

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF CENTRAL SAANICH

Minutes of the **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** Meeting
Monday, May 10, 2010, at 7:17 p.m.
Central Saanich Fire Training Centre

PRESENT: Councillor Alastair Bryson, Chair
Mayor Mar
Councillors Garrison, Kubek, Mason, Olsen, and Siklenka
Gary C. Nason, Administrator
Susan Brown, Municipal Clerk
Hope V. Burns, Director of Planning and Building Services
Nirmal Bhattacharya, Municipal Engineer

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Mayor Mar excused himself from the Meeting at 7:18 p.m. announcing a potential conflict of interest due to a business relationship with the applicant for the Vantreight Farm Hills project.

The Municipal Clerk noted the following additions to the Agenda materials:

Under Item 1. Correspondence Received Since the Regular Council Meeting of May 3, 2010, Pertaining to the "Vantreight Farm Hills" Project:

New Item 1(mm) D&J Lewis, May 5, 2010
(nn) D Sutton, May 5, 2010
(oo) Lawrence/Baillie Family, May 6, 2010
(pp) E VanDoormaal, May 5, 2010
(qq) R Stanley, May 6, 2010
(rr) B Goulet, May 6, 2010
(ss) RA Fimrite, May 6, 2010
(tt) H Fyfe & H Mayhill, May 6, 2010
(uu) Form Letter in Opposition to the project signed by 63 signatories
(vv) S Orlik, May 3, 2010
(ww) L Bourgeois, May 6, 2010
(xx) H Goulet, May 7, 2010
(yy) C Quail, May 8, 2010
(zz) J Robinson, May 8, 2010
(aaa) B Leslie, May 9, 2010
(bbb) G Closson, May 10, 2010
(ccc) L Megenbir, May 7, 2010

360.10 **MOVED AND SECONDED**
That the Agenda for the Planning & Development Committee Meeting held on May 10, 2010, be approved as amended.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. Staff Memorandum

- a) Staff Memorandum dated May 5, 2010, from the Director of Planning & Building Services and Planner entitled "OCP and Zoning Amendment Application; Proposed Development at 8410 Wallace Drive (Vantreight Farms)"
- b) Staff Memorandum dated May 5, 2010, from the Planner entitled "Late Additional Information Received – OCP & Zoning Amendment Application; 8410 Wallace Drive (Vantreight Farms)" (including a submission from the applicant dated May 5, 2010)
- c) Correspondence Received Since the Regular Council Meeting of May 3, 2010, Pertaining to this Application"
 - a) I Vantreight, April 27, 2010
 - b) PE Bion, May 3, 2010
 - c) S Harrison & S Vagle, May 3, 2010
 - d) C&B Youell, May 4, 2010
 - e) R Wittal, May 4, 2010
 - f) L Woytowich, May 3, 2010
 - g) T DeMooy, May 4, 2010

- h) JC Miller, April 30, 2010
 - i) C Paynter, May 4, 2010
 - j) V Marshall, May 1, 2010
 - k) D Wilson, May 4, 2010
 - l) LA Snair, May 4, 2010
 - m) P Douglas, May 4, 2010
 - n) E Partridge, May 4, 2010
 - o) G&P Morrison, May 4, 2010
 - p) C Gruber, May 4, 2010
 - q) G Page, May 4, 2010
 - r) S Kelly, May 4, 2010
 - s) D Wright, May 5, 2010
 - t) L Vantreight, May 4, 2010
 - u) B&H Gartshore, May 5, 2010
 - v) K Steinman, May 5, 2010
 - w) B&D Whistlecroft, May 5, 2010
 - x) R Gafter, May 5, 2010
 - y) N Verbrugge, May 5, 2010
 - z) E Doublier, May 5, 2010
 - aa) B Stapleton, May 5, 2010
 - bb) JB Martin, May 5, 2010
 - cc) Devlin Gailus, Barristers and Solicitors, on behalf of H Horie and S Stroud, May 5, 2010
 - dd) R Macfarlane, May 5, 2010
 - ee) A Roaf, May 5, 2010
 - ff) J Albis, May 5, 2010
 - gg) K Stroh, May 5, 2010
 - hh) D Dobbie, May 5, 2010
 - ii) BA Grooms, May 5, 2010
 - jj) G Perrin, May 5, 2010
 - kk) C Dobbyn, May 5, 2010
 - ll) B von Schulmann, May 5, 2010
- (late items as follows:)
- mm) D&J Lewis, May 5, 2010
 - nn) D Sutton, May 5, 2010
 - oo) Lawrence/Baillie Family, May 6, 2010
 - pp) E VanDoormaal, May 5, 2010
 - qq) R Stanley, May 6, 2010
 - rr) B Goulet, May 6, 2010
 - ss) RA Fimrite, May 6, 2010
 - tt) H Fyfe & H Mayhill, May 6, 2010
 - uu) Form Letter in Opposition to the project signed by 63 signatories
 - vv) S Orlik, May 3, 2010
 - ww) L Bourgeois, May 6, 2010
 - xx) H Goulet, May 7, 2010
 - yy) C Quail, May 8, 2010
 - zz) J Robinson, May 8, 2010
 - aaa) B Leslie, May 9, 2010
 - bbb) G Closson, May 10, 2010
 - ccc) L Megenbir, May 7, 2010

The Director of Planning & Building Services, referencing PowerPoint slides overviewed the Staff Memorandum. Her presentation included a review of the various aspects of the application, such as proposed density and zoning designations, the subject property and site plan, proposed park and green space, road access issues, watertower, septic system, and irrigation issues. She commented on energy emissions, traffic, affordable housing component, sewage effluent, and the need for Restrictive Covenants to address such issues, as well as referencing the Advisory Planning Commission meeting recommendations on this application. She outlined the Staff concerns set out in the Staff Memorandum, including concerns in relation to ecologically sensitive areas, amount of parkland dedication, slope and width of roads, width of vegetated buffers next to agricultural areas, location and status of access road, and consistency with the Official Community Plan (OCP) in terms of residential density number and type of units and preservation of a larger agricultural land base through possible property consolidation.

The Director then outlined the options presented in the Staff Memorandum Recommendations and noted the Staff position that the application in its current form was not consistent with the policies and objectives of the OCP. The Director responded

to questions from the Committee.

Ian Vantreight, representing the applicant, Vantreight Farms, 8277 Central Saanich Road, Saanichton, introduced a number of people present at the meeting who are involved in the proposed project. He then introduced Merv Mawson, who would be making the presentation.

Merv Mawson, Broadmead Planning & Development, provided an overview of the project. He read out a statement that he also made at the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting which described the project and spoke to the reasons for and the history involved in arriving at the current development proposal. He emphasized the applicant's situation in attempting to save the family's farming business. He then responded to the specific issues raised by Staff, including the provision of park and open space, the issue of road access, changes in the site configuration and consistency with the OCP. Mr. Mawson stated that Options A and B would both mean the end to this application, and asked Committee to consider an abbreviated Option C, such that this application, subject to first and second reading of the proposed Bylaw, could be presented at a Public Hearing to obtain the input of the community. He noted that the applicant was pleased with positive comments that were made at the APC meeting and noted the motion to recommend moving forward with the application was only defeated 5 to 4.

Mr. Mawson then responded to questions from members of Committee concerning such things as:

- Consolidation of the remaining lands into two agricultural parcels – applicant could agree to such consolidations if the application proceeded to approval in its current form;
- Density of the development and site coverage;
- Sufficiency of water for irrigation, and
- Road//driveway access and the issues of location, dedication, rezoning, easement and density implications.

The Director of Planning and Building Services responded to questions concerning the financial reinvestment in agricultural use and the potential size of the units.

Rick Lloyd, RCL Consulting, responded to questions concerning the water and sewage treatment, and the possibility of the effluent being stored in the irrigation ponds seeping into the District's aquifers.

Ryan Vantreight responded to questions concerning road access to the farm lands.

Ian Vantreight responded to questions concerning water and sewer and location of the well heads.

Mr. Mawson also responded to a question concerning the applicant's commitment to servicing the development on site, advising that drilling would first be undertaken on site, but if unsuccessful, drilling could be undertaken on adjacent Vantreight property. He noted that the District could be a party to any easement.

Ryan Vantreight added a comment concerning the benefit to the farm of having the development's water available to the farm.

In response to a question, **Mr. Lloyd** indicated on an aerial depiction, the location of the sewage treatment plant.

The Committee Chair advised that Committee would now hear from members of the public who wished to speak, and explained the speaking rules which included: stating name and address; not repeating comments already set out in correspondence submitted to the Committee; keeping comments to a maximum of two minutes in length; and respecting other speakers. He then invited members of the gallery wishing to speak to come forward.

E Blumenschein, Non-resident, advised that although he is not a local resident, he is a long term Peninsula resident, and gave his opinion that the more food that is produced on the Island, the better for all residents.

S Kelly, Non-resident, advised that he was born in the area, and that he believes local farmers and the production of food on the Island should be supported, and that he

therefore supports the applicant's goal of continuing the farming business.

A Sarroff, Non-resident, advised that he supports sustainable farming.

M Fleming, Resident, advised that he supports the Vantreights, but as a neighbour to the proposed development, is concerned about effluent going into his pond and the food supply.

Ryan Vantreight advised that bio-solid sludge would not be used.

D Wilson, Resident, Brentwood Bay, referenced his letter, noting that he is supportive of local farming and sustainable agriculture, but that if the RE5 proposal proceeds it should be modeled after the Island View development with reference to the provision of parkland.

The Director of Planning and Building Services responded to a question from Committee.

J Olson, Resident, voiced the opinion that a farm can make plenty of money without developing land for residential housing, and queried what kind of precedents would be set by allowing this development.

S Stroud, Resident, noted that the proposed development was outside the urban containment area, which was established through community planning, and voiced the opinion that the District should stick to the vision it established in the OCP. She also noted BC Transit's position against developments that are too far to walk to use transit.

B von Schulmann, Non-resident, expressed the concern that agricultural land is being turned into large estates for wealthy people and horse farms, rather than being used for true agricultural purposes. He questioned the percentage of land actually farmed in the District. In response, the Chair noted that the District was in the process of developing an Agricultural Area Plan.

B Slater, Non-resident, commented that the Vantreight farm produced flowers, not food.

Ryan Vantreight, Resident, clarified that the Vantreight farming operation was moving toward more food production, in addition to the daffodils, and commented on how their produce was marketed and on their plans for an expanded community-based operation. He noted that the next generation was ready and willing to continue the farming business.

C Paynter, Resident, questioned how the acceptance of a loss of 30 acres of farmland would benefit the community, and opined that the proposed loss of such land did not make sense.

B Jordan, Non-resident, noted that the land proposed to be developed was not farmable, and that if the District is looking for someone to manage and sustain farmland, the best choice is a five-generation farming family. He gave the opinion that the land is in an appropriate location, being adjacent to an urban area, and will enable the Vantreights to continue farming.

B Lord, Non-resident, spoke in support of the application, commenting on the issues of subdivision of agricultural land, and small business vulnerabilities in an environment of large business multi-national control.

D Chambers, Non-resident, expressed concerns about changes to farm lands, and the setting of a precedent that would result in driving up the price per acre of farm land. She gave the opinion that this would be more damaging to farming, and that development was not the answer.

T DeMooy Resident, adjacent to the Vantreight's property, commented that this application is crucial to the Vantreights to avoid losing the farm, that the proposal fits with the Dean Park development, that many of the detractors are not residents and that the project will help to preserve farmland.

R Galey, Galey Farms, Non-resident, commented that farming has many challenges and needs to be supported, and that the subject property is a pile of rocks that is not in the ALR. He commented on ALR regulations and gave the opinion that the District should

keep a farm that wants to farm – that sometimes you have to make precedents.

N Chambers, Madrona Farms, a restoration ecologist, provided comments concerning biological diversity and sustainable agricultural models, and opined that these goals do not depend on development. She spoke about the need to protect adequate forested buffering to farmland, sufficient to sustain the ecosystem, and gave the example of the current pollination challenge, noting her opposition to the proposal on this basis.

M Tennant, Non-resident, advised that she came from a family of farmers and had noted that there has been much loss of farming because the farmers were unable to diversify. She opined that we need farms to diversify, and to see five-generation farms continue.

C Flora, Non-resident, daughter of Ian Vantreight, requested that Committee let the application go to Public Hearing, and stated that she wanted their farm to continue, that Committee had all the information as the application had been three years in process and had been changed to meet all the requests.

V Kelsey, Non-resident, gave the opinion that everyone needed to look for a win/win solution, as the world was changing and the proposed project was a viable model. He expressed his support for the Vantreights.

G O'Connor, Non-resident, asked Committee to vote down this proposal, as Central Saanich was unique in having a rural community so close to a large urban centre. He opined that land is wealth, and that it should not be rezoned to meet a business plan, as it would drive up the speculative value of land and signal to other developers, with consequent loss of farmland.

N De Rooy, Resident, noted that his father worked with the Vantreights 60 years ago, sold his farm, and the subsequent owners went under, as farming is not easy. He gave the opinion that the Vantreights are a pillar to the Peninsula, that the proposal fits with the Municipal Act, and that he supports the proposal.

S Newman, Resident, stated that the average farmer's salary in North Saanich is \$6000 per annum, and that the Vantreight farm will be broken up if this application is unsuccessful. He opined that the detractors bring nothing to this community, and that Central Saanich citizens should be the ones to have input at the Public Hearing.

R Stanley, Non-resident, advised that protecting farmers is integral to protecting farms, and queried who wanted to take on the challenges of farming.

K Babich, Resident, gave the opinion that there is no difference between Vantreight's proposal and the Garden Gate Estates development – both properties are rocks, not farmland.

The Chair thanked the speakers for their input and turned the matter over to the Committee for consideration.

361.10 **MOVED AND SECONDED**
That it be recommended to Council:

That the Staff Memoranda dated May 5, 2010, from the Director of Planning & Building Services and the Planner entitled "OCP and Zoning Amendment Application; Proposed Development at 8410 Wallace Drive (Vantreight Farms)" and from the Planner entitled "Late Additional Information Received - OCP & Zoning Amendment Application; 8410 Wallace Drive (Vantreight Farms)" be received; and

- 1. Staff be directed to prepare a zoning amendment bylaw for the site to an amended Rural Estate RE-5 zoning, Parks and Openspace P-2 zoning and Public Utility P-3 zoning;*
- 2. Subject to the bylaw receiving first and second readings, the bylaw be referred to a Public Hearing to solicit input from the community on the merits of the proposed development, to determine whether the community considers the proposal consistent with the Central Saanich Official Community Plan; and*
- 3. Prior to any consideration of the Bylaw for adoption, the applicant be required to provide a guarantee acceptable to the District, that the*

Vantreight property East of Central Saanich Road would be consolidated into one 60± acre agricultural parcel, and the Vantreight property West of Central Saanich Road would be consolidated into one 175± acre agricultural parcel.

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Councillors Bryson and Olsen

In response to a question from a Committee member, the Director of Planning and Building Services, clarified that the question of consistency with the OCP vision would ultimately be up to Council to decide.

ADJOURNMENT:

On motion, the Planning & Development Committee Meeting held on May 10, 2010, adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Councillor Alastair Bryson
Chair

Recorded by: Susan Brown
Municipal Clerk