AGENDA

1. NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

2. CALL TO ORDER

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

   Minutes of the Meeting December 16, 2015

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

   None.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

   None.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

   None.

8. NEW BUSINESS

   8.1. Development Variance Permit - 6638 Buena Vista Rd

       (Referral from Council January 25th, 2016):

       "With respect to the proposed subdivision and subsequent
       construction of two single family dwellings on the property at 6638
       Buena Vista Road that Council refer this report to the Advisory
       Planning Commission for review and comment."
Staff Recommendation
That the APC comment on the following:

1) the suitability of the impact on neighboring properties for the reduced setbacks; and,
2) the suitability of the impact on the streetscape, especially the requirement to have a maximum shared driveway width of 7m.

8.2. 1060 Lucille - Rezoning and Variance

Staff Recommendation
That the Advisory Planning Commission provide comment to Council on the proposed rezoning of the property at 1060 Lucille Drive to facilitate a proposed 2-lot single-family residential subdivision, including the following:

1) proposed use and density;
2) site layout and access;
3) requested variances; and,
4) impact on neighbourhood streetscape.

8.3. Liaison Appointments to other advisory committees:

Agricultural Advisory Committee – 3rd Thursday of the month, 7:30pm

9. REPORTS ON PLANNING RELATED INITIATIVES


9.2. Agricultural Advisory Committee

10. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, March 16, 2016

11. ADJOURNMENT
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF CENTRAL SAANICH

Minutes of the ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting
Wednesday, December 16, 2015, at 7:00 PM
Council Chambers

PRESENT:
Allison Habkirk, John Hannam, Ron Heal, William Lipp, Jerry Mussio, Ron Spelt, Denise Tidman

Council Liaisons:
Councillor Carl Jensen

Staff:
Bruce Greig, Director of Planning and Building Services
Jill Walker, Recording Secretary

REGRETS: Doug Hamilton
ABSENT: Courtland Sandover-Sly

1. CALL TO ORDER
   The meeting was called to order at 7 pm.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
   MOVED AND SECONDED
   That the agenda be adopted as presented.
   CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES
   MOVED AND SECONDED
   That the minutes of the meeting October 21, 2015 be adopted as presented.
   CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

Referrals from Council:

7.1. Staff Memo dated December 11, 2015 - Update to APC Bylaw

Motions from the November 16 Regular Council Meeting:

"That the draft Advisory Planning Commission Bylaw No. 1877, 2015, be referred to the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) for review and comment;"

"That the municipal Heritage Program (policy 0340-50-1991-03) be referred to the APC for review and comment on areas of attention for an update"

The Director of Planning and Building Services explained that the need for updating and changing the APC Bylaw came about as a result of Council looking at designating the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) as an official advisory body of Council. The APC bylaw was to be used as a template for the AAC which brought to light areas of the APC bylaw which first require updating. The revisions include out-of-date items, areas of overlap with other processes, and additional responsibilities that have been referred to the commission by Council specifically establishing the APC as a heritage advisory commission. The Heritage Program policy is also due for review and update, including the possibility of removing the section referring to a municipal Heritage Registry, as it does not presently exist.

Discussion ensued with particular reference to items in the draft APC bylaw pertaining to public input at meetings, reporting to Council, and the proposed reduction of the number of members for a quorum to only 3. Questions were asked of the Director of Planning about members qualifications to comment on such things as Environmental issues, Community Transportation, and Heritage items (item 16) as will be required by the revised bylaw. After a further discussion about resources for committees, it was then

MOVED AND SECONDED

That the Advisory Planning Commission encourage Council to allocate resources, at some point in the future, to review the Heritage Program policy.
and its goals.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOVED AND Seconded
That the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to Council its support for appropriate resources for the advisory committees.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Additional comments were shared encouraging Council, when referring items to the various committees, to format the referral to focus and target on specific items. The APC commented on the need for additional direction on what specifically Council is requesting.

7.2. Referral from Council: CRD Trails Management Plan

Motion from the December 7 Council Meeting:

“That the CRD Trails Management Plan be referred to local farms for comment with respect to the proposed paving of Lochside Trail, and to the Agricultural Land Commission with respect to the proposed trail passing through the Agricultural Land Reserve, and be referred to the Advisory Planning Commission and the Peninsula and Area Agricultural Commission for review and comment, including issues of horse access on the trails”.

The Director of Planning, Mr. Greig, distributed the CRD comment form in addition to the Regional Trails Management Plan referral from Council. Being that the plan spans across the region, Mr. Greig directed attention to item 17 in the plan which specifically focuses on development of the Lochside Trail. Mr. Greig noted it was this item that prompted Council to refer the plan to the APC.

Discussion ensued around the Development Concept for the Lochside Trail as outlined on page 28 of the plan. Questions arose about horse use of the trails with respect to paving the trail. Mr. Greig explained the plan needs to address the variety of demands on the trail system. The APC discussion focused on the equestrian community in that area. Mr. Greig commented that the Peninsula Area Agricultural Committee (PAAC) also received this referral and will have an opportunity for input. It was then,

MOVED AND Seconded
That the Advisory Planning Commission requests that Council ensures that adjacent property owners (farmers) along the trail are informed of the potential paving of the trail.
UNANIMOUS

Mr. Greig added that there are corresponding overarching policies in the District’s Official Community Plan regarding trails.
The APC further commented that the Lochside Trail is a great part of the regional trails network, and encourages Council to continue to work on connections to the trail system.

8. REPORTS ON PLANNING RELATED INITIATIVES


Doug Hamilton was not present to give an update on this committee.

8.2. Agricultural Advisory Committee

No meetings have convened recently, pending Council adoption of a new AAC bylaw.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, January 20th, 2016.

Mr. Greig added that the District intends to bring in a legislative expert for some procedural training for all the advisory committees of Council and it will likely occur on the proposed date of the next meeting.

Councillor Jensen thanked the Advisory Planning Commission for their time and input over this past year.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Denise Tidman, Chair
RECOMMENDATIONS:

that Council, with respect to the proposed subdivision and subsequent construction of two single family dwellings on the property at 6638 Buena Vista Road:

1. give notice of intent to consider issuing a Development Variance Permit (DVP) that would reduce the minimum interior side yard setback total for two sides from 4.5m to 3m, subject to the condition that the maximum combined driveway width at the property line not exceed 7m; and
2. refer this report to the Advisory Planning Commission for review and comment.

BACKGROUND:

On the 27th of July, 2015, Council rezoned the subject property from R-1 (Large Lot Single Family Residential) to R-1M (Medium Lot Single Family Residential) to facilitate a two-lot subdivision of the subject property. On the same day, Council also approved a DVP to reduce the minimum required lot width from 21m to 15m for the subject property.

The applicant has been granted a Building Permit for the construction of one single family dwelling on the subject property, and construction on that unit has begun. The applicant has also applied for subdivision of the subject property.
Proposal:
Baldev Lalli has applied on behalf of Manjit and Parminder Lalli to vary the minimum required interior side yard setback from 1.5m, and a total of 4.5m for two sides to 1.5m for all sides in order to facilitate the development of two single family dwellings.

Site and Surrounding Area:
The subject property was formerly occupied by a single family dwelling and several accessory buildings which have since been demolished in anticipation of the currently proposed development. The property is located in the Tanner Ridge neighbourhood, south of Keating Cross Road. The site is zoned R-1M and is mostly surrounded by properties in the R-1 zone, although the adjacent lot to the south west (6645 Central Saanich Road) is in the RCH (Residential Carriage House) zone (see site context map in Attachments).

DISCUSSION:
Planning Department Comments:
The applicant wishes to have a minimum interior side setback of 1.5m for both sides of the proposed houses, as opposed to the 4.5m total for two sides as required by the Land Use Bylaw. Varying the bylaw in this manner will allow the applicant a wider building envelope for the proposed houses. However, Council may wish to note that the reduced setback means that there will not be room in the side yard for a driveway or vehicle access to the rear of the dwellings. Section 42.10(d) of Land Use Bylaw No. 1309 requires that parking for a secondary suite be provided behind the front setback line of the single family dwelling it is accessory to. With this in mind, as the applicant intends to have secondary suites in the proposed dwellings, the applicant is proposing to have a reciprocal access agreement between the two lots over a shared driveway between them providing access to the rear yard (where a garage or secondary suite may be located). A site plan is attached to this report showing the shared driveway concept.

The site plan attached shows the shared driveway with a 14m opening onto Buena Vista Road (each lot has a maximum allowable driveway width of 7m, and the driveways are adjacent to one another). There is a large parking area proposed for the front of each lot, which negates one of the primary advantages of the shared driveway arrangement - the ability to keep parking and garages at the rear of the buildings and out of site from the street. Reducing the driveway opening width would have the desirable effect of improving the streetscape aesthetics, creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment, and making room for more street parking. Staff therefore recommend that as a condition of DVP issuance Council require the maximum driveway crossing width at the property line be 7m.

Council may wish to note that, to a certain extent, the ongoing construction of one unit on the subject property presupposes issuance of the current DVP. If the current application for variance is rejected, the applicant will be forced to redesign his subdivision to provide a 3m setback on the north side of proposed lot A (where one unit is currently under construction). This subdivision re-design would force the applicant to apply for a further DVP to again reduce the minimum lot frontage of proposed lot B from 15.26m to 13.76m, or thereabouts. This would also trigger the need for an application to amend the zoning further, as the re-designed lot B would be slightly less than the 660m² minimum area specified in the R-1M zone. Also note that, if this future hypothetical DVP or rezoning application were rejected the applicant may be unable
To: Bruce Greig, Director of Planning and Building Services  
For: January 18, 2016 Committee of the Whole  
Re: 6638 Buena Vista Road; Development Variance Permit  

January 12, 2016

To achieve a subdivision of the subject property, and as such the applicant is currently building the first house at his own risk.

Building Department Comments:
The applicant may wish to consider the implications of proposing 5’ (1.5m) side yard setbacks as this will effect:
1. Allowable windows area and location of windows facing the side yards; and,
2. Future building permits for any new construction would be required to show compliance with District bylaws and the 2012 Building Code as amended, including site servicing, seismic design, and energy conservation.

CONCLUSION:
Subject to public comment, staff recommend that Council consider authorizing the requested DVP for a reduced interior side setback requirement on the subject property at 6638 Buena Vista Road. If supported by Council, staff will undertake the required notification for the Development Variance Permit. Upon issuance of the DVP, the applicant could then proceed with completion of his application for subdivision and subsequently apply for a Building Permit for the second house.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Site Context Plan
- Proposed Site Plan
- Front Elevations

Endorsed by:
Bruce Greig, mcip. bcsia  
Director of Planning & Building Service

Administrator’s Recommendation:
I concur with the recommendation contained in this report.  
Patrick Robins  
Chief Administrative Officer
BUENA VISTA STREET VIEW

- HOUSE ON RIGHT FOR SUBDIVISION PURPOSE. ONLY
  THE DESIGN AND LOOK WILL BE DIFFERENT.
  HOUSE TO BE DESIGNED AFTER VARIANCE.

- SHARED DRIVEWAY BETWEEN HOUSES.

- CARPORT/GARAGE IN BACK.
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

For the Advisory Planning Commission meeting on February 17, 2016

To: Bruce Greig
Director of Planning & Building Services

From: Kyle McStravick
Planner

Priority: [ ] Strategic [x] Operational

Date: January 29, 2016

Re: 1060 Lucille - Rezoning and Variance

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Advisory Planning Commission provide comment to Council on the proposed rezoning of the property at 1060 Lucille Drive to facilitate a proposed 2-lot single-family residential subdivision, including the following:

- proposed use and density;
- site layout and access;
- requested variances; and,
- impact on neighbourhood streetscape.

BACKGROUND:

Proposal:

Carl and Sherry Nesbitt have applied to re-zone the property at 1060 Lucille Drive from R-2 (Residential Two Family) to R-1XS (Single Family Residential Infill), and to vary the setbacks of the R1-XS zone in order to permit a proposed 2-lot residential subdivision.
To: Bruce Greig, Director of Planning & Building Services  
For: February 17, 2016 Advisory Planning Commission  
Re: 1060 Lucille - Rezoning and Variance  

January 29, 2016

Site and Surrounding Area:

This corner lot at the intersection of Clark Road and Lucille Drive is presently zoned R-2 (Residential Two Family). The site is approximately 902 square metres in size, and is presently occupied by an older single-family home which the applicants intend to maintain on site. The site contains several mature trees, including one pine tree and one cedar tree which are proposed to be removed as part of the development.

The surrounding neighbourhood is entirely zoned R-2, and the current proposal would be the first infill project to occur in the immediate area.

The subject property is located within the Urban Settlement Area and is designated as Residential in the OCP long-range Land Use Plan.

DISCUSSION:

The District’s adopted OCP policies provide general support for appropriate infill subdivision in existing neighbourhoods within the Urban Settlement Area.

OCP policy 4.2(4) states that “Sensitive residential infill and intensification will be considered in areas designated for residential uses within the Urban Settlement Area. Development that addresses community housing needs, particularly the need for more affordable housing, should be encouraged. Housing forms that may be considered include carriage housing, small-lot single family homes, and duplex or triplex garden units…”

There is also support for smaller lot sizes in OCP policy 4.4(2) “Small, more compact forms of housing are encouraged to be developed in the community to provide more affordable housing options for a range of lifestyles and income levels”.

Staff Comments:

Building Department:

The Building Department has no objections to the proposed rezoning; however, in anticipation of a future application for a two lot subdivision and subsequent building permits, please note the following:

1. Confirmation is required that the existing house to remain on Proposed Lot A complies with the Land Use Bylaw for the proposed zone, including use. A single family dwelling has been authorized in this building; therefore any proposed secondary suite would require a building permit demonstrating compliance with the bylaws and building code.

2. Confirmation will also be required, prior to subdivision, that the existing building south elevation complies with the building code for the reduced setbacks including spatial separation (from the proposed new lot line), construction, cladding etc.

3. Site services (water, storm, sewer) would be required as per District bylaws and the current BC Building Code, including the Surface Water Management bylaw. Any on-site plumbing works to service the new lot would require a plumbing permit.

4. Future building permits for any new construction would be required to show compliance with District bylaws and the current BC Building Code, including site servicing, seismic design, and energy conservation. Specific attention should be paid to code requirements relating to
To: Bruce Greig, Director of Planning & Building Services
For: February 17, 2016 Advisory Planning Commission
Re: 1060 Lucille - Rezoning and Variance

January 29, 2016

wall faces located closer than 2m to the property line (window glazing size, location, soffit projections etc.).

Engineering Department:

The application is currently under review; comments on any required upgrades to municipal infrastructure including roads, water, drainage and/or sewer utilities will be provided prior to Council review.

Planning Department:

Planning staff note that the property is within the Urban Settlement Area, and the current proposal for small-lot infill development is generally consistent with the Official Community Plan.

The applicants propose to create two lots: proposed Lot A at 596.6m² (6,400 sq.ft.) would retain the existing house, and a new house would be constructed on the 305.3m² (3,280 sq.ft.) proposed Lot B. The R-1XS zone would accommodate lots of the sizes proposed. Note, however, that due to the siting of the existing house on proposed Lot A, certain variances are required. Proposed Lot A is a corner lot with frontage on both Clarke Road and Lucille Drive. As the Clarke Road frontage is the shorter of the two, it is considered the front lot line (per the Land Use Bylaw definition) although the existing house is oriented towards Lucille Drive. The "rear" property boundary of Lot A would be on the south side. The required variances are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-1XS</th>
<th>Proposed (existing house)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Single Family</td>
<td>Residential Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Suite</td>
<td>Secondary Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min. lot area</td>
<td>596.6m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. lot coverage</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. FAR</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min. frontage</td>
<td>10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min. setbacks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front (Clarke)</td>
<td>6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rear</td>
<td>7.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>side interior</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total 2 sides)</td>
<td>4.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>side exterior (Lucille)</td>
<td>4.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. height</td>
<td>8m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Denotes variance required.

Varying the rear yard setback for proposed Lot A would mostly affect the residents of the new house on proposed Lot B, which the owners themselves intend to occupy. Note that the majority of the existing structure is set back 1.5m from the proposed new rear lot line - it is only a relatively small 'bump out' overhang which will have the 0.94m setback noted above.
The applicants intend to remove one pine and one cedar tree from the frontage of the proposed Lot B. The removal of these trees may require a tree cutting permit per the municipal bylaws.

Staff strongly support the proposal to retain the existing house on Lot A, to avoid the environmental impact of sending building material and its embodied energy to the landfill. The house shown for the proposed Lot B is a well-designed 150m² (1,600 sq.ft.) home with features that would complement the neighbourhood.

CONCLUSION:
Staff recommend that the APC provide comment to Council on the proposed 2-lot development at 1062 Lucille Drive.

ATTACHMENTS:
Appendix 'A' - site context map
Appendix 'B' - application materials

Endorsed by:
Bruce Greig, mcip, bcsla
Director of Planning & Building Service
## Rezoning - Land Use Bylaw

- **Address:** 160 LUCAS DR
- **City:** Brentwood Bay
- **Postal Code:** V8M 1E8
- **Phone:** (250) 652-8009
- **Fax:**

### Owner

- **Name:** CARL J. NESBITT & SHERRY D. NESBITT
- **Address:** 160 LUCAS DR
- **City:** Brentwood Bay
- **Postal Code:** V8M 1E8
- **Telephone:**
- **Fax:**

### Applicant (if not owner)

- **Name:** OWNER
- **Business License:**
- **Telephone:**
- **Fax:**

### Project Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Plot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1W</td>
<td>13036</td>
<td>CO41618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Required Documentation & Plans

- Survey Certificate (BCLS) of all structures, watercourses, etc.
- Current Certificate of Title - within the past 30 days
- Site Plan to scale, showing all structures, setbacks, access, adjacent building separation, watercourses, site contours, water supply, storm and sewage disposal, etc.
- Landscape Plan, including landscape specifications, screening, fences, lighting, etc.
- Building Floor Plans and Elevations (identifying specific finishes).
- Calculations for site area, coverage, bldg. area, floor space ratio, bldg. height, grade, and parking stalls.
- Signage Details (if applicable).

### Fee Schedule

- **Rezoning or Heritage Application:** $3400.00
- **OCP Text Amendment Application:** $3400.00
- **Joint Rezoning & OCP Application:** $3900.00
- **Notification Sign Off:** $20
- **HIA Notification Sign:** actual cost billed to applicant
- **Public Hearing Sign:** actual cost billed to applicant
- **Site Profile(s):** $50.00

*Includes $150.00 Public Notification Fee - refundable if application does not proceed to Public Hearing.*

### Owner Authorization

I, the owner of the above property, hereby authorize and appoint

MYSELF

as my agent for the purposes of this bylaw change permit application. The applicant hereby declares that all information submitted is true and correct.

**Applicant**

**Sign:**

**Date:** 15 Jan 2016

**Owner (required if not applicant):**

**Sign:**

**Date:**

---

*Any personal information provided in this application is collected for the purpose of administering the Local Government Act and the bylaws of this municipality under part 26 of the Local Government Act and under the authority of those enactments. Questions about the collection of the information may be directed to the Freedom of Information Officer.*

---

*Includes $150.00 Public Notification Fee - refundable if application does not proceed to Public Hearing.*
**Development / Development Variance Permit Application**

### Project Info
- **Address**: 1060 Lucille Dr, B.C. V8M 1C8

### Owner
- **Name**: Caryl L Sheehy
- **Telephone**: 250 652 8039
- **Email**: Caryl@sheehy.com

### Applicant (if not owner)
- **Name**: 
- **Telephone**: 
- **Email**: 

### Project Details
- **Description of existing use/development**: Single Family dwelling
- **Description of proposal**: Setback variances relating to rezoning & subdivision. Front setback to 5.8 m, rear setback to 0.94 m for proposed Lot 'A'.
- **Reasons for requested variance (if applicable)**: Reorient setbacks due to lot change through subdivision.

### Required Documentation & Plans
- **Current Certificate of Title** - within the past 30 days
- **Site Plan** (Compliance with Zoning Bylaw)
- **Building Floor Plans and Elevations** (Identifying specific finishes)
- **Calculations** for site area, coverage, bldg. area, floor space ratio, bldg. height, grade, and parking stalls.

### Owner Authorization

**I, the owner of the above property, hereby authorize and appoint** [Signature] as my agent to apply for and obtain this permit. If issued, I understand a notice regarding this permit will be placed on the property site.

The applicant hereby declares that all information submitted is true & correct. [Signature] Date 1/23/2016

Owner (required if not applicant) Date 

### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Permit</th>
<th>Development Variance Permit</th>
<th>Development &amp; Development Variance Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor without Variance</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>Major without Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major without Variance</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>Major with Variance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FEES** $ 500.00

**Received By** [Signature] Date 1/26/2016

**Application/File Number** 3090.20.116

[Signature] October 2014
Site Area
- As identified at attached B.C. Land Surveyor's plan of proposed subdivision
  - 596.6m²

Site Coverage
- % Site Coverage = (2nd Floor Area / Site Area) X 100
  - (144.63m² / 596.6m²) X 100 = 24.2%

Building Area (Gross Floor Area)
- Dimensional values as identified at attached B.C. Land Surveyors plan of proposed subdivision.
- Gross Floor Area = Ground Floor Area + 2nd Floor Area
  - 142.77m² + 144.63m² = 287.41m² (3093.65 ft²)

Floor Space Ratio
- Gross Floor Space / Site Area
  - 287.41m² / 596.6m² = .48

Building Height
- Dimensional values as identified at attached B.C. Land Surveyors plan of proposed subdivision.
- Geodetic height difference between eve and grade, plus half distance between peak and eve.
  - (50.58 – 46.16) + [(52.55 – 50.58)/2] = 5.40m (17.71ft)

Grade (Geodetic elevation)
- North  46.40m + 46.48m / 2 = 46.44m
- West  46.40m + 46.48m / 2 = 46.13m
- South  45.86m + 45.91m / 2 = 45.88m
- East  45.91m + 46.48m / 2 = 46.19m
  - 46.44m + 46.13m + 45.88m + 46.19m / 4 = 46.16m

Parking Stalls
- Existing two car garage and driveway
## Existing House Best Fit Suitability List

### Lot A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING</th>
<th>COMPLIANT</th>
<th>NON COMPLIANT</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1XS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1Z</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FSR Exceeded by 0.03:1 (+8.6 sq. m) and; exterior side yd set back lacking 0.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FSR Exceeded by 0.03:1 (+8.6 sq. m) and; exterior side yd set back lacking 0.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>FSR Exceeded by 0.08:1 (+22.9 sq. m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![RECEIVED]
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The Corporation of the District of Central Saanich
Planning Department