



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

Minutes - Draft

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

APC Design Review Committee

Wednesday, March 13, 2024

2:30 PM

Esquimalt Council Chambers

Present: 5 - Chair Graeme Verhulst
Member Chris Windjack
Member Shaun Smakal
Member Simon Williams
Member Alexander Robinson

Regrets: 2 - Vice Chair Tara Todesco
Member Xeniya Vins

Staff Present: Bill Brown, Director of Development Services
James Davison, Manager of Development Services

Council Liaison: Darlene Rotchford

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting of the Design Review Committee to order at 2:30PM and gave a Territorial Acknowledgment.

2. INTRODUCE NEW MEMBER TO COMMITTEE

3. LATE ITEMS

The agenda was amended to include "Director's Update and Small Scale Multi-Unit Housing".

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as amended.

5. MINUTES

24-153 Draft Minutes of DRC meeting January 10, 2024

Moved by Member Windjack, seconded by Member Smakal: That the minutes of the January 10, 2024 meeting of the APC Design Review Committee be adopted as circulated. Carried Unanimously.

6. STAFF REPORTS

- 1) 24-138 Development Permit Application - 884 Lampson St - Staff Report No. DRC-24-003

Alex Stringer from WA Architects gave a presentation.

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

- * Is this rental - *Developer has not decided*
- * What takes precedence - the landscape plan or the renderings? *The landscape plan. The renderings are just illustrative.*
- * Step Code 3 is no longer that ambitious. Have you looked at what it would take to get to Step code 4? *No, it would take quite a lot to get to Step 4. With a building like this you would be hard pressed to reach step 4 due to all the articulation.*
- Video Played.
- * Inset balconies are increasing your envelop quite a bit. If you do not have all those inset buildings you will save framing cost and improve energy efficiency.
- * This building design process started years ago.
- * Comments - there are strong horizontals that are effective.
- * Appreciate the landscaping especially on the Tillicum side. You are managing the closeness on the Tillicum side.
- * There are a lot of things that are working.
- * Landscape focused. You have listed four cash-in-lieu trees. 25 planted and 4 cash in lieu. It looks like there would be room in the northeast corner.
- Why are there no trees?
 - * Is the underground preventing trees from getting planted?
 - * Public art - have you decided what the public art would be? *I would not call it public art as it is for the residents.*
 - * The activity lawn is made less useful because of the benches. Consider moving the benches to create a more livable lawn space.
 - * Is the putting green going in on the roof top patio?
 - * I like that there is a good mix of native species with the planting.
 - * Happy to see that you got 25 trees in the landscaping.
 - * Wood or concrete - *wood above the first floor.*
 - * Is the site permeable to the public. *It is private property.*
 - * In the rendering on the curvy path it felt quite high - where am I relative to adjacent homes. *It is up a little compared to the neighbour to the house to the north.*
 - * There is a low spot - about 5 feet lower from the elevation of the lobby to the neighbours grade at the property line.
 - * What is the privacy screen - is it wood? *I do not know.*
 - * This is something to look at.
 - * How will the retaining walls be finished? *Cast in place concrete.*

- * East side - See drawing A300 or A 400. (pg 11 of power point). The openings in the parkade on the east side. *There is landscaping to help attenuate the visual impact.*
- * Is there going to be cooling in this building? Where are the heat exchangers located? *In the lower level of the parkade and on the rooftop.* *There will be visual screening.*
- * You mentioned cargo bikes. They are at the lowest level of the parkade? Often cargo bikes are mixed with other bikes when riding. Consideration should be made to mix the bike parking.
- * About 8 cargo bikes are on the upper level. It is harder to put bikes on the upper level.
- * 45% family units is good. Has there been thought to three or four bedroom units? Have you studied this? *We did a unit mix early on - the affordability factor was a major consideration to keep the costs down for the users.*

Discussion

- * Building form and character - good to see you followed up on original comments. My issue is with landscape. * It is hard to see all of the work coordination. I do not see the detail that shows where the parkade sits. I would love to see a detailed sheet of grading plan. It should show native vs not native. Form and character of landscape. What is the specific programming? The lawn sidewalk looks into the neighbours yard. I like the simplicity of the rendering. It is a struggle to get trees on a roof top garden.
- * Rental and condos are a little different financially. How does that impact the design? Is it lawn or artificial turf?
- * Design and programming of space is potentially radically going to change.
- * The pathway from Lampson is a raised bridge. Where are the details? How does the bridge relate to oversight on the neighbouring property? How are the onsite grades preserved to protect trees? Even planting a tree in a tree protection zone can be an issue. Overall it is tough.
- * It could be moving in the right direction. There is no homework to show how the landscaping has evolved.

There are six trees at the very south of the property. Where is the section that shows why trees are where they are? There are sloping and parkade entrance issues. I do not see how the landscape plan shows or buffers things - especially the parkade entrance. This is absent in this sheet.

- * There are a few things in materiality. There are lots of things that says by others. Why don't we see details?

There is a reference to the permeability of the paving. Is that an architectural slab? There is not enough information to explain why some pavers are herringbone and others are an architectural slab.

- * Plant palette is a good mix of native and adaptive. It would be good to see where they are on site.
- * I respect your work to reduce massing. The materiality is contemporary. There could be clearer description of some of the materials. We need to be mindful of mechanical screening. Suddenly the bulk of the screening becomes part of the form.
- * The garbage collection is going to be behind someone's kitchen.
- * The unit types are expressed in the massing. What if there was a different way of getting a slightly different unit mix within the existing massing? Unit mix is an important thing.
- * How does mechanical screening affect the form and massing of the building?
- * Interaction of the landscaping with the perimeter of the site.
- * Re: materials - there is a central box in the building. Does this impact the transition? Can the block be made softer? Maybe black is too strong an expression
- * The mechanical systems have important form and character impacts. Generally I like the project - you are here a little early. Condo vs rental has an impact.
- * Echo what has been said.
- * It is a little misleading to present it as finished
- * As a landscape plan in looks fine the landscape plan is light. What do the privacy screen looks like? Large format pavers will be on pedestals. The permeable pavers are on the slab which is not useful - it is only permeating to the slab. There is still an expectation for best practices - trees need 1 m deep soil. Soil volumes may not be adequate. There is no details or sections that demonstrates what is proposed. The trees may just be stunted and die. It is hard to judge it more than just a nice green plan.
- * Caution going for the demographic of people who want a putting green. I want to see more of how it is coming together.

Moved by Member Windjack, seconded by Member Williams: That Esquimalt Design Review Committee recommends the Development Permit application to authorize the proposed development of a six-storey residential building consistent with the architectural plans and renderings provided by WA Architects and the landscape plans and estimate provided by Calid Services Ltd to be located at

884 Lampson Street
PID 006-323-987
LOT 14, BLOCK 6, SECTION 10, ESQUIMALT DISTRICT, PLAN 2546

863 Tillicum Road
PID 004-243-307
LOT A, SECTION 10, ESQUIMALT DISTRICT, PLAN 14648

887 Tillicum Road
PID 004-801-849
LOT 5, BLOCK 6, SECTION 10, ESQUIMALT DISTRICT, PLAN 2546

879 Tillicum Road
PID 006-337-953
AMENDED LOT 8 (DD 212980-I), BLOCK 6, SECTION 10,
ESQUIMALT DISTRICT, PLAN 2546

885 Tillicum Road
PID 004-312-821
LOT 2 SECTION 10 ESQUIMALT DISTRICT PLAN 7433

be forwarded to Council with a recommendation to approve with the following conditions, for the reasons that it is an attractive project, enhances the streetscape along Tillicum Road, and provides needed housing.

The approval is conditional on providing more clarity on questions around:

- * Transition at property line at pedestrian walkway
- * Lack of specificity on planting plan and their location
- * What mechanical systems are going to be used and the impact on form and character
- * Openness south of the parkade entrance and buffering of neighbouring back yards
- * If individual heat pumps are used where are they going
- * Plant location, fence heights, terrace heights, soil volumes, functionality of the amenity lawn
- * Screening details
- * Confirmation that all trees have adequate soil volumes with sections.
- * Confirmation of the design and use of the roof top amenity.
- * Further description and clarity on the visual and acoustic impact for screening on the building form and character.
- * Further resolution of the east side of the parkade
- * Grading plan that demonstrates coordination of the building and landscape elements
- * Additional details on the pedestrian entrance from Lampson and its relationship to adjacent properties

* Surface parking materials

In Favour: 4 - Chair Graeme Verhulst, Member Chris Windjack, Member Simon Williams and Member Alexander Robinson

Opposed: 1 - Member Shaun Smakal

7. DIRECTOR'S UPDATE AND SMALL SCALE MULTI UNIT HOUSING

The Director provided an update on the status of projects that have undergone review by the DRC. He also chatted about the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Roadmap, the changes in the amendment to the Development Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw, specifically the delegation of Small Scale Multi Unit Housing (SSMUH) and minor variances, and the Census Dashboard.

The Director provided additional information on the SSMUH.

8. DRC REPORT TO COUNCIL - Discussion of issues or concerns for the Chair to take to the Committee of the Whole April 15, 2024.

Simon Williams - broader scope of things concerns throughout the province - have more input into the OCP or other guidelines.

- * Would like to have seen more detail in submissions.
- * Have more opportunity to be involved in changes in review of DP Guidelines.
- * Be able to contribute to guidelines.
- * Bring back experience and outlook.
- * Having a higher degree of involvement in the OCP and Guidelines.
- * More interaction with staff.

Graeme Verhulst -

*With new provincial guidelines the Township's communications to applicants about design guidelines and submission requirements becomes far more important.

*More feedback on the process and how they evolve over time.

Shaun Smakal- Applications are getting more complex. Taking this last application for example, it is hard to look at and extrapolate from 1, 2, or 3 sheets. There is no backup of any kind to show where the parkade is. The point is to avoid amendments. What is required to submit a landscape plan? What is a hedge, what was not. There is not enough there to protect the form and character in the landscape design. There needs to be more - 1:100 planting plan

Make distinction between rezoning and DP even more clear.
Update application checklist for Rezoning and DP.
Rezoning should be about program - how do you deal with stormwater?
Storm water is about scale-ability - buildings are getting more complex.
Mechanical systems are going to start to influence building form and character.
Submissions do not reflect the complexity of modern buildings
Checked boxes are not enough.
Scalability from rezoning to high definition building complexity.
Zoning bylaws have been more restrictive than what the market can bear.
With the SSMUH the zoning bylaws may be more permissive than what the markets can bear

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting of the Design Review Committee adjourned at 4:50PM.

GRAEME VERHULST, CHAIR
APC DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
CERTIFIED CORRECT THIS

BILL BROWN
RECORDING SECRETARY
, 2024