



# 1006, 1008, 1010 CRAIGFLOWER ROAD

## Parking Study

Tanner Vollema, EIT  
Transportation Engineer-in-Training  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

Tim Shah, RPP, MCIP  
Senior Transportation Planner  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Reviewer

Prepared For: Denciti Craigflower LP  
Date: June 27, 2023  
Our File No: 3356.B01

**WATT** VICTORIA  
302 – 740 Hillside Ave  
Victoria, BC V8T 1Z4  
250-388-9877

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed development at 1006, 1008, and 1010 Craigflower Road is a six-storey mixed-use residential building with 134 strata condominium units and 11,280 ft<sup>2</sup> (1,048) m<sup>2</sup> of ground floor commercial space. The total parking requirement for the site is 209 parking spaces, which is 27 spaces more than what is proposed (182 spaces). See **Table A**.

**Table A. Vehicle Parking Requirement**

| Land Use  | Requirement                         | Required Spaces | Proposed Spaces | Requested Variance |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Residential   | 1.3 spaces per dwelling unit        | 174             | 151             | 23                 |
| Ground-floor Commercial                                 | 1 space per 25m <sup>2</sup> of GFA | 42              | 31              | 11                 |
| Subtract 7 spaces for shared commercial-visitor parking |                                     | -7              |                 |                    |
| <b>Total</b>  |                                     | <b>209</b>      | <b>182</b>      | <b>27</b>          |

The analysis concluded that the expected parking demand for the entire site is 154 spaces, which is 28 spaces less than what is proposed. Therefore, the proposed parking supply is supported. See **Table B**.

**Table B. Summary of Expected Parking Demand**

| Land Use                                      |               | Units                | Expected Parking Demand                  |                |
|---|---------------|----------------------|--|----------------|
|   |               |                      | Rate                                     | Parking Spaces |
| <b>Multi-Family Residential (Condominium)</b> | Studio        | 15                   | 0.56 spaces / unit                       | 8.4            |
|   | One-Bedroom   | 75                   | 0.71 spaces / unit                       | 53.3           |
|   | Two-Bedroom   | 39                   | 1.11 spaces / unit                       | 43.3           |
|   | Three-Bedroom | 5                    | 1.28 spaces / unit                       | 6.4            |
| <b>Total Residential</b>                      |               |                      |  | <b>112</b>     |
| <b>Visitor</b>                                |               | 134                  | 0.1 space / unit                         | <b>14</b>      |
| <b>Commercial</b>                             |               | 1,048 m <sup>2</sup> | 1 space / 37.5 m <sup>2</sup> floor area | <b>28</b>      |
| <b>Total Expected Parking Demand</b>          |               |                      |  | <b>154</b>     |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
| <b>1.0</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>                   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1        | Subject Site.....                          | 1         |
| 1.2        | Site Characteristics & Policy Context..... | 2         |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT .....</b>          | <b>7</b>  |
| 2.1        | Land Use.....                              | 7         |
| 2.2        | Proposed Vehicle Parking Supply.....       | 7         |
| 2.3        | Bike Parking.....                          | 7         |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>PARKING REQUIREMENT .....</b>           | <b>8</b>  |
| 3.1        | Vehicle Parking .....                      | 8         |
| 3.2        | Bicycle Parking.....                       | 9         |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>EXPECTED PARKING DEMAND .....</b>       | <b>10</b> |
| 4.1        | Residential Parking .....                  | 10        |
| 4.2        | Residential Visitor Parking .....          | 15        |
| 4.3        | Commercial Parking .....                   | 16        |
| 4.4        | Summary of Expected Parking Demand.....    | 17        |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>                    | <b>19</b> |
| 5.1        | Recommendations.....                       | 19        |



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

WATT Consulting Group was retained by Denciti Craigflower LP to conduct a parking study for the proposed development at 1006, 1008, 1010 Craigflower Road in the Township of Esquimalt, BC. The purpose of this study is to determine the total expected parking demand for the site.

### 1.1 Subject Site

The proposed development is located at 1006, 1008, 1010 Craigflower Road (see **Figure 1**). It is currently zoned C-2: Neighbourhood Commercial.



**Figure 1. Subject Site**



## 1.2 Site Characteristics & Policy Context

The following provides information regarding services and transportation options in proximity to the subject site. In addition, the Township of Esquimalt's Official Community Plan (OCP) and other community policies pertaining to sustainable transportation and parking management are summarized.



### COMMUNITY POLICIES

The Esquimalt Official Community Plan (OCP) contains policies that provide direction on future planning and land use management within the Township.<sup>1</sup> Per Schedule B of the OCP (Proposed Land Use Designations), the subject site is designated as Neighbourhood Commercial Mixed-Use. According to Section 6.4 of the OCP, the Township will “encourage the development of a series of neighbourhood commercial mixed-use nodes throughout Esquimalt that will primarily serve the daily needs of the surrounding neighbourhood but may also include destination uses.”

Section 11 of the OCP (Transportation) and Section 13.3 (Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions) contain a series of policies focused on promoting multi-modal and low-carbon transportation. The most relevant policies for the subject site are as follows:

- Prioritize walking, cycling and public transit as preferred modes of transportation in infrastructure improvements.
- Consider prioritizing transit along frequent and regional transit corridors.
- Where feasible, improve the continuity of the bike network by linking existing and future bikeways and trails.

---

<sup>1</sup> Township of Esquimalt (2018). Corporation of the Township of Esquimalt Official Community Plan. Available online at: [https://www.esquimalt.ca/sites/default/files/docs/business-development/OCP/Esquimalt\\_OCP\\_2020-01-09.pdf](https://www.esquimalt.ca/sites/default/files/docs/business-development/OCP/Esquimalt_OCP_2020-01-09.pdf)



Additionally, the Township recently published its Active Transportation Network Plan (ATNP)<sup>2</sup> that identifies how active transportation can play a multifaceted role in achieving Esquimalt’s broader strategic priorities including a healthy, livable, and diverse community. Some of the “Big Moves” included in this plan are:

- Implement a 5.3km quick-build cycling network on three major roads over the next five years
- Lower vehicle speeds to create a more friendly pedestrian and bike environment
- Short-term intersection reviews and improvements
- Fill in sidewalk gaps

The ATNP also recommends several design parameters for bicycle parking in new developments for consideration in the Township’s Parking Bylaw Update, which is currently underway. Recommendations are provided for long-term and short-term bicycle parking, location and access, dimensions and layout, oversized bicycle parking spaces, and cycling end-of-trip facilities. Providing bicycle parking in alignment with these parameters is anticipated to make cycling a more attractive and convenient mode of transportation.



## SERVICES

The site is located approximately 800m or an 11-minute walk from several retail stores (including a Fairway Market and Shoppers Drug Mart), a bank, and several small-scale restaurants at the intersection of Tillicum Road and Gorge Road West. There is also a 7-Eleven convenience store and a Tim Hortons restaurant about 75m or a 1-minute walk from the site, as well as a small grocery/convenience store

---

<sup>2</sup> Township of Esquimalt (2022). Esquimalt Active Transportation Network Plan. Available online at: [https://www.esquimalt.ca/sites/default/files/docs/municipal-services/engineering/roads-transportation/Esquimalt\\_ATNP\\_Final\\_Plan\\_Feb28-22-Rev\\_4.pdf](https://www.esquimalt.ca/sites/default/files/docs/municipal-services/engineering/roads-transportation/Esquimalt_ATNP_Final_Plan_Feb28-22-Rev_4.pdf)



(Craigflower Foods) and small-scale restaurants at the corner of Craigflower Road and Dominion Road, about 700m or a 9-minute walk from the site.

Furthermore, the development is within 1.6km of Tillicum Centre (about a 20-minute walk or 7-minute bike ride), which offers a number of additional amenities including retail stores, informal dining, a supermarket, a movie theatre, and GR Pearkes Recreation Centre.

Nearby schools include Esquimalt High School (650m or a 3-minute walk), Tillicum Elementary School (1.5km or an 18-minute walk), Victoria West Elementary School (1.6km or a 20-minute walk), and Rockheights Middle School (1.6km or a 22-minute walk).

The following parks are also in proximity to the subject site: Lampson Park (300m or a 4-minute walk), Anderson Park (750m or a 9-minute walk), and Esquimalt Gorge Park (800m or a 10-minute walk).



## TRANSIT

The site is well-situated with respect to transit. **Route 14** runs along Craigflower Road with eastbound and westbound stops within 100m of the site. Additionally, **Route 26** runs along Tillicum Road and has stops within 100m of the site. **Route 24** is also in proximity, with stops on Colville Road (550m away) and Lampson Street (550m away).

- **Route 14 Vic General / UVic** | This is a Frequent Route with limited stops that provides 15- to 60-minute service between about 5:40am and 1:50am, every day. It serves key locations including Downtown Victoria, the Royal Jubilee Hospital, the Victoria General Hospital, and the UVic Exchange.
- **Route 26 Dockyard / UVic** | This is another Frequent Route with limited stops that provides 15- to 60-minute service between about 5:50am and 1:00am, every day. It serves key locations





including Uptown, Saanich Centre, the HMC Dockyard, and the UVic Exchange.

- **Route 24 Cedar Hill / Admirals Walk** | This local route provides 30- to 60-minute service between about 6:30am and 12:30pm, Monday through Friday (as well as service about every hour on weekends), and connects with Cedar Hill, Admirals Walk Shopping Centre, Downtown Victoria, and Tillicum Mall.

BC Transit's Victoria Region Transit Future Plan<sup>3</sup> identifies both Craigflower Road and Tillicum Road as "Frequent Transit Corridors" with the goal of providing frequent service (15 minutes or better between 7am and 10pm, 7 days/week). Another goal of Frequent Transit Corridors is to enhance bus stop infrastructure. **Thus, the subject site will benefit from frequent, reliable, and convenient transit service.**



## WALKING

The site has a Walk Score<sup>4</sup> of 54, meaning that some errands can be accomplished on foot. The streets immediately adjacent to the site provide a reasonably safe pedestrian environment, with sidewalks on both sides of Craigflower Road and Tillicum Road. There are also crosswalks at the intersection of Craigflower Road and Tillicum Road.

Some of the actions in the Esquimalt Active Transportation Network Plan that will improve the pedestrian environment in Esquimalt include the implementation of separated sidewalks, the undertaking of a pedestrian wayfinding strategy, and developing a Township walking map. A review of crossing improvements along Tillicum Road at the Gorge Bridge to Craigflower Road intersection (about 100m from the subject site) has

---

<sup>3</sup> BC Transit (2011). Victoria Regional Transit Future Plan. Available online at: <https://www.bctransit.com/documents/1507213421003>

<sup>4</sup> More information about the site's Walk Score is available online at: <https://www.walkscore.com/score/1006-craigflower-rd-victoria-bc-canada>



also been recommended, as well as an intersection study at Craigflower Road / Tillicum Road (fronting the subject site).



### CYCLING

Craigflower Road has unbuffered bike lanes on both sides of the street providing connections to downtown Victoria, and the E&N Rail Trail.

Additionally, the Esquimalt Active Transportation Network Plan prioritizes the implementation of a quick-build cycling network that will include improved bike facilities along Tillicum Road, Lampson Street, Esquimalt Road, and Head Street, all of which are in proximity to the subject site. The Township will be starting construction of the Tillicum Road / Lampson Road quick-build cycling project summer 2023.<sup>5</sup> While not identified as part of the quick-build network, Craigflower Road is identified as part of the Township's future ultimate cycling network.

Ultimately, the Township's cycling network is planned to provide more separation and protection from motor vehicles and greater connectivity.



### CARSHARING

Carsharing programs are an effective way for people to save on the cost of owning a vehicle while having access to a convenient means of transportation. The Modo Car Cooperative (Modo) is a popular carsharing service in Greater Victoria with about 110 Modo vehicles and over 3,000 members across the Greater Victoria region. There is one Modo vehicle 450m or a 6-minute walk from the subject site, at Colville Road and Lampson Street. The next closest Modo vehicle is available at Craigflower Road and Dominion Road, 750m or a 10-minute walk from the subject site.

---

<sup>5</sup> More information about the project is available online at: <https://engagingsquimalt.ca/lampson-tillicum>



## 2.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

### 2.1 Land Use

The proposed development is a six-storey mixed-use residential building with a total of 134 strata condominium units and approx. 11,280 ft<sup>2</sup> (1,048 m<sup>2</sup>) of ground floor commercial space. The unit breakdown is shown in **Table 1**.

**Table 1. Unit Breakdown**

| Unit Type     | Number of Units |
|---------------|-----------------|
| Studio        | 15              |
| One-Bedroom   | 75              |
| Two-Bedroom   | 39              |
| Three-Bedroom | 5               |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>134</b>      |

### 2.2 Proposed Vehicle Parking Supply

A total of 182 parking spaces are proposed (including 137 residential, 14 visitor, and 31 commercial spaces).

### 2.3 Bike Parking

The applicant is proposing to provide 139 secure indoor bicycle parking spaces, including 26 electrified spaces for use in charging e-bikes. Additionally, 135 secure storage lockers are provided where residents could securely park bicycles. Six short-term visitor parking spaces are also provided.



### 3.0 PARKING REQUIREMENT

#### 3.1 Vehicle Parking

The Township's Parking Bylaw No. 2011 identifies the parking requirements for the site. The multi-family residential units fall in the 'Medium and High Density Apartment zones' category and the ground floor commercial in the 'Retail Sales of Goods and Services' category.

For the residential units, the Bylaw requires that 1.3 spaces per dwelling unit are provided. Furthermore, one of every four required parking spaces must be designated as a visitor space. Applied to the subject site, this results in 174 parking spaces (130 resident and 44 visitor spaces). Further, Section 11 of the Parking Bylaw indicates that in a mixed residential/commercial development, required visitor parking spaces may be assigned to commercial use but shall not comprise more than 15% of the spaces required for the commercial use component. The intention of this regulation is to allow for shared parking between visitor and commercial spaces. This results in a reduction in the parking requirement of 7 spaces.

Therefore, the site is required to provide 209 parking spaces.

**Table 2. Vehicle Parking Requirement**

| Land Use  | Requirement                         | Required Spaces | Proposed Spaces | Requested Variance |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Residential   | 1.3 spaces per dwelling unit        | 174             | 151             | 23                 |
| Ground-floor Commercial                                 | 1 space per 25m <sup>2</sup> of GFA | 42              | 31              | 11                 |
| Subtract 7 spaces for shared commercial-visitor parking |                                     | -7              |                 |                    |
| <b>Total</b>  |                                     | <b>209</b>      | <b>182</b>      | <b>27</b>          |



Further, the Bylaw identifies that 100% of the parking spaces for the multi-family residential units are required to be energized. Additionally, one loading space is required for the commercial use.

*The authors of this study acknowledge that the Township is currently in the process of updating its parking bylaw and that parking requirements are subject to change in the near term.*

### **3.2 Bicycle Parking**

The site is not required to provide any bicycle parking. However, the applicant is proposing to provide both long-term and short-term bicycle parking spaces. Based on the recommendations in the Esquimalt ATNP, it is likely that the Township will start to require bicycle parking in its new parking bylaw, which is anticipated to be adopted in 2023.



## 4.0 EXPECTED PARKING DEMAND

Expected parking demand for this site was estimated in the following sections to determine if the proposed supply will adequately accommodate the parking demand. Expected demand is based on [a] parking observations collected from representative sites in the Township of Esquimalt, and [b] research based on previous parking studies. *Calculations for expected parking demand have been rounded up to align with the Township's bylaw requirement for calculating number of parking spaces.*

### 4.1 Residential Parking

Observations of parked vehicles were completed at 7 condo buildings in the Township of Esquimalt representing a total of 176 units. A summary of the representative sites is outlined in **Table 3**. Each location was chosen based on the following criteria:

- Walk Score. This is a tool that ranks the walkability of a location based on its proximity to seven types of amenities: Dining and drinking, groceries, shopping, errands, parks, schools/education, and culture and entertainment. It is a useful tool for determining if a trip will require a vehicle and may inform parking needs. The Walk Score of this development is 54, and the average Walk Score of the chosen representative sites is **53**.
- Proximity to shops and services. The proposed location of this development is about 800m or an 11-minute walk from a small-scale mall at Tillicum Road and Gorge Road West. Representative sites were selected based on the criteria that they are within similar proximity to these specific types of amenities, in addition to assessing their Walk Scores (which considers a broader range of amenities).
- Countable parking spaces. To accurately collect observational data, parking lots must be accessible to a data collector. Sites with gated or underground parking were ruled out as they prohibited data collection.



**Table 3. Summary of Representative Sites**

| Site / Address       | Walk score | Units      |
|----------------------|------------|------------|
| 955 Dingley Dell     | 36         | 29         |
| 853 Selkirk Avenue   | 55         | 38         |
| 885 Ellery Street    | 62         | 20         |
| 830 Esquimalt Road   | 63         | 21         |
| 477 Lampson Street   | 39         | 44         |
| 642 Admirals Road    | 58         | 12         |
| 611 Constance Avenue | 58         | 12         |
| <b>Average</b>       | <b>53</b>  | <b>--</b>  |
| <b>Total</b>         |            | <b>176</b> |

#### 4.1.1 Observations

Observations of parking utilization were conducted at representative sites during the typical weekday peak hour period for residential land uses. Two weekday counts were completed. For the purposes of this study, the greater number of observed vehicles between the two parking occupancy counts were used for the representative peak demand at each location. Parking demand ranged from 0.74 vehicles per unit to 1.33 vehicles per unit, with an average parking demand of 0.96 vehicles per unit as shown in **Table 4**.

Observations were conducted on August 24 and 25, 2022 at 9:30pm.



**Table 4. Observations at Representative Sites**

| Site / Address       | Units | Observed Vehicles | Parking Demand (Vehicles/Unit) |
|----------------------|-------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| 955 Dingley Dell     | 29    | 24                | 0.83                           |
| 853 Selkirk Avenue   | 38    | 28                | 0.74                           |
| 885 Ellery Street    | 20    | 17                | 0.85                           |
| 830 Esquimalt Road   | 21    | 19                | 0.90                           |
| 477 Lampson Street   | 44    | 48                | 1.09                           |
| 642 Admirals Road    | 12    | 12                | 1.00                           |
| 611 Constance Avenue | 12    | 16                | 1.33                           |
| <b>Average</b>       |       |                   | <b>0.96</b>                    |

#### 4.1.2 Adjustment Factors

Observations are a useful method of assessing parking demand rates; however, there are limitations to this method. The main limitation is that resident(s) vehicles may not be present at the time of observation. To mitigate this factor, observations were conducted after 9:30pm to maximize likelihood of residents being present. There is still a chance that residents' vehicles may not be present for a multitude of factors including being out of town.

This would typically be addressed with a 10% adjustment in accordance with the Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study.<sup>6</sup> This resulted in an adjusted parking demand ranging from 0.81 vehicles per unit to 1.47 vehicle per unit, with an average parking demand of 1.06 vehicles per unit as shown in **Table 5**.

<sup>6</sup> Metro Vancouver. (2012). The Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study, Technical Report. Available online at: [http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/Apartment\\_Parking\\_Study\\_TechnicalReport.pdf](http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/Apartment_Parking_Study_TechnicalReport.pdf)





**Table 5. Adjusted Observations at Representative Sites**

| Site / Address       | Units | Parking Demand<br>(Vehicles/Unit) | Adjusted Parking Demand |
|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 955 Dingley Dell     | 29    | 0.83                              | 0.91                    |
| 853 Selkirk Avenue   | 38    | 0.74                              | 0.81                    |
| 885 Ellery Street    | 20    | 0.85                              | 0.94                    |
| 830 Esquimalt Road   | 21    | 0.90                              | 1.00                    |
| 477 Lampson Street   | 44    | 1.09                              | 1.20                    |
| 642 Admirals Road    | 12    | 1.00                              | 1.10                    |
| 611 Constance Avenue | 12    | 1.33                              | 1.47                    |
| <b>Average</b>       |       | <b>0.96</b>                       | <b>1.06</b>             |

#### 4.1.3 Parking Demand by Unit Type

Unit size type refers to the number of bedrooms provided within a residential unit. Research has shown that larger units will generally have more occupants or a family, therefore increasing the likelihood that additional vehicles will be owned by occupants and growing the parking demand.<sup>7</sup> Parking data collected for this study was assessed to reflect unit type using the following steps:

- Parking demand was calculated and adjusted by 10%;
- Parking Demand by unit type was calculated based on the demand ratios of bedrooms per unit at each site acquired from the King Country Metro Transit study from 2013; and
- The assumed “ratio differences” (from 2013 King County Metro Transit study) for parking demand between each site was applied to unit data and vehicle

<sup>7</sup> Potoglou, D., & Kanaroglou, P.S. (2008). Modelling car ownership in urban areas: a case study of Hamilton, Canada. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 16(1): 42–54.



observations. These “ratio differences” are as follows.<sup>8</sup> This approach is also consistent with Working Paper no.1 of the Township’s Integrated Parking Strategy and Regulatory Framework project.<sup>9</sup>

- 1-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 20% higher than studio unit rates;
- 2-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 60% higher than 1-Bedroom rates; and
- 3-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 15% higher than 2-Bedroom rates.

**Table 6** illustrates the average parking demand by unit type.

**Table 6. Parking Demand by Unit Type at Representative Sites**

| Site / Address       | Adjusted Parking Demand | Studio      | One-Bedroom | Two-Bedroom | Three-Bedroom |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| 955 Dingley Dell     | 0.91                    | --          | 0.59        | 0.95        | --            |
| 853 Selkirk Avenue   | 0.81                    | --          | 0.51        | 0.82        | 0.94          |
| 885 Ellery Street    | 0.94                    | 0.54        | --          | 1.03        | --            |
| 830 Esquimalt Road   | 1.00                    | 0.58        | 0.70        | 1.12        | --            |
| 477 Lampson Street   | 1.20                    | --          | --          | 1.05        | 1.21          |
| 642 Admirals Road    | 1.10                    | --          | --          | 1.10        | --            |
| 611 Constance Avenue | 1.47                    | --          | 1.05        | 1.68        | --            |
| <b>Average</b>       | <b>1.06</b>             | <b>0.56</b> | <b>0.71</b> | <b>1.11</b> | <b>1.07</b>   |

<sup>8</sup> VIA Architecture & King County Metro Transit. (2013). Right Size Parking Model Code. Available online at: <https://metro.kingcounty.gov/programs-projects/right-size-parking/pdf/140110-rsp-model-code.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> More information about the project is available online at: <https://engagingsquimalt.ca/parking>



The demand rate for 3-bedroom units (1.07 spaces / unit) is lower than the 2-bedroom demand rate due to small sample size (only two of the representative sites including 3-bedroom units). As a result, the observed 3-bedroom rate was disregarded, and a new 3-bedroom rate was determined by applying a factor of 1.15 (from the King County study) to the 2-bedroom rate. The resulting average parking demand, when factored for number of bedrooms, is as follows:

- Studio Units - 0.56 spaces per unit
- 1-Bedroom Units - 0.71 spaces per unit
- 2-Bedroom Units - 1.11 spaces per unit
- 2-Bedroom Units - 1.28 spaces per unit

To determine the expected parking demand of the site, the above rates were applied to the development as follows::

- Studio Units | 0.56 spaces per unit X 15 units = 8.4 spaces
- 1-Bedroom Units | 0.71 spaces per unit X 75 units = 53.3 spaces
- 2-Bedroom Units | 1.11 spaces per unit X 39 units = 43.3 spaces
- 3-Bedroom Units | 1.28 spaces per unit X 5 units = 6.4 spaces

**Total Resident Parking Demand = 112 (111.4 rounded up)**

## **4.2 Residential Visitor Parking**

Observations of visitor parking were conducted at each of the representative sites. The findings showed that average rate was 0.10 vehicles per unit. This is similar to what has been reported in other studies such as the 2012 Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study which concluded that visitor parking typically has a demand of less than 0.10 vehicles per unit.<sup>10</sup> Additional findings from similar studies conducted by WATT in the City of Langford and the City of Victoria also support these findings and suggest that visitor parking is not strongly linked to location. A recently completed development near

---

<sup>10</sup> Metro Vancouver. (2012). The Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study, Technical Report. Available online at: [http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/Apartment\\_Parking\\_Study\\_TechnicalReport.pdf](http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/Apartment_Parking_Study_TechnicalReport.pdf)



to this location, 826 Esquimalt Road, is a 30-unit condo building where the developer provided three visitor parking spaces, a rate of 0.1 spaces per unit.<sup>11</sup>

Based on the available research and observational data, a rate of 0.1 is recommended. With 134 units and applying a visitor demand rate of 0.1, the visitor parking demand is 14 spaces (13.4 rounded up).

### 4.3 Commercial Parking

At the time of writing this report, part of the commercial use has been identified as a potential liquor store, while the rest is still unconfirmed. To accommodate for the potential uses that could be developed, this analysis encompasses various commercial uses. As such, original data collection was not completed to understand typical commercial parking demand in Esquimalt. Further, as the Township is currently undertaking an update of its parking bylaw, the commercial parking rates from the existing bylaw could not be utilized as they are outdated and do not align with current trends and best practices. Therefore, commercial parking demand was estimated using rates from the City of Victoria's Zoning Bylaw No. 80-159 (Schedule C).

Schedule C specifies parking requirements based on several different factors for commercial uses including:

- **Class of Use** – Office, Medical Office, Personal Services, Financial Service, Restaurant, Drinking Establishment, Retail, Grocery Store, and Transient Accommodation
- **Geographic Location** – Core Area, Village / Centre, and Other Area

---

<sup>11</sup> More information about the 826 Esquimalt Road Parking Study is available online at:  
<https://esquimalt.ca.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3663&GUID=B883D3FE-6D24-4C02-9550-0339E2D847A4>



Each geographic area is defined in the City of Victoria OCP.<sup>12</sup> For each different geographic area, a different parking requirement is set. Even though Victoria is a different municipality, the proposed development has similar conditions to the Urban Residential (or Other Area) land use, which is defined in the OCP as follows:

- Primarily multi-unit residential (including townhouses and row houses, low and mid-rise apartments up to six storeys)
- A residential character public realm featuring landscaping and street tree planting, and mixed-uses located along arterial and secondary arterial roads
- Generally located within 400m of Urban Core, a Large Urban Village, or Town Centre, or frequent transit route, or within 800m of a rapid transit station. The proposed development is located on a frequent transit route

The general parking requirement for commercial uses (including medical office, personal services, financial service, and retail) in the Other Area category in Schedule C is one space per 37.5 m<sup>2</sup> floor area, which is an appropriate rate for the subject site as the specific commercial use has not yet been determined. Applied to the subject site, this results in 28 spaces (27.9 rounded).

#### 4.4 Summary of Expected Parking Demand

Based on the analysis above, a total of 154 vehicle parking spaces is expected. This includes 112 residential spaces, 14 visitor spaces, and 28 commercial spaces (**Table 7**).

---

<sup>12</sup> City of Victoria (2012). Official Community Plan, Available online at: [https://www.victoria.ca/assets/Departments/Planning~Development/Community~Planning/OCP/Up-to-date~OCP~and~Design~Guidelines/OCP\\_WholeBook.pdf](https://www.victoria.ca/assets/Departments/Planning~Development/Community~Planning/OCP/Up-to-date~OCP~and~Design~Guidelines/OCP_WholeBook.pdf)



**Table 7. Summary of Expected Parking Demand**

| Land Use                                      |               | Units                | Expected Parking Demand                  |                |
|---|---------------|----------------------|--|----------------|
|   |               |                      | Rate                                     | Parking Spaces |
| <b>Multi-Family Residential (Condominium)</b> | Studio        | 15                   | 0.56 spaces / unit                       | 8.4            |
|   | One-Bedroom   | 75                   | 0.71 spaces / unit                       | 53.3           |
|   | Two-Bedroom   | 39                   | 1.11 spaces / unit                       | 43.3           |
|   | Three-Bedroom | 5                    | 1.28 spaces / unit                       | 6.4            |
| <b>Total Residential</b>                      |               |                      |  | <b>112</b>     |
| <b>Visitor</b>                                |               | 134                  | 0.1 space / unit                         | <b>14</b>      |
| <b>Commercial</b>                             |               | 1,048 m <sup>2</sup> | 1 space / 37.5 m <sup>2</sup> floor area | <b>28</b>      |
| <b>Total Expected Parking Demand</b>          |               |                      |  | <b>154</b>     |



## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The proposed development at 1006, 1008, and 1010 Craigflower Road is a six-storey mixed-use residential building with 134 strata condominium units and 11,280 ft<sup>2</sup> (1,048 m<sup>2</sup>) of ground floor commercial space. The applicant is proposing to provide 182 parking spaces. The total parking requirement for the site is 209 parking spaces, which is 27 spaces more than what is proposed.

Expected parking demand for the residential use was estimated based on [a] parking observations collected from representative sites in the Township of Esquimalt, and [b] research based on previous parking studies.

Commercial parking demand was estimated based on the general commercial parking requirements for Other Areas in the City of Victoria's Zoning Bylaw No. 80-159 (Schedule C). The proposed development has characteristics of the Other Areas category.

The total expected parking demand for the proposed development is 154 spaces (28 less than what is proposed).

### 5.1 Recommendations

The proposal to provide 182 parking spaces is supported based on the analysis and conclusions in this study.