was then Put and CARRIED**

The meeting adjourned at 3:43 pm.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**CHAIR**

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**COMMITTEE SECRETARY**

3834 Ophir Street



1:2,000



District of Saanich  
2/18/2022 11:21:23 AM

This map is for general information purposes and should not be considered authoritative for any purpose. Accuracy, currency and precision are not guaranteed.