



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

Minutes - Draft

Municipal Hall
1229 Esquimalt Road
Esquimalt, B.C. V9A 3P1

APC Design Review Committee

Wednesday, May 10, 2023

2:30 PM

Esquimalt Council Chambers

Present: 6 - Chair Graeme Verhulst
Vice Chair Tara Todesco
Member Derek Jenkins
Member Xeniya Vins
Member Chris Windjack
Member Shaun Smakal

Regrets: 1 - Member Richard McGrew

Staff Present: Alex Tang, Planner
Bill Brown, Director of Development Services
James Davison, Manager of Development Services, Recorder

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 PM. The chair then gave a territorial acknowledgement.

2. LATE ITEMS

One late item was added to the agenda following Staff Reports: Chair to collect input from committee to report back to Council.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as amended.

4. MINUTES

1) [23-273](#)

The minutes of the March 8, 2023 were amended as follows:

*Remove Member Verhulst from the vote on item 5.2 as he had previously recused himself.

*Correct the adjourner of the meeting from Chair to Vice Chair.

Moved by Member Vins, seconded by Member Smakal: That the minutes of the March 8, 2023 meeting of the APC Design Review Committee be adopted as amended. Carried Unanimously.

5. STAFF REPORTS

1) [23-126](#) Rezoning Application – 878 Colville Road, Staff Report No. DRC-23-005

The Planner introduced the application. The applicant, Ryan Hoyt, presented the application along with the owner, Dave Mackenzie.

Committee Questions and Comments (staff and applicant response in *italics*)

*How did you come up with the 6 units, what price point will they be at? *Personal in nature with a goal to retain units for family, no intention or goal to sell immediately. Wanted to come up with good size of units that would support a family. Find the unit size to tailor to a family rather than maximizing site.*

*Why split into 4 and 2 rather than 3 and 3? *Advantage to splitting 4:2, moves the turnaround up the property. Top unit will only have to back down to the turnaround only 2 units rather than 3.*

*To staff, we're looking at not having these townhomes not having street orientation, in the past the committee has recommended denial based on this configuration. Has a higher use been considered?

Land Use Designation is Townhouses, have not strayed. Do recommend having as much frontage, but the unusual shape has caused staff to not aim to different orientation.

*House to left: have you approached the owners and entertained a land assembly? *No.*

*Proposal risks orphaning the parcel. Very supportive of proposing net zero. Curious why only committing to Step code 3? *Was just a tactic to not have to make higher commitment.*

*Did you look at moving orientation from west to east? *We had it other way to start, nature of slope and crossfall made excavation more difficult. Geotech advised the current orientation.*

*Wondering if you have images to show us to walk through landscape space? Need better understanding of the landscape beyond parking on other side and frontage. The applicant gave paper copies of the landscape plan explained it to the members.

*Small lots de-emphasizing lawns, still doing the small lawn in each back yard, practicality of each household keeping a lawnmower - consider non-lawn? *Series of gates to facilitate strata maintenance, not forcing people to maintain own space. Raised garden bed, planter etc might be better for some, lawn good for pets.*

*Plan calls this out as natural lawn or synthetic lawn? Clarification on maintenance of path, gas meter access or convenience for homeowners. *Sort out discrepancy, understand that it is to be natural lawn. Gates are for landscape access (maintenance etc.) and discouraging residents to traverse other yards.*

*Planting selection, synthetic lawn alarms me. Goes against climate ready nature. Plant selection has no ecological value supporting native insects and birds. Could have a shared push mower, or something other than turf that doesn't grow tall and may have ecological value, like creeping thyme.

*How is garbage collected? *North end of drive, smaller bins to move down to street rather than require vehicles to come up.*

*Units being wheelchair accessible, how is the wheelchair to access for the back yard? *Provision for additional stop in elevator to get out to rear level.*

Discussion

*Net zero ready and elevator provisions, puzzled by making numbers work. Do have concerns about how site plan is laid out with only six units, should have ended up with a ton more green space.

*Driveway is very large, 7m usually typical for a 120 unit condo. Should narrow to less, 1.5-2m buffer possible on west side.

*Facing large parking lot, already almost no trees. Parking lot is huge, worried that adding giant driveway will add to the heat island effect, to water runoff, issues with severely sloped site. Buffer would allow tree planting that is desperately needed in that area. Development here should provide opportunity for larger trees.

*Massing is fine, splitting into 4 and 2 triggers fire suppression, 3 would not require it. Parking could be reduced to provide more amenity space. Opportunity for children to play on property more important than 2 extra parking stalls. Space at end or both should be looked at as opportunity to provide more landscaping/amenity space to development.

*More definition to façade in terms of colour or massing would be beneficial. Rear elevation facing condo building facing 3 storey blank wall. Northern elevation needs more attention, looked at in more detail.

*Great that it is net zero ready and provides a rain garden. Do think that lot is under utilized by at least as many units as you're proposing.

*For me, with small children, can't send them out to play in big field on their own. To have more sense of communities, sense of green space. Opportunity to create personalized community, increased green space instead of parking. Finding ways to have a tree corridor would be amazing, driveway is unnecessarily wide. Climate crisis isn't just warming, goes hand in hand with ecological crisis. Selection of plants and trees makes a huge difference.

*There are some things to like and some are head-scratching. Not working to the cohesive whole. Not quite finished.

*Such a challenging site, applaud for taking it on. In terms of slopes., potentially shared spaces on site are pretty extreme in terms of how they could be useable. Spot on north side require fairly extensive retaining. Appreciate the school is across the street, but can't send small kids alone. Not complaining terribly much about artificial turf. Can see the application working small scale. Stuff that works but not stuff that's the best for habitat or local bird/pollinator habitat. Avoid getting too gung ho on native stuff as native stuff isn't going to work anymore. A bit more mix may be good. Buffer path - more resilient than lawn? Squeeze in columnar trees on east face?

*For west side, agree, deal with some pretty aggressive turning radiuses and they're never enough. Fence will get beat up. If driveway itself can be narrowed a bit, metre's worth of plantable edge, push in that direction. *Pavers are great, will they be great on 10% slope? Not so much. Bit more deliberation on how that materiality plays into the landscape and drainage and cars turning. Regular garbage pickup etc needs reinforced concrete. Add buffer, barrier curb, treatment

to collect rainwater, give space for trees, structural soil treatment, roots to grow under driveway. Like to see more colour, pop for each unit. Doesn't clash with the neighbourhood. Applaud use of solar.

*Bike storage is missing

That the Esquimalt Design Review Committee recommends to Council that the rezoning application to authorize the proposed development of a 6-unit residential building consistent with the architectural plans provided by Hoyt Design Co. and landscape plan provided by Jonathan Craggs, to be located at 878 Colville Road [PID 006-245-382, Lot 14, Section 10, Esquimalt District, Plan 3060] be forwarded to Council with a recommendation to approve the application with the conditions below because it follows the OCP, it proposes 4-bedroom units with the potential for aging in place, it is net zero ready and it is to be built to Step Code 3. Conditions

Investigate:

- 1) removing surface parking in favour of green and amenity space;
- 2) adding a buffer on the west side with significant amount of trees planted; and,
- 3) solving the garbage and recycling collection.

Carried Unanimously.

In Favour: 6 - Chair Graeme Verhulst, Vice Chair Tara Todesco, Member Derek Jenkins, Member Xeniya Vins, Member Chris Windjack and Member Shaun Smakal

6. COMMITTEE INPUT FOR REPORTING TO COUNCIL

The Chair advised the committee that he would be reporting to Council in June and would like feedback from the them to pass along. The Director of Development Services provided some background for the request and mentioned operational matters. Councillor Armour indicated that Council is looking for more broad thoughts around application levels and policy issues. The Chair asked that the committee to email him their thoughts. One comment was made, on the operational side, that the committee is interested in receiving updates on applications that are approved by Council. Other members gave some additional input that will be made available in the Chair's report in June. Councillor Armour assured the committee that Council gives the DRC's recommendations a lot of weight and values the input.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting of the Design Review Committee was adjourned at 4:45 PM.