



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
HELD ON
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2017
ESQUIMALT COUNCIL CHAMBERS

MEMBERS PRESENT:	David Schinbein (CHAIR) Amy Higginbotham Ken Armour Graeme Dempster	Christina Hamer Berdine Jonker Duncan Cavens
STAFF LIAISON:	Trevor Parkes, Senior Planner	
STAFF:	Alex Tang, Planning Technician	
COUNCIL LIAISON:	Councillor Olga Liberchuk	
SECRETARY:	Pearl Barnard	

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

II. LATE ITEMS

No late items

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Moved by Graeme Dempster, seconded by Christina Hamer, that the agenda be adopted as circulated. **The Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

IV. MINUTES

Moved by Christina Hamer, seconded by Berdine Jonker, that the minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission held September 19, 2017 be adopted as circulated. **The Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

V. STAFF REPORTS

1) DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT

1003 Wollaston Street

[PID 009-211-829, Lot 2, Block B, Section 11, Esquimalt District, Plan 292]

Purpose of the Application:

Alex Tang outlined that the applicant is proposing to construct a new Single Family Dwelling on a lot that is vacant except for a small garage, which will be demolished. Mr. Tang explained that the proposed dwelling would cover 36.2% of the Area of the Parcel; which is 6.2% more than the allowed 30% Lot Coverage.

Tara Cumming and Dan Cumming, Cumming Design and Liz Sansoucy-Jones, Owner were in attendance.

Tara Cumming gave a PowerPoint presentation and a brief overview of the site plan and building design for the project. Ms. Cumming explained that the variance is required due to the addition of the covered walkway and rear deck and stairs, which are important components that will contribute to the long term livability of this home.

The proposed dwelling will have a secondary suite. All the neighbours have been consulted, except for the apartment building to the north (their parking lot faces this property) and the homeowners on all sides of the property are supportive of the project.

Commission Members comments and questions included:

- Members liked the design of the house. Completely understand the desire for a covered walkway and the back deck for accessibility.
- A member asked how often variance applications come in where the amount of the dwelling is marginally higher than the 30% lot coverage. Mr. Parkes advised that lot coverage variances are not common; however some are received. He clarified that variance requests such as this for a brand new building is very uncommon.
- Does it make a difference if the deck is on the ground or above the ground in terms of lot coverage? - Mr. Tang advised that the Bylaw states that if a deck is 0.4 metres or less above the ground level then it is considered landscaping, anything above 0.4 metres is considered as part of the lot coverage.
- During the Public Notification process does the public have an opportunity to submit their comments? Mr. Tang confirmed that there is an opportunity for the public to submit their comments. Member then asked if Council considers those comments when they are making their final decision. Mr. Tang advised that any comments received are forwarded to Council.
- Is on-site parking required for secondary suites? Mr. Tang advised that currently secondary suites do not require onsite parking.
- A member commented that there could be some confusion about where the front entrance is. The door off the patio that goes into the master bedroom could be mistaken for the front door. Ms. Cummings advised that the patio area would be a courtyard type of space and the covered walkway entrance would guide people to the front door. The desire is to enter into the living area rather than entering at the front of the house and walking down a long hallway. The covered walkway is basically an outdoor hallway.
- Members indicated they thought the variance requested was reasonable.
- Concern was stated that if these types of variances are approved then it could be precedent setting in the future.
- Members commended the applicant for consulting the neighbours and getting their approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

Moved by Graeme Dempster, seconded by Ken Armour: That the Esquimalt Advisory Planning Commission [APC] recommends to Council that the application for a Development Variance Permit allowing construction of a new Single Family Dwelling as illustrated in the architectural drawings prepared by Pacific Homes, stamped "Received September 22, 2017", sited as detailed on the survey plan prepared by JE Anderson & Associates, stamped "Received September 22, 2017", and including the following variance for the property located at PID 009-211-829, Lot 2, Block B, Section 11, Esquimalt District, Plan 292 [1003 Wollaston Street] be forwarded to Council with a recommendation for approval as the variance requested seems reasonable.

Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050, Section 34 (8)(a) – Lot Coverage: A 6.2% increase to the requirement that all Principal Buildings, Accessory Buildings and Structures combined, shall not cover more than 30% of the Area of a Parcel [ie. from 30% to 36.2%]. **The Motion Carried Unanimously**

2) OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT and REZONING APPLICATION
1052 Tillicum Road
[Lot C, Section 10, Esquimalt District, Plan 11683]

Purpose of the Application:

Trevor Parkes, Senior Planner outlined that the applicant is requesting a change in Official Community Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning from the current OCP designation Single and Two Unit Residential to Townhouse Residential and a change in zoning from the current RD-1 [Two Family Residential] zone to a Comprehensive Development zone [CD]. Mr. Parkes explained that these changes are required to accommodate the proposed five strata townhouse residences to be constructed in two buildings on the subject property.

Sak Johl, Owner, David Yamamoto, Zebra Design and Megan Walker, LADR Landscape Architects were in attendance.

David Yamamoto gave a PowerPoint presentation detailing the site plan and an overview of the setbacks, building heights, streetscape, parking and landscaping features for the project. Mr. Yamamoto explained that their primary inspiration for this proposal derived from the ten unit townhouse project immediately to the north (1060 Tillicum Road) which was rezoned in 2014 from RD3 [two family] to a CD zone. He believes the proposed design integrates well with the adjacent townhouse project and has similar height, massing and enhanced landscaping features. The proposal will provide affordable housing for a range of tenure to young families, couples and single parents in a location that provides amenities for all. Mr. Yamamoto outlined that the Floor Area Ratio presented is 0.74 however, the Township is currently considering excluding stairs which would bring the Floor Area Ratio down to 0.70. Mr. Parkes clarified that, while draft amendments are being considered they would need to be approved by Council, therefore the current zoning bylaw regulations apply to this application. Accordingly, the Floor Area Ratio as presented would require a Density Bonus or Amenities Bylaw. Mr. Yamamoto advised that they would consider bringing the Floor Area Ratio down to 0.70.

Commission Members questions and comments included:

- This development will revitalize the street and add to the desirability of the neighbourhood. What is being proposed has more curb appeal than what is currently there.
- Like the design, the applicant has done a great job with a tough site. Three bedroom townhouse units are needed for family housing.
- Townhouse developments are an under utilized approach to densification.
- A concern was expressed with the proposed increase to the building height and the reduction to the rear setbacks. Looking at the townhouses to the north, member felt that this proposal was pushing the limits a little further in terms of density and massing.
- Concerns were raised with the parking limitations; there is no street parking available on Tillicum Road.
- What is the difference between Floor Area Ratio and Lot Coverage? Mr. Parkes advised that Lot Coverage is calculated from a plan view or overhead view and the principal and accessory building footprints, including protrusions, contribute to the calculation of lot coverage. Floor Area Ratio, a measure of density, in this case, is defined as the interior livable space all floors with the exception of the garage space. A member then asked if the Floor Area Ratio was reduced to 0.70 or less would the lot coverage also be reduced? Mr. Parkes advised that potentially it would, depending on the applicant's approach. Mr. Yamamoto clarified that if they

reduced the Floor Area Ratio to 0.70, it would also reduce the Lot Coverage. A member commented that the applicant should consider reducing the Floor Area Ratio to .70 or less.

- A Member asked for clarification on the definition of amenities. Mr. Parkes advised that the Official Community Plan, Section 2.2.4.1 outlines what the amenities might be and gave some examples.
- Member asked about bicycle storage and bike lockups for the project. Mr. Yamamoto advised that bicycle storage could be accommodated in the garages and the bike lockup for use of visitors would be located at the entrance to each unit.
- Concerns that this development will not be affordable housing. What is your definition of affordable? Mr. Yamamoto advised that it would not be affordable for everyone. It is affordable to a range of tenure. Another member commented that home ownership for one unit in a townhouse development will be less expensive than owning a single family dwelling. Mr. Yamamoto added that he thinks they are making the most efficient use of this land. He stated that density equals affordability; if you put 100 units on this lot it is going to be affordable, but not very livable.
- Concerns with the sightlines for vehicles coming down the driveway. Mr. Yamamoto advised that they are very cognizant of that and will ensure that the landscaping is attuned to the sightlines.
- A member raised concern with the relationship between the private realm and the street, noting it is really hard to contend with a large uninterrupted retaining wall adjacent to the sidewalk.
- A member commented that the reason density is desirable is to allow for walking, transit and biking, however, this development is at the top of a 14% grade ramp which residents and visitors will have to climb up within the driveway area.

RECOMMENDATION:

Moved by Ken Armour, seconded by Graeme Dempster: That the Esquimalt Advisory Planning Commission [APC] recommends that the application for OCP amendment and rezoning to authorize development of 1052 Tillicum Road as five Townhouse Residential units contained in two detached buildings, incorporating siting, height and massing consistent with the architectural plans provided by Zebra Design stamped "Received September 18, 2017" be forwarded to Council with a recommendation for **approval with the following condition** that the FLOOR AREA RATIO be reduce to .70 or less. The reason: Townhouse residential is a desirable building form to add densification to the Community. **The Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

VI. PLANNER'S STATUS REPORT

- 615 Fernhill Road - Staff are developing the Amendment Bylaw for presentation to Council
- 464 Head Street (The Wet Bay Triangle Project) - is approved and through the Development Permit process.
- 460 Head Street (West Bay Quay) – Staff are working on the Section 219 covenant, once it is registered the Rezoning Application will be going back to Council for adoption. The Design Review Committee has reviewed the Development Permit and complemented it unanimously. Once the Rezoning Application is adopted and the Development Permit approved the project is in a position to move forward.

VII. COUNCIL LIAISON

- Councillor Liberchuk advised the Commission Members that variances are not precedent setting. Council considers Variance Applications on a case by case basis.
- Councillor Liberchuk also thanked the Commission Member for expressing their concern about affordable housing with this development. If an applicant is saying that the development is affordable then you need to know what definition of affordability they are using. Affordability can mean different things to different people. Density does not equal affordability, you can have 100 condos that are very expensive. The Official Community Plan does have a definition of affordability which relates to income. A member then commented that is challenging for a Commission member to determine affordability by income when the prices of the units are not known.

VIII. INPUT FROM APC TO STAFF

- A member commented that Esquimalt has adopted a 38% greenhouse gas reduction target by 2020 and thought it would be useful when providing the green building features in the Staff Report to include how every project is actually moving towards or away from this target. Mr. Parkes advised that is something that Staff could look at.
- Is Esquimalt considering any sites for the Modular Housing Units that are being considered by the CRD? Councillor Liberchuk advised that there has been no discussion at Council.
- Has any thought been given to staff providing the recommendation in their Staff Report? Mr. Parkes advised that the intent of the Staff Report is to present the facts and provide the information as it exists. The Commission Members can then come to their own decisions as it relates to their recommendation. Council Liberchuk then added that Council hears from Staff, the Commission Members and the Applicants/Developers independently.

IX. NEXT REGULAR MEETING

Tuesday, November 21, 2017

X. ADJOURNMENT

On motion the meeting adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

CERTIFIED CORRECT

CHAIR, ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
THIS 21th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2017

ANJA NURVO, CORPORATE OFFICER