

2017 Public Input – OCP Review

Housing & Residential Development (110)

General (12)

1. Our OCP should reflect a caring community – that cares for its people, infrastructure, environment, culture and heritage.
2. I think the proposed OCP does an excellent job in recognizing the new realities facing our region, including our need for both ground-oriented and multi-unit housing. I also encourage Esquimalt to look closely at using our few laneways and thinking about the properties that back to the golf course - these could be excellent locations for townhome-style development, perhaps with carriage houses or "mews" style townhouses. Providing ground-oriented "missing middle" housing will be one of our tough land use challenges in coming years, and one I believe cities in the core of the region should consider.
3. At the end I have a lot of concerns with the current city development plan that I don't support I think this should be rewrote with a different spirit and not grant developers with specific numbers of storeys they can build. In the plan we should feel more energy to make Esquimalt a great place to live in harmony between residents and developments, protecting green spaces, reducing / controlling car traffic, making kids, pedestrians, bikers feel safer regarding the traffic with more cross walks like in front of the library for instance, there is a issue now since the development that takes place over the library parking. We've been sold a village concept and I see a cement development project at the moment.
4. I would like to ask that the housing discussion include the general requirements of the audiences that we may be looking to attract to Esquimalt. This way the work on affordable housing is recognized within our requirements to meet other Esquimalt audience requirements identified over the past few years as well, such as shipyard and tech sector.
5. Identify audiences for housing in Esquimalt – do we want 100% low-income housing, 100% middle income housing; 100% high-income housing or some combination, and why.
6. USES should revolve around Local community Integration with adequate commercial, recreation and park amenities. A range of affordable housing needs may be considered and a mix of uses will break down social barriers.
7. HOUSING should include a variety of types including Single Family, Townhouse, Coach House, Garden Suites, Lane access homes and Co-op housing.
8. POPULATION MIX should respect diversity for individuals with different age groups, financial backgrounds, needs
9. VALUE CONSIDERATIONS preservation of long term security inherent in a vibrant community with amenities, clean environment and interaction among residents
10. I feel we should focus on people who work in Esquimalt (including the 15000 who drive in daily for Seaspan and CFB Esquimalt – many of whom are middle \$90K to high\$150K family income) – target 10% of them is 1500
 - a. Meet with Seaspan and CFB Esquimalt commuters
11. We are grateful for the positive support offered by Esquimalt for the planned project for the Anglican Church St. Peter/St. Paul site. Our goal is to demolish the old 1958 Hall and build a new church hall (Ministry Centre) along with 3 floors of affordable/seniors rental accommodation. It is rare for a Parish to “build a new building” so this is a very rare opportunity to 1) remove an old hall, 2) build a new hall, and 3) provide 24 accommodation units. It’s the Parish, BC Housing, Diocese, the Township of Esquimalt and the community all supporting this initiative. We say “thanks” and look forward to the grand opening.
12. I did a mini-survey on Facebook over the past few days. As noted, no group is more important than others,

than should all be addressed within our planning processes for Esquimalt. I would really like a focus on the CFB Esquimalt and Shipyard people as well to help reduce the Westshore crawl. This has come up a few times in the previous Business round table discussions.

www.esquimalt.ca/.../OCP-r.../draft_policies_housing.pdf

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	middle-income workers	+25
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Downtown workers	+13
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Seniors, retirees	+12
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CFB Esquimalt personnel (reduce some commuters)	+11
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Esquimalt Shipyards / Seaspan / Suppliers (reduce some commuters)	+10
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Esquimalt area workers - businesses, retail, services, ...	+9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	low-income workers	+8
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tech sector workers (Viatec notes \$4 Billion and growing)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	high-income workers	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Families with children	
<input type="checkbox"/>	no specific target audience	
<input data-bbox="186 1071 211 1092" type="button" value="+"/>	Add an option...	

Affordable Housing (17)

1. Low income housing!
2. Where's the low income housing?
3. More subsidized/low-market high density affordable housing with commercial space.
4. If affordable housing is to be a criteria, then allow some market-rent densification alongside, around and even over the industrial area.
5. To me, affordability needs to be the number one priority, followed by environmental concerns, followed by aesthetics. Parking concerns should be at the absolute bottom- having affordable housing is a need, while being able to park on the street in front of your home is a luxury that can be done without.
6. My own view is that the growth strategy and numbers outlined at the Affordable Housing Workshop are a lot lower than they should be.
7. AFFORDABILITY OPTIONS could include rental and purchase with protection for re-purchase at affordable rates contained in 219 covenants
8. If it is possible for Esquimalt to be the first in the Capital Region to move affordable housing applications to the front of the line for approvals, that would be beneficial to the Affordable Housing Industry.
9. I am excited to see revitalization starting in downtown Esquimalt. I support added density, but let's not lose sight of the need for diverse housing including affordable housing options (perhaps including pilot homeownership and new equity coop models), and continue to encourage good design including sensitive transitions.
10. Hopefully the NDP will give the city more money for Government Funded Affordable housing.

11. I think there should be more housing in Esquimalt, everybody could be sleeping on the streets really soon. There is BC Liberals that ran this province in the hole. People will be sleeping in front of Leg soon. So wake up and get off your ass and do something for the people of Esquimalt.
12. It was evident from the workshop that there is a lot of interest, excitement and support for further engagement in affordable housing initiatives. It is recommended that the Township capitalize on the energy and expertise in the room and identify next steps for engagement as soon as possible, both to develop clear OCP policies, as well as to take the next bold steps in creating some affordable housing in the community. From the participants' comments, it appears that some topics are less understood than others, and could benefit from further exploration. Further engagement could include, for example:
 - a. Host a follow-up workshop to focus on OCP policy development;
 - b. Host a design charrette to identify parcels of land where housing could be built and the partners that need to be involved;
 - c. Create a housing task force that can identify the terms of reference for a housing fund, which was strongly supported, and to explore options for a housing organization;
 - d. Host another discussion or learning opportunity about resale price restrictions and/or municipal land acquisition, two topics that could have clear benefits in creating affordable housing in the long-term, but may not be well understood and did not have as strong support in the workshop;
 - e. Host a follow-up workshop with the development/builder community to identify the key steps required to support the building of affordable housing.
13. Suggestions:
 - recognize target audiences for new and updated housing stock in Esquimalt: low, medium, high; tech sector, CFB Esquimalt, Shipyards, work in Esquimalt; work downtown; seniors, homeless, ...
 - broaden the housing policy update to include all audiences that we need to consider/address
 - have section related to high, medium and low income housing
 - don't lose sight on the recommendations outlined by this summary report, but add the broader context
 - include a neighbourhoods section in OCP or at least in action plan with relevant comments for housing similar to Victoria
14. I would have preferred a more distinct set of provisions and possibly even actual bylaw proposals that would ensure affordable housing initiatives to be part of all future development proposals, either by way of market versus nonmarket ratios defined in the bylaw and or financial off-sets to allow for the creation of a non market housing fund for the community. With pressures increasing for the redevelopment of older rental buildings, that are at the lower end of the market rental rates, as well as land assembly with a purpose to build either rental or for sale inventory, it would be a high priority for the township to provide clear leadership and well articulated direction to secure a healthy balance of market and affordable housing inventory for decades to come.
15. As far as potentially residential property held/owned and or acquired by the township, language (in the OCP) that would provide clear preferential affordable housing use would also further show a leadership role in securing a pathway for a more balanced housing inventory within the community. The past decades have shown us that not making clear articulated provisions at a community level about affordable housing causes "the economics" to overrule the real needs in the community, with very negative results for large portions of the population. Access to affordable housing has a huge impact to the wellbeing of the entire community and it can only be secured by way of making difficult political and possibly financial decisions, personally I can't see a better way for the Township to lead the community towards a healthy and balanced living environment than by articulating this in the new Official Community Plan.
16. Would like to see more of an emphasis on ways to protect the current rental stock as many of these buildings are past their prime and will be at risk of being demolished for strata units. Some certainly need replacing and/or updating but I would like to see stronger language about protecting and adding to the

current rental stock as well as strong incentives for owners to update and beautify their properties.

17. Under the “**Affordable Housing**” heading, not sure what the bullet “Consider the impacts of converting existing rental apartment buildings to stratified condominiums” means. Is this referring to the need to protect current rentals? If so it needs stronger language. Or is it saying that some current rental buildings could be stratified for an ‘affordable’ ownership option – not clear on meaning. We will always need rental buildings and need to ensure that what we do have we do not lose.

Age-in-Place (Seniors) (1)

1. The Residential and commercial housing- will ENCOURAGE be strong enough to actually have AGE IN PLACE accommodation for 28% of the people who will be over 65 in 2030, can the Township demonstrate leadership in this area?

Density (12)

1. Increase density x 2
2. Infill housing
3. More condos
4. Allowing more condo type buildings
5. Infill development, multi-unit residential development should be expanded in all core municipalities to reduce urban sprawl in CRD.
6. In helping with community growth, I am in support of new applications for Proposed redevelopment infill housing.
7. The proposed FSR of 1.5 for neighbourhood commercial is not enough and will cause problems for smaller sites designated as Neighbourhood Commercial in being redeveloped. A 3 FSR but keeping the storey height makes more sense. If this is not done the economics for re-development will be hard to make sense.
8. Bonus density should have a set formula. It removes uncertainty and provides the Township with a clear understanding of what its receiving. For example, for every 0.1 FSR increase a developer could pay \$20,000 or provide that by way of an amenity the Township would like to have.
9. Land use isn’t just about “how much where”, but also about community design/neighbourhood design/architectural design. It would be great to see more of this spelled out – even as a fairly high-level vision -- so that Esquimalt citizens can understand (and hopefully share and support) the vision.
10. Reduce duplex zoning to Victoria size 5850 sq. ft. from 7200 sq. ft.
11. I live in an existing single + 2 unit residential zone. It stays the same. I think there should be much more flexibility for housing options in this zone – garden suites, secondary suites, small homes (100 sq. ft), reductions in parking requirements. Many people need housing and the single + 2 unit residential zone is now too exclusive. Township staff use the bylaws + building code but are not flexible or responsive in their thinking or interactions with the general public.
12. Why are we opposing subdivision and infill housing in Rock Heights? Is it specific to panhandle lots, or just a general prohibition? Given that it's so close to amenities, why wouldn't we want to intensify the population slightly?

Development Approval Process (5)

1. Seamless and speedy development and building process
2. Quick turn around for development / building permits
3. Reduced fees for Development/Building Permits
4. I’d be supportive of a process that allowed for variances after municipal evaluation of a property.
5. Information for all major developments should be published with links on the Esquimalt website as part of keeping Esquimalt informed but also part of Esquimalt marketing plan – show the future and build it

Float Homes (1)

1. Under the heading “**Float Homes**”. I, like many residents, support the existence of the float homes and marina – and feel it is a picturesque as well as needed commercial addition to the community. Would like to ensure any future plans for the marina area continue to ensure that the height of the float homes be confined to a specific number of stories, as well as to areas of the marina where they do not obstruct views, etc., and that the area remains an area for walking, sightseeing, etc., for everyone.

Height (4)

1. I do want to see an increase in density along Esquimalt Rd to a maximum height of 6 stories
2. Please keep buildings low and multi-functional to preserve and encourage an “island” culture, small community feel that our children can grow with and into – still sense it as their own community – despite an influx of residents, recognize the community as welcoming as when they were we.
3. Twelve storey buildings anywhere along the Esquimalt Road corridor will fundamentally change the township quality of Esquimalt, even when stepped back at the third or fourth floor. The 'village' character will be irretrievably lost, no street sunshine and very probably a wind tunnel with the summer westerlies. West Bay will be 5 storeys - that's plenty! If Esquimalt Road is to be vibrant and have character and be "pedestrian friendly", it needs to be more like Commercial Drive or Main Street in Vancouver, and not with 12 storey buildings which will give it all the character of Douglas Street in Victoria - and that's NOT a compliment! A very bad idea! If high buildings (6 storeys and more) are to be the future of the township, then create zones which allow them on the highest points of land in the municipality where they have a view and block no one else's. Keep the commercial corridors of the township to "human scale".
4. I've been going to meetings / open houses when it is outside of the working hours and provided comments but I don't get the feeling that I had any influence at the end. I am not happy with the development plan the city is putting together. That plan to me is the result of the pressure of developers on the city but the city does not need to agree with that. There are a lot of of lobbying around to increase city density and it is not because of shortage in housing but because investors make a huge amount of money in these operations. Increasing building height should be case by case and people living around should be consulted and if they don't agree they should be listened. The city should not grant that a current building that is 2 or 3 storey height can become a 6 storey height because of this city plan. Instead there should be negotiation on case by case with the involvement of the people affected. I see that the chamber of commerce put some pressure for development on the city but the city needs to be independent. The chamber of commerce does not represent people living in Esquimalt. The chamber of commerce represent people that pay to be part of this chamber because they have business interest. On this island we see building density increase quickly because investors find a good return on their investment in the real estate market we live in. Does it make the quality of people living there better? I don't think so. It just make a few people richer and more powerful.

Parking (1)

1. New developments, whether they be a strata or otherwise, should consider making accommodations for visitor parking as well as resident parking, to ensure that the street does not become overly congested.

Neighbourhood Plans (6)

1. At some point protect 2 gems of residential, Rockheights & Parklands.
2. It is possible to consider subdivision of some large lot single family homes, where there is room? I am thinking of Highrock Ave at Rockheights Ave. area.
3. More attractive apartments along the Esquimalt Road with businesses on the ground floor.
4. I am also interested in how the Design Guidelines (West bay and Esquimalt rd) will be incorporated in. Perhaps posting a copy of the updated draft OCP Table of Contents might be helpful.

5. I would also like to see a priority put on the neighbourhood profiles to ensure that we are looking at housing stock priorities in the context of the neighbourhood priorities as well. Affordable housing is very important and does need attention. It does need to fit within the context of Esquimalt's overall housing AND business priorities. Please see the previous information that I provided regarding Victoria's section in their OCP. This should be a priority for us. As we do not have time for design guidelines for our neighbourhoods hopefully we at least have time to clarify the priorities for various areas in 2 page summaries. This should help to bring in a higher awareness of the impact of the 15000+ people that drive in daily.
6. I am also looking at the neighbourhood planning for City of Victoria. I think if we did a light version of the neighbourhood plans (example screen shots below), it could really provide some insights for us including DND, Seaspan, etc. Input could come from roundtables summaries and a few other available sources. [OCP Book 2012 amended April2017.pdf](#) pg 142-163. Some of their neighbourhood vision and strategic direction statements could be very applicable for our neighbourhoods. Along with some from Esquimalt. Add Neighbourhood 2 pg summaries like Victoria Focus on vision and strategy for each area (Saxe Point and RockHeights were profiled recently in TC – let's build on it as these are our "Oak Bay, Sunnymead" areas

Multi-unit Residential Development (9)

1. Support Multi-unit Residential Development in our community as long as everything meets your guidelines. Under "**Multi-unit Residential Development**" heading, re the bullet "Consider, where appropriate, development proposals with densities greater than those set out in the official...for the benefit of the community". This type of policy needs to ensure that the benefits for the community realistically balances out the variances being given for the increased densification, etc. We can all point to examples where developers were given density bonuses in exchange for what many would consider negligible "benefits" back to the community.
2. There should be town-homes for more families with 3 bedrooms. Families need more available housing options. Town-homes in Esquimalt are bought immediately and in demand.
3. An insufficient amount and range of housing forces people to commute long distances to suitable housing, thus increasing the cost of travel and its carbon footprint.
4. "design standards" – have them provided in design guidelines like West Bay Design Guideline – all neighbourhoods need this consideration
5. multi-unit development should be address high, med, low income housing audiences – I do not agree that condos & townhouses targeted for high-end should have same limit to reduce single use vehicles
6. **live/work local should be a focus** - housing stock audience for Esquimalt should include tech industry, CFB Esquimalt and Seaspan staff & consultants to help reduce Westshore, Saanich and Victoria daily crawl - many Seaspan and CFB Esquimalt workers do not want low-income housing
7. should be a reference to working within design guidelines of the city and neighbourhood
8. When considering new development within established areas, acknowledging neighbourhood character is important. Building style, exterior finish, massing, height, and infrastructure capacity, are factors that affect effective integration. It is also important to recognize that new approaches & styles can enhance neighbourhood vitality.
9. All residential land needs to meet CPTED requirements – buildings that are not painted/maintained, grounds that are not maintained /overgrown / weeds results in drawing crime to the area and lowering the value of surrounding property as they detract from a vibrant community.

Rentals (5)

1. apartments available
2. *Rental property, other than for family members, requires a business license. It is a business. Charge \$10 or whatever, but it is a business. **Note:** absentee landlord properties are bringing in \$30K-70K/year/house on 2-*

4 bedroom homes. That is a business. Some property owners have a number of properties, that is a business.

3. Residential properties including rental properties including grounds need to be maintained to maintain/establish the quality, health and safety of the neighbourhoods of Esquimalt. **Note:** I realize we have a bylaw but let's make it less onerous to maintain. (recognize and support CPTED for all residential properties)
4. **Safety:** Work with residents, schools, businesses and neighbourhood groups to address public health and safety and crime prevention.
5. **All residential rental properties,** must be regulated for health and safety – fire, insurance – lets get this done – unfair to neighbours and to renters if fire is not covered by insurance

Secondary & Detached Accessory (Garden) Suites (34)

Secondary Suites (12)

1. Support Secondary Suites
2. Duplex – no secondary suites
3. Zoning which allows for rentals within two-family (duplex) zones
4. Allowing secondary suites – in non-single family homes to assist with affordability
5. All residential rentals, should be licensed, and meet standards - inspection, build code, etc.
6. I support the inclusion of secondary rental suites as well as detached and garden suites in municipal definitions of housing.
7. I would like to see duplex properties be allowed to have a detached rental property if the land size is adequate. A lot of home owners live in duplexes and they should not be excluded from this policy that stand alone houses get to take full advantage of.
8. Allow strata title of legal suites.
9. Please allow secondary suites in existing duplexes. We need more affordable rentals. I have had a suite that the building inspector passed before i bought my house. For over 15 years, it has been illegal; Cant be rented out!! Ridiculous.
10. Expansion of secondary suites to duplex & **small lot detached dwellings.** I AM NOT IN FAVOUR OF THIS !! From Dominion Rd to Grafton and Esquimalt Rd to Munro, the streets are clogged with parked vehicles. The current policy of minimum one off street parking space per dwelling, coupled with an expansion of living spaces, will further exasperate an already untenable situation.
11. If you want more density through duplex & small lots, you should address the parking problem first.
12. I think the ability to create new housing forms, such as duplexes with suites and small lot houses with suites, is an excellent proposal to support ground-oriented housing for homeownership (with the mortgage helper of the suite) and new rental units. It also supports multi-generational housing. I encourage this type of housing, and hope good design controls will be in place (including massing that leads to modest-sized, entry-level units).

Accessory Detached Suites (22)

1. Support garden suites.
2. support Detached Accessory (Garden) Suites
3. Detached suites/granny flats
4. Would like to support suites within duplex housing.
5. I'm in favour of garden rental suites & rental units in infill housing
6. If carriage houses and the like are permitted the off-street parking is an absolute MUST! Please don't allow carriage houses without off-street parking.
7. Also, in our case or possibly someone else's plans, we personally would like to build a double garage with a

- suite above it, and hoping this may be a possibility, however I do understand there is many things to consider.
8. I am in favour of infill. I like the idea of Garden Suites on a property. Can keep families together + give income to seniors who do not have private pensions. Get to stay on our property + not have to sell + move away.
 9. Must be regulated for health and safety – fire, insurance – unfair/unsafe to neighbours and to renters if fire/water/electrical is not covered by proper insurance. This needs to become mandatory –look at London fire
 10. Requires water and sewer line
 11. Must be within property setbacks of zoning – changes to zoning setbacks are significant and should require a referendum
 12. Requires off-road parking for any vehicles – consider having a non-vehicle rating on the rental?
 13. Please describe process as to *“how neighbourhood impacts can be mitigated”*
 14. Relating to the OCP suggesting that it would be permitting garden and backyard suites – she would like there to be a provision in the plan that ensures there is adequate parking *on the property* for the additional suite(s). For example, if there is a duplex being converted into a four-plex, that the additional parking not be regulated to an already congested street.
 15. I live in Saxe Point on Bewdley. I am not in support of carriage houses as a housing option. The density of the neighbourhood has already increased dramatically in the past 2 years with the proliferation of rental suites. The upcoming development of rental suites. The upcoming development of the English Inn will also significantly increase the density. Adding coach houses would be too much.
 16. The adoption of “coach” houses for the area closely resembling the City of Victoria guidelines would be great! The would be a great step forward to help alleviate the housing crisis!
 17. Allow strata title of carriage homes if they have off-street parking.
 18. I do want to see allowing for garden suites in single home properties and relaxing the zoning so single family dwellings can add additions by building up/out to create suites for extended families or rentals.
 19. I am very PRO detached garden suites! I live on a 13,000+ lot, and have more than enough space for a backyard cottage. If I was able to have one, my mother-in-law could live with us in her own accommodation. And when my husband and I are finding our house too onerous, I’d rent it to my god-daughter, and we would move into the cottage. Aging in place doesn’t get any better than that! I wouldn’t need to leave my neighbourhood, and I could make my lot a whole lot more manageable as I age. I have seen many Auxiliary Dwelling Units (ADUs) in Portland.
 20. I am very pleased to see the zoning of "single and two unit" residential, and the discussion of detached suits. Given the ongoing difficulty with housing in Victoria, infill funded by homeowners will produce more units cheaper than any government subsidized operation ever could, and offer the dignity and privacy of separate dwellings rather than being jammed in a hastily converted basement. The policy document does not go into specifics on detached suites, and I hope such details are forthcoming. My main concern is that having accepted the idea of detached suites in principle, the zoning and approval requirements will prove so prohibitive that very few can actually be built, or that the square footage ratios (max 10% of property, max 35% floor area to property size) will be left adjusted. Or that not all RS-1 zones will be eligible for detached suites, and the distribution becomes arbitrary. The draft policy statement doesn't indicate whether a detached suite can exist in the same lot as a main dwelling with a secondary suite built in. I am guessing there is no intention to allow this. Assuming I am correct, is this a matter of principle, expressed community will, or the difficulty of deciding which lots could support the configuration without deleterious effects?
 21. ****Under the heading **“Secondary and Detached Accessory (Garden Suites)”**. At the Open House staff members explained that the new draft policy for garden suites would see them go through as a permit vs a rezoning application. Rezoning is the way it would have been done in the past. For example, that will mean that if people applying to put a garden suite in their yard meet the permit requirements they could proceed

with no input or consultation with their neighbours, which would have been required under the old system (i.e. rezoning of the property). New garden suites are in fact a rezoning of properties but without the input. This means that neighbours may not have any prior knowledge of a backyard suite going in that may or may not impact their privacy and enjoyment, but at the very least changes the configuration of their neighbourhood. I am definitely in favour of the Municipality adding secondary and garden suites as a housing option. However community residents will be concerned if the system, as we move forward, does not provide for information, consultation and input prior to a new garden suite being built next door. On the other hand, done right garden suites could be a win-win for everyone.

22. I would very much like to encourage building permits for garden suites. However, when I looked at the Victoria garden suite bylaw text that was approved by City of Victoria, I believe it made reference to the fact that a duplex could not have a garden suite on the lot. Because I'm not familiar with the terminology I wasn't sure if it meant neither half of a duplex that was owned by different owners could construct a garden suite, or if meant a single private owner of both sides of a duplex could not have a garden suite on the lot. I could understand the limitation on the former situation, but not if the owner owned the whole duplex/property. I'm not sure if I'm articulating this very clearly but, for example, my Dad is the single owner of a fairly large lot in Esquimalt with a duplex on it - the primary residence on one side and the other side is rented out. The backyard behind the duplex is large enough to have a garden suite, vegetable garden, plus keep some of the yard as grass. If say, Esquimalt were to adopt the same wording as City of Victoria I'm unclear if a garden suite would be permissible to be built on his property because of the wording, when in fact there'd be plenty of room for it. I would hope also that garden suites would be offered (rented) as viable, affordable options for seniors, students, family members, and individuals who otherwise can't afford rising housing prices in the area (and not have an adverse effect of driving up prices somehow). I think we really need to protect housing, especially for seniors, especially.

Short Term Accommodations (3)

1. Charging Airbnb operators a municipal tax
2. I also support the allowance of Air BnB types, "grass roots" economy enablers. I'm sensitive to the impacts to a neighbourhood, such as parking, but believe the benefits outweigh the disadvantages.
3. (is this AirBNB?). This statement seems to be setting a precedent to change zoning? Must consider noise, parking, and especially safety/security (if in apt or condo). If we want to support more long term rentals, we need a workshop to discuss why property owners are considering short-term rentals, and address the issues including problem tenants; we also need to address slum landlords – or Esquimalt have a much more challenging time to change Esquimalt image.