

**From:** [REDACTED]  
[Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** Detached Accessory Dwelling Units  
**Date:** April-12-21 7:36:00 AM

---

Tricia,

I want to add my support for the Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADU) initiative that the Township is taking.

With all the stresses on the housing market, including increasing costs and limited supply, this initiative is a positive opportunity for gentle infill housing that will support a number of people's different housing needs, from aging in place, to housing for extended families, to income support. A good use of land and resources as Esquimalt continues to evolve. In some ways it also helps to stabilize existing lower density neighbourhoods.

We certainly support the inclusion of our property in the new zone.

Thank you for moving this initiative forward.

Michael Dillistone and Caroline Startin  
1039 Bewdley Avenue, Esquimalt

TO: TRICIA deMACEDO, POLICY PLANNER  
FROM: RICHARD RENNIE, ESQUIMALT RESIDENT  
RE: DADUs  
DATE: 17 MARCH 2021

1. My wife and I are long-time residents of Esquimalt. We live on a single-family wartime-house lot (50' x 120') at 801 Intervale Avenue.
2. In theory I am in agreement with the tenets of DADUs. However, I could not support bylaw amendments to promote implementation of the necessary zoning/design requirements as I think the human challenges are just too great. To me, those challenges are four in number:
  - a) Parking – A requirement for the home-owner to provide an additional parking space is essential. Where will the space for the space come from? It will come from the front yard of the primary structure. The existing lawn, shrubs and trees will be removed and paved over. In most cases this will be unsightly to the entire lot and most surely unsightly to the neighbourhood and the Municipality in general. Even at this time, residents of my neighbourhood do not use garages or off-street parking: they park on the street. The streets are already over-flowing with automobiles while driveways are bare and garages are stuffed with belongings, not cars! The 1100 block Lockley Road is one stunning example of what I think would be many in this Municipality. Under the proposal both sides of Lockley, the upper south and the lower north, would qualify for DADUs (the north lots being of sufficient larger size 5704+ sq. ft. and the south having only 5200 sq. ft. but being on a lane). Ask your parking people just how difficult is the non-flow of traffic on this block now! With parking on both sides of the street permitted there is only room for one moving vehicle at a time (this your officials euphemistically call “traffic calming”). Residents here do not use their garages, their garages off the lane-way or their off-street parking now. To ask them to do so under revised DADU zoning plus accommodate an additional parking

space per lot in the future would be just “pie-in-the-sky” wishful thinking. Sanctioning nose-to-tail parking on a long driveway to satisfy the additional one spot requirement should be a non-starter, the “second” car would invariably end-up on the street;

- b) Trees – I would suspect that many mature trees would be a casualty of DADUs. This trade-off is not acceptable to me. Trees are esthetically pleasing – undoubtedly more so than backyard construction – and, it is a scientific fact, they contribute to the environment. Again, here at 801 Intervale, were I to avail myself of the proposed rezoning bylaw and to construct a permissible 700 sq. ft. DADU, I would have to cut-down 3 sixty-foot mature trees as well as unregulated 50 year-old camellia and rhododendron bushes. Adjacent properties would suffer, the neighbourhood would suffer and the Municipality would be the lesser;
- c) Design – I fear that we would relive the very poor “shared-wall” episodes of duplex zoning in Esquimalt with a single building appearing as if it was built by two different people at different times. Because, it was built by two different people at two different times! Regardless of the diligence of your design team I think you would be doomed to failure to attempt the impossible task of “design unity” between an existing residence and a DADU backyard barrio especially when budgets are involved; and
- d) Scale – My family’s original wartime house at 801 Intervale was a standard wartime house. Six hundred square feet. There are many remaining and many have been modified. But what this bylaw proposes is that on a lot of 5200 or 6000+ sq. ft. at the outset designed to site a residence of 600 sq. ft. an owner can now erect an “accessory dwelling” in the backyard of 700 sq. ft. This result escapes my logic: if the “accessory” structure is larger than the original structure on the lot, then it is not an “accessory” building, it is the main building and the present-day evolution of the original building becomes the accessory or the supplement. Whether you agree with my “reasoning”, the conclusion is ineluctable that site coverage is far too great under the proposal.

3. The idea of maximum single-family residential density or “accommodation usefulness” is a good one and would work well if planners had bare land and a clean slate. They do not. Given reality my sense is that there are just too many impediments and too many consequences that impact life for immediate neighbours and the community of Esquimalt as a whole. There are no doubt several ways to deal with these concerns from a policy perspective, if you think they are valid, but the one that immediately jumps to my mind is to increase the minimum lot size required for DADUs to 7200 sq. ft. with no exceptions. As I understand the present building bylaws, an owner fortunate enough to have a 60' x 120' lot in Esquimalt would have the choice of a single-family residence, a single-family residence with DADU or a multi-family duplex.
4. These are my written views. Please incorporate them on your file. I would wish to speak to Council and at the public hearing.
5. Thank you for your time.



Dick Rennie

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** DADU Feedback  
**Date:** March-15-21 1:25:00 PM

---

Hello Tricia,

I have received a letter regarding the proposed Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADU) on eligible properties in Esquimalt.

I am the homeowner of 1207 Colville Road and am 100% in favour of having DADU's on eligible properties.

Thank you,

**Marie Ormiston**

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** DADU on eligible properties  
**Date:** March-16-21 4:48:09 PM

---

Hi Tricia,

I received a letter in the mail that my property is eligible to be rezoned as a DADU. First, I think this is a great initiative on behalf of the city to remove barriers for more housing options on single unit lots. This can expedite permitting and overall help keep development costs down. So good work there.

For my particular property, [REDACTED]

Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback and good luck with the process!

Diana

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** DADU Rezoning  
**Date:** March-24-21 3:12:58 PM

---

Hi Tricia,

I wanted to acknowledge your letter of 9 March about Esquimalt's proposal to rezone to legalize Detached Accessory Dwelling Units. I had not been aware of this proposal previously so I am grateful for the letter you sent about it.

I am enthusiastically in favour. Measures like this which allow us to increase urban density are fantastic as they reduce our overall environmental impact and facilitate improved services (including public transit). I would ask that the bylaw permit 1.5 story DADUs as I think that it is important to offer a range of options with the design (but agree with limiting them to less than the height of the principle building). I would also argue that parking should not be required as a condition but left to the discretion of the lot owners (runoff causing impermeable surfaces are already too numerous to require us to create more).

Thank you for letting me know about this proposed change. I will also take the opportunity to mention that I think Esquimalt has been doing a fantastic job with development over the last several years and I'm pleased to see all the new buildings and developments throughout the township. Great work!

Sincerely,

Angus Topshee

422 Fraser Street  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Corporate Services](#); [Laurie Hurst](#); [Bill Brown](#); [Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** Feb 22nd Council Agenda Item re DADU's  
**Date:** February-21-21 6:26:54 PM

---

February 21, 2021

Township of Esquimalt Mayor and Council, Laurie Hurst, Bill Brown, Tricia deMacedo

**Dear Mayor and Council:**

**Re: Feb 22<sup>nd</sup> Agenda Item "DADU Bylaw Amendments – Staff Report No. DEV-21-003"**

My letter is in support of Staff's newest recommendations for Bylaw Amendments regarding Detached Accessory Dwelling Units ("DADU's"). I believe it to be a thoughtful and sensitive approach to the implementation of DADU's, in part regarding on-site parking, owner occupation and building height and design requirements.

I was disappointed that the process would not include a mechanism for neighbour input, or at least neighbour notification, in order to provide an opportunity for input on privacy issues and also so that it would not be a surprise when construction started on a house just over one's backyard fence.

I also wish to address three of the considerations put forth by the Advisory Planning Commission re the proposed regulations and guidelines:

#1 – Suggestion that no parking spaces be required "as they take up too much green space".

I am not sure how realistic it is to think that we will get away from using cars in the future. If parking is not required, people will still have cars and will be parking on the street. Not requiring parking while increasing density will only add to our already congested roadways. Many of the streets in my area are full of parked cars, in part from secondary suites with no onsite parking. Staff's current recommended approach provides some flexibility while hopefully addressing additional street congestion.

#2 – Suggestion that there be no requirement for the DADU or the principle residence be owner-occupied "as there are no major issues with homes that have rented suites and are not owner-occupied".

Absentee landlord rentals can be a big problem for a neighbourhood. A number of other municipalities have gone with requiring owner occupation as it helps to alleviate fears that neighbours have about some strictly rental properties. It can also help with some of the quality and privacy design choices that are made in the building of DADU's as the owners will be living on the property as well. The intention of DADU's is to provide the community with a mechanism for gentle densification and increased (hopefully affordable) rental opportunities within what are currently single family zoned neighbourhoods; where home owners have a means to age-in-place; where rental revenue can provide a mortgage helper making home ownership more affordable for more people; and, to provide dwellings for family members as they grow and want to stay in their community. Owner occupation supports this intent and inspires confidence in the neighbourhood that DADU's will blend into the existing neighbourhood and not bring a lot of additional concerns. This is not always the case with strictly revenue generation investments.

#3 – Suggestion that there be consideration given to changing the height to "1.5 storeys to accommodate interior lofts".

I believe this could be considered in some areas. For example there are very large lots in some designated areas, such as parts of Saxe Point, where this might make sense. But some areas, for example in some areas proposed for West Bay where the lots are small, any dwelling that is put in next door will **not** be unassuming. A one storey dwelling could be made to blend in



but a one and a half storey building could impact neighbours on all sides significantly. I suggest that for those larger properties where it makes sense to do so, that consideration be given for some height variances while limiting smaller properties to one storey.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Rozlyne Mitchell

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Rezoning to allow DADUs  
**Date:** March-17-21 12:51:18 PM

---

[REDACTED]

We understand our municipality is facing increasing demands to accommodate more and more people who want to live here but don't agree that DADUs are the answer. We believe that if increasing density must be allowed then it should be contained in the core and not spread out into single family residential areas thus reducing the quality of life for its neighbourhoods. Increased traffic and on street parking are just two examples of the ramifications of the proposed bylaw. Increased assessed property values and therefore higher municipal taxes is another negative effect . We don't accept the term " housing crisis " as a fact of life as do many politicians . We believe the motivation to increase our density is more about Greed rather than Need and a supply vs. demand issue.

Yours Truly  
Mark & Kathleen Aitken  
657 Lampson St.  
V9A6A5

Sent from my rotary dial phone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Rezoning to Allow Detached Accessory Dwelling Units on Eligible Properties  
**Date:** March-22-21 9:25:15 AM

---

Dear Ms. Tricia deMacedo,

Thank you for the letter dated 9 March 2021, regarding Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADU).

We applaud and wholeheartedly welcome the rezoning proposal being undertaken by the Township of Esquimalt.

As stated in the letter, our property at 1133 Munro Street is eligible and qualifies for the proposed rezoning.

As per the first bullet of your letter: properties on a corner or laneway where the lot size is greater than 475 m<sup>2</sup> are also eligible for rezoning.

Please note that ours is a corner property with the lot size of 966 m<sup>2</sup> which is currently zoned as a duplex lot. Based on proposed rezoning this qualifies for two new zones (as  $475 * 2 = 950$  m<sup>2</sup>). We, therefore, meet the requirements for two new zones. Accordingly, the potential for another dwelling on our property should be acceptable to the Township of Esquimalt. We would greatly appreciate your feedback / comments.

In order to get all the details about the proposed rezoning we would be happy to meet with you and also attend the public hearing.

Progressive thinking by the Esquimalt Municipality Planning Department is genuinely desired and appreciated.

Sincerely,

Paramjit Attariwala  
Jagbir Attariwala

1133 Munro Street  
Esquimalt, BC  
V9A 5P3  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Tricia deMacedo](#)  
**Subject:** Re: DADU lot size analysis  
**Date:** March-31-21 4:12:53 PM  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED]

---

Yes, we will talk . . .

I understand that there would be work to do.

Am I a bad citizen? I was born on this lot, my Mom and Dad lived here since 1945 . . . my Mom lived here as a widow from 1968 to 1995 . . . my wife and I and my Mom lived here in the new house from 1996 to 1999 . . . my wife and I and her Dad lived here until 2015 . . . I will live here until I die. The story of my life in the Municipality of Esquimalt. But I must be an "unconcerned or uninformed citizen" because the first I knew of this scheme to rezone my property was on receipt of the letter from the Municipality of 9 March 2021. I was flabbergasted: I still am! I would have thought that each "potentially affected" property owner should have been advised much, much earlier in the process. With only 1468 properties under consideration from the start, that would seem to have been not too complex to accomplish. There seems to be considerable store placed in the fact that there was a survey of residents. Who were these residents; were they from "affected" properties or were there some non-affected property owners (ie. waterfront properties, residents who rent; industrial property owners); what measures were taken to ensure "proper" representation of owners of potentially affected properties; why was I not selected as part of the survey? To place other than passing significance on a survey without an objective design basis would show an irrefutable bias.

But there is more: the APC conclusions, especially with relation to parking are manifestly out of touch with the realities of parking in this community (especially in the Rockheights/Colville area with which I am familiar). I would say, as well, that there is no indication at all that **obvious** patent issues of noise, privacy, extra fire-hazards, extra police intervention, parking disputes, etc. have been canvassed. With respect, I would say that a very poor and inadequately poor job of staffing has been done. But to my principal point, even if there is some merit in the overall "backyard bungalow" zoning scheme, that initiative should not be applied to smaller lots (less than 7200 sq. ft.) as they are of insufficient size to reasonably support such a condensed burden. You have not convinced me that just because Saanich and Victoria have applied such parameters that Esquimalt should do so. You have not mentioned how Oak Bay, a Municipality more similar in size in terms of population and area to Esquimalt, has behaved on this "issue" -- whatever the issue is? One of the ultimate concerns for me is whether staff took the initiative and proposed this zoning scheme to Council or whether Council directed staff? Who came-up with the germ of the idea? Who is pushing this idea? Why now? Is there a rush? Why now in terms of COVID when we cannot even meet face-to-face? I have so many more questions . . .

We will talk at your convenience . . .

Thanks.

*Dick*

---

**Kim Maddin**

**From:** Laurie Hurst  
**Sent:** February-22-21 10:11 AM  
**To:** Kim Maddin  
**Subject:** FW: Bylaws and Projects

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT		
For Information:		
<input type="checkbox"/> CAO	<input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Blair/Scott/Bill		
RECEIVED: FEB 22 2021		
Referred: Rachel		
<input type="checkbox"/> For Action	<input type="checkbox"/> For Response	<input type="checkbox"/> COTW
<input type="checkbox"/> For Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council Agenda	<input type="checkbox"/> IC

For mail log, thanks.

**Laurie Hurst, CPA, CGA**  
Chief Administrative Officer  
Tel: 1-250-414-7133

**For the latest on the Township's response to COVID-19, please visit [esquimalt.ca/covid19](http://esquimalt.ca/covid19)**

**From:** Barb Desjardins <Barbara.Desjardins@esquimalt.ca>  
**Sent:** February-21-21 6:23 PM  
**To:** Laurie Hurst <laurie.hurst@esquimalt.ca>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Bylaws and Projects

Public input on agenda items  
Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

**Barbara Desjardins**  
Mayor, Township of Esquimalt  
Lekwungen Territory  
Tel: 1-250-883-1944  
Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Sean MacUisdin  
**Date:** February 21, 2021 at 5:19:09 PM PST  
**To:** Mayor and Council <[mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca)>  
**Subject:** Bylaws and Projects

Good day, Mayor and Council.

I'm dropping a line on a couple of issues that I have some concerns about; the Garden Suite bylaw and the proposed design for the Emergency Services building.

**Garden Suite Bylaw.**

Though I am happy to see the proposed bylaw amendment finally submitted, I do have concerns with some of the content.

**"A Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit may not be located on any Parcel with a Secondary Suite."**

My interpretation of this may be at fault, however, I read this as to state that a SFR that already has a secondary suite may not have a Garden Suite. I'm concerned about this restriction as it seems to be an unnecessary throttle on a housing measure that will likely already have limited buy in because of the other measure that must be met before one takes into account cost (say \$60,000 or more for a 300 square foot suite). I do not believe that this bylaw will result in a dearth of garden suites within the municipality, so a restriction such as this only serves to further reduce the number of those that may be considering this option. Speaking anecdotally from the perspective of my neighborhood, there are many properties with adequate room for a 300-400 square foot garden suit that already have suites. They would then be disqualified.

If the point of this bylaw is to increase infill housing and density, then I would suggest we make it easier for SFR owners to achieve this rather than putting up restrictions. Although I am unsure of what prompted this, I would suspect it is parking. Parking is indeed an issue in the municipality, but as it seems that developers have been able to download parking onto municipal streets, as have legal and illegal suites, and for that matter, SFR's with multiple vehicles, why we have drawn a line in the sand over this is puzzling.

Please reconsider this and perhaps treat the ongoing issue of on-street parking as a separate issue.

**"Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit must not have a Basement or any habitable space below or above the First Storey."**

I believe I understand the reticence of having a multi story garden suite in a SFR backyard, I would suggest that this statement is a bit sweeping, especially when one considers the inclusion of a loft in order to decrease the overall footprint. A restriction on loft height would ensure that suites were not imposing edifices while at the same time, allowing flexibility in design that would also maximise a smaller footprint. As noted by the APC:

"That the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to Council the proposed regulations and guidelines for the legalization of Detached Accessory Dwelling Units in the Township of Esquimalt be approved with the following consideration be given to changing the height to 1.5 storeys to accommodate interior" lofts.

**"The Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be provided with a bicycle storage area, onsite, screened from the view of pedestrians on the street."**

I assume 'area' does not mean building, however, I'm also not sure what 'area' entails.

### **Emergency Services Building**

I noted the proposed design of the new Emergency Services building lacked anything but the emergency services, which I must admit, surprised me greatly. I recall during feedback sessions and with conversations with council members that the proposed building could have residential and community space above it ( I remember this as there were discussions about TCAC having access to community space). The design appears to have neither, which I believe is a great opportunity lost. It is my understanding that in order for the the municipality to pair with BC housing for affordable housing options, we need municipal land, of which there is little that is not park space. This therefore seemed like an ideal spot for residential housing, community space, and quite frankly, some additional commercial frontage as the building displaced three stores. Beyond this, building a two story building amongst a collection of six plus story buildings that are being built with the message of densification and building up (and with some of those projects being rather unpopular) seems pretty tone deaf. I

would hope that a significant rethink of this building be considered to include residential, community, and commercial space.

### **Parks and Rec LED Sign Board**

Finally, though I understand the desire and utility for an LED sign for Parks and Rec and for its messaging opportunities, I must admit that placing it at one of the most dangerous stretches of road in Esquimalt for cyclists and pedestrians causes me concern. The road in front of the plaza is notorious for cyclists being hit by inattentive and distracted drivers – me being one of them – and adding a large LED sign will likely only add to that. If this sign goes forward, please consider the installation of mitigating devices or signage as suggested by the Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition.

Thank you for the consideration.

Sean Pól MacÚisdin

Independently Published Author



Website - [Author Sean MacUisdin](#)

**Deborah Liske**

---

**From:** Jeremy Semple  
**Sent:** April-23-21 3:25 PM  
**To:** Corporate Services  
**Subject:** Re: Esquimalt Detached Suite Bylaw

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: <u>April 26 , 2021</u> For Information <input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council Other _____ Referred to: <u>Anja</u> For <input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report For Agenda <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC
---

Hi there, my wife and I live on Lockley Rd in Esquimalt. We would love to see this bylaw passed. Detached suites can be built tastefully and would be a great way to bring some more density to Esquimalt, without over developing. We would likely take advantage of this if the bylaw passes and would be supporting local businesses to help get detached suite built.

Best,

Jeremy Semple



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT  
RECEIVED: April 26 , 2021  
For Information \_\_CAO \_\_Mayor/Council  
Other \_\_\_\_\_  
Referred to: Anja  
For \_\_Action \_\_Response \_\_Report  
For Agenda X Council \_\_COTW \_\_IC

**Deborah Liske**

---

**From:** Christie Eng  
**Sent:** April-25-21 10:29 AM  
**To:** Corporate Services  
**Subject:** secondary suites

I'm in favour of secondary suites but most concerned about parking. Esquimalt could do more to encourage biking. Maybe include a contract signed by the homeowner that they will either do without a vehicle or will agree not to park on the street. Anything that makes it clear that it is the responsibility of the homeowner to not add to street parking.

--  
Christie Eng  
931 Dunsmuir Rd  
Esquimalt  
V9A 5C4

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	May 12, 2021
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	_____
Referred to:	<u>Bill</u>
For	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

GOOD MORNING:

Would you please make and distribute sufficient copies for Members of Council and an additional copy for Mr. Brown.

Nisa made a  
copy for Bill.

Thanks

*Dick Rennie*

801 Intervale Avenue

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE REMARKS TO BE  
MADE BY ESQUIMALT RESIDENT RICHARD RENNIE  
TO ESQUIMALT COUNCIL AT A PUBLIC HEARING  
SCHEDULED FOR 17 MAY 2021  
REGARDING PROPOSED RS-6 REZONING

My name is Richard Rennie, my wife Karen and I live at 801 Intervale Avenue bordering Rockheights School. I sent Council a six-page letter on 19 February. My conclusion in that letter was that the RS-6 zone was misguided. I have not changed my mind.

The published rationale, for this RS-6 zoning plan is to increase the stock of affordable rental housing in the Municipality. Council, Committees and certainly Staff were working on this assumption. The Mayor noted this rationale in an interview with the local newspaper. A laudable social goal but the proposed blanket rezoning of 1500 backyard bungalows is terribly invasive to the lifestyle of residents and will not achieve the desired target.

The cutting down of mature trees, the uprooting of 50-year old camellias, the paving of paradise, parking gridlock, the din of increased noise, the overcrowding of the Municipality will not happen. Thankfully as there is no humanity in any of this plan. The most heinous result being the destruction of our single-family backyard privacy. This significant change in our lifestyle, will be avoided. Why? Because these back-yard units will be built

only by a special few who have unique short-term needs and who have lots of money to spend.

I know of few Esquimalt residents who have access to the \$250,000 required to construct an approved backyard structure. And if they do then this costly 700 sq. ft. accommodation will not be offered to tenants at a rent less than market, now or in the future. Are my wife and I going to borrow a quarter of a million dollars and disrupt our lives – and those of our neighbours -- and then rent the brand-new housing unit for a rent less than market? We will not be doing so and I would be gobsmacked if there was a single family in the Municipality that would subscribe to such an irrational undertaking.

As staff point-out, Saanich and Victoria have backyard bungalows – we in Esquimalt are not Saanich or Victoria. They are, respectively, 7 and 5 times larger than us. We are the identical geographical and population size as is Oak Bay. Oak Bay does not have a backyard bylaw. As Staff noted, Nanaimo, too, has a carriage house bylaw. However, Staff failed to point-out that to qualify requires a minimum lot size of 8,500 sq. ft. Nor did staff make Council aware that the similar backyard bylaw in Victoria, after 2 years in force, attracted less than two dozen takers. That would mean that Esquimalt could expect five applicants under this proposal! This proposed bylaw seem like overkill.

I would end by referring Council to p. 26 of the survey

passed to 1000 residents and non-residents by Municipal staff. This survey has absolutely no statistical worth. Regardless, at comment #51 on p. 26, an astute respondent succinctly says "I think the concept is ridiculous." I would reinforce that statement, and say that the concept is ridiculous because it is not **necessary**, it is **unfair** and it will not achieve the **aim**. It is not necessary because the Municipality has no crisis that Council is empowered to resolve; it is unfair as the perceived remedy for this social goal is foisted on arbitrarily selected property owners while excluding others; and the economics of the scheme are so naive that it is obvious that the aim of increasing the stock of affordable housing in this Municipality will not be achieved by creation of this RS-6 zone.

Richard Rennie  
801 Intervale Avenue