

JULY 30, 2025

revision 1 (August 11, 2025)

Corporation of the Township of Esquimalt  
1229 Esquimalt Road, Esquimalt, BC  
V9A 3P1

Attn: Development Services

RE: Development Variance Permit Applications – Lot 16 & Lot 17 at 527 Lampson St

---

527 Lampson Developments Ltd. is pleased to submit these DVP applications for our upcoming project at 527 Lampson Street. This is a supplemental application for variance requests to the development permit applications previously submitted in June 2025 (DP-000259 and DP-000260).

## Context

The attached DVP applications are being made in response to the *STAFF REVIEW AND CIRCULATION COMMENTS – DP000259 AND DP000260* received on July 21, 2025, specifically to address the below items:

### **2. Variance to reduce required side yard setback**

*The RSM-2 zone requires a side setback of 3.0m where a side yard is used to access rear yard parking. The proposal for 1.7m and 2.0m would require variance approvals, or the proposed design can be updated to meet the requirements (see also the Engineering comments relating to an easement on Lot 17). The OCP includes policies encouraging shared driveways that would support variance applications.*

### **4. Updated site/landscape plans to include wider parking spaces**

*Per Parking Bylaw 3089, the minimum parking space width for both standard and small car spaces is 2.6m. An additional 0.3m of width is required for each space where it abuts an obstruction. With a building on one side and a hedge proposed on the other, the two proposed exterior spaces should be 2.9m in width. Only 2.4m is shown on plans.*

### **Revision 1: Email Correspondence re: Bike Lockers**

*Several additional variances will now be included in the DVPs and staff reports (lot coverage, accessory building in front yard, accessory building building separation).*

Further revisions to address the remaining comments provided by staff will be addressed through a revised set of drawings for the DP applications as needed.

## Variance Requests

To address the comments above and provide for a workable project design, we are requesting the following variances.

With respect to item 2, the bylaw as written, requires Principal Buildings to be set back 1.2m from the Side Yard, except when a shared driveway leads to Rear Yard parking, which requires 3.0m setbacks. We have proposed a shared driveway and maneuvering space between the parking stalls that spans across the mid-line property boundaries of the two sites. We have 6 parking proposed – 4 on surface, and 2 in private garages.

The proposed combined driveway has a clear width at grade of 4.22m and a clear width at the second storey of 3.66m (reduced by the overhanging soffits) and the combined dimension of the maneuvering area satisfies the parking bylaw minimum of 7.0M for 90-degree parking on two sides. Our original development proposal had the maneuvering area

measuring 7.92m between the stalls, and by reducing this to comply with the bylaw, we were able to reallocate this space to additional softscape.

In our conversations with various neighbours and observations, street parking in the area is of primary concern. There is little quantity and high demand for it, and we believe, based on the neighbourhood feedback and our observations, that more on-site parking would be a benefit to the area and the future residents and neighbours. Therefore, we have proposed 6 on-site parking stalls accessed via a shared driveway to the parking in the rear yard. Current planning preference is to hide the parking to the best extent possible and not feature it prominently on the street frontages.

Hypothetically, if we were to revise the proposal to only have 2 parking stalls per site for a total of 4 stalls (reduced to the current 0.5:1 ratio) and then revising the ground floor plan to provide the parking within private garages, the setbacks would no longer be required to be 3.0m, but 1.2m, as the shared driveway is no longer accessing a Rear Yard parking area.

The site plan would remain relatively unchanged, with the same shared driveway and spatial conditions, but the net result would be 2 less parking stalls on site and fewer 3-bedroom units, as the unit plans at grade would be altered to accommodate a larger garage leaving only enough square footage for a one-bedroom configuration.

Ultimately, we'd be left with fewer family-oriented units and fewer parking stalls, resulting in 2 more cars potentially on the street, which we know is a concern for the neighbours. Therefore, given the low occupant load for this project at full build out, the low intensity usage of the site, and its residential nature, we feel that a shared driveway of 4.22m, a shared maneuvering area for the stalls, and the setbacks as proposed result in a better overall result for the future residents, the neighbours, and the project.

As this variance request exceeds the 25% variance staff is entitled to approve, we understand council must make the ultimate decision. To date, the cooperation between the developer, planning staff, and engineering has been excellent. Given that the OCP supports and encourages shared access points, engineering and staff have been supportive of the idea since it was first presented, and the layout results in the most benefit to all parties, we believe that this is the best solution possible.

With respect to item 4 above, we understand that the Township recently adopted new parking standards and ratios, and we applaud these changes as a positive. However, given our observations and conversations with the neighbours mentioned above, we firmly believe that street parking is concerning for the residents.

Given this, we are proposing 6 on-site parking stalls. Our DP applications had proposed the width at 2.4m and we are revising these to 2.9m to comply with the required size of 2.6m per stall plus an additional 0.3m as they abut a wall or fence. To achieve this, we have modestly adjusted the buildings to the south, resulting in the front setback being reduced from the required 2.0m to 1.85m, or approximately 6 inches. This is the dimension to the overhanging structure at level 2. At ground level, the dimension between the property line and the face of the building is 2.05m. The patios at grade remain generous and are not compromised or unusable. We believe this variance is imperceptible and is only a concern on plan – in person, the difference will not be noticeable, if it is even perceived at all.

Using the calculator provided by staff, we believe the variance requested for item 4 appears to fall within the 25% deviation that staff is entitled to review and approve of.

#### **Revision 1 (August 11, 2025): Email Correspondence re: Bike Lockers**

Staff communicated via email correspondence the need for an additional variances with respect to the secure bike lockers. The initial request was contemplated as a variance for lot coverage, for an accessory building in front yard, and for the accessory building to principal building separation. Upon further evaluation, we were able to make the following adjustments to eliminate the need for any additional variance requests.

To address the lot coverage, we found an error in the rounding and were more accurately able to calculate the exterior assembly thicknesses. This resulted in 49.9% site coverage, which we will round to 50% to allow for a small margin of error.

For the accessory building in the front yard, we have adopted staff's preference to locate the lockers in the rear yard adjacent to paver pathways and recycling areas. This space is easily accessed, is better tucked away from the primary street-facing elevations and considered more secure than the front yard. The proposed soft landscaping counts should not

be impacted as we were able to adjust to suit, but the benches will be removed and replaced by the lockers. We anticipate this to be a favorable adjustment, as the benches were unlikely to ever be used.

To address the separation of the accessory building and principal building, we have moved the lockers 2.5m from the principal building and is +/-1.45m from the rear setback, which now meets the prescribed bylaw setbacks for an accessory building.

The performance specification for the lockers is based on Mad Lockers model ML2-2. Each locker accommodates 2 bikes, with a lockable access door on each end. The lockers measure 75" L x 39" W x 46" H and come in a variety of two-tone colours and are currently proposed to be blue and tan (refer to site plan A101 for image).

Below is the list of the **updated** supporting documents provided with these applications. If you have any concerns or questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Devon Skinner, Architect AIBC  
Development Director, 527 Lampson Developments Ltd.  
T 250.514.4289 E [devonskinner@gmail.com](mailto:devonskinner@gmail.com)

Xeniya Vins  
Architect, AIBC  
T 416.876.4846 E [xeniya.vins@gmail.com](mailto:xeniya.vins@gmail.com)

**Supplied Drawings and Documents :**

1. Esquimalt Development Variance Application & Owner Authorization Letter
2. Esquimalt Development Variance Permit Application Checklist
3. Esquimalt Green Buildings Checklist
4. Copy of Current Land Title
5. Arborist's Report
6. Updated Landscape Cost Estimate
7. Survey Plan – Existing
8. Survey Plan – Proposed
9. Updated Architectural Drawing Set- 1 set of 11" x 17" (revision 1: updated A000 and Site Plan A101)
10. Civil Letters – 1 set of 8.5" x 11"
  - a. Inlet Control – Horizontal Circular Orifice (1 page)
  - b. Stormwater Estimates (2 pages)
  - c. Stormwater Treatment Trench Sizing Calculation Sheet (1 page)
11. Updated Civil Drawing Set - 1 set of 11" x 17"
12. Updated Landscape Drawing Set - 1 set of 11" x 17" (revision 1: updated Landscape Plan L1)