



# CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

## Minutes - Draft

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

### APC Design Review Committee

---

Wednesday, August 10, 2022

2:30 PM

Esquimalt Council Chambers

---

**Present:** 5 - Member Derek Jenkins  
Member Tara Todesco  
Member Xeniya Vins  
Member Chris Windjack  
Member Shaun Smakal

**Regrets:** 2 - Chair Graeme Verhulst  
Member Richard McGrew

Staff Present: Bill Brown, Director of Development Services  
James Davison, Manager of Development Services  
Alex Tang, Development Planner  
Benjamin Lee, Recording Secretary

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Bill Brown, Director of Development Services called the Design Review Committee meeting to order at 2:33 PM and gave a Territorial Acknowledgment.

#### 2. LATE ITEMS

The following late item was added to the Agenda:

\* Pertaining to Item 7. Staff Reports 3) Rezoning Application - Proposed 119 - Unit  
6-Storey Apartment Building - 884 Lampson Street  
- Green Building Checklist

#### 3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Moved by Member Todesco, seconded by Member Jenkins: That the agenda be approved as circulated with the inclusion of the late items. Carried Unanimously.

#### 4. OTHER BUSINESS

##### 1) [22-410](#) Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Brown opened the floor to nominations for Chair. Member Verhulst was the only nomination received for the role of Chair.

Moved by Member Windjack, seconded by Member Vins: That Member Verhulst be nominated for Chair. Carried Unanimously.

Member Verhulst was appointed to the position of Chair of the APC Design Review Committee.

Mr. Brown opened the floor to nominations for Vice Chair. Member Todesco was the only nomination received for the role of Vice Chair.

Moved by Member Windjack, seconded by Member Vins: That Member Todesco be nominated for Vice Chair. Carried Unanimously.

Member Todesco was appointed to the position of Vice Chair of the APC Design Review Committee.

Vice Chair Todesco assumed the role of Chair.

## 5. MINUTES

- 1) [22-402](#) Minutes of the Design Review Committee Meeting, April 13, 2022
- 2) [22-403](#) Minutes of the Design Review Committee Meeting, May 11, 2022
- 3) [22-405](#) Minutes of the Design Review Committee Meeting, June 8, 2022

Moved by Member Vins, seconded by Member Jenkins: That the minutes of the Design Review Committee meeting held on April 13, 2022, Design Review Committee meeting held on May 11, 2022 and Design Review Committee meeting held June 8, 2022 be approved as circulated. Carried Unanimously.

## 6. PRESENTATIONS

- 1) [22-401](#) Dan Casey - Presentation on Integrated Parking Strategy & Regulatory Framework

Bill Brown, Director of Development Services introduced Dan Casey, Transportation Planner, Urban Systems. Mr. Casey presented the Integrated Parking Strategy & Regulatory Framework.

Committee comments (Staff and Applicant responses in italics):

\* Clarification on 1.2 cars per household in SFD vs 0.8 in multi-family apartment: Data source from CRD taking into account from multi-family, townhouses, -- forms of housing. Public comments want more parking.

\* Question on vacant parking stalls: *Proprietary data from Urban - not as comprehensive data set as CRD*. Observation of parkades that are full vs under-utilized parkades where stalls are being rented out.

\* Objective is to reduce parking requirements including matching parking demand close to site or conditions that justify varying parking supply - ex. 3-bedroom condo unit will have different needs. Also testing for demand based on location - commercial areas, transit routes.

\* Township needs to build 3-bedroom apartment units - reluctance by developers to provide parking due to expense. Council has been reducing parking requirement by approving parking variances. Developer suggests reducing parking requirement in tradeoff for other community contribution. Township needs municipal infrastructure to provide incentives to reduce reliance on driving.

\* Suggestion of a cash-in-lieu clause for parking stalls: Provided by developer.

Funds used for improving streetscape, improving beautification of the neighbourhood. Boulevard improvement, sidewalks; improve overall transportation circulation.

\* Safety mechanisms amongst road users: *Suggestion is well-received.*

Development guidelines support parking, facilities are designed in a way where active transportation users will increase.

\* Baseline requirement of TDM: *Being addressed.*

\* Fulfilling the maximum parking ratio has a push-pull and affects landscape design considerations. Applications can also have too many parking stalls proposed.

## 7. STAFF REPORTS

- 1) [22-381](#) Development Permit Application – 1360 Lyall Street, Staff Report No. DRC-22-015

Member Windjack recused himself from the meeting because his employer is the Landscape Architect in the application.

Alex Tang, Development Planner introduced the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Michael Mooney, Designer, MJM Architect Inc., Dan Hagel, Applicant and Owner, Bev Windjack, LADR Landscape Architects presented an overview of the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Committee comments (Staff and Applicant responses in italics):

\* Amenity space dimensions and use: *Front is communal while rest is private.*

\* Bike Racks: *Located at rear garbage area.* Not found in survey

\* Garbage pickup logistics: *Picked up via lane*

\* Curb stops: *Will be provided.*

\* Heating system: *Heat pumps.*

\* Privacy between property and adjacent SFH property: *5m.*

\* Good looking project. No concerns with landscaping.

\* Suggestion to reduce parking stalls to provide more landscaping. Positive reaction to the roof deck, repeated need for bike rack in the front of the building for visitors.

\* Communal space: Positive reaction to the roof deck. Suggestion to make the front patios on Lyall Street also a communal space. Also add more space to the rear.

\* Rear parking area: Tight space. Suggestions to make improvements to the structural soil.

\* Oversight: Concerns with privacy due to overlooking into neighbour's property - reduce impression of being looked at by providing more plantings.

\* Step 1 is insufficient: Suggestion to the Applicant to increase Step in the BC Energy Code.

\* Suggestion to the Applicant to add permeable paving to enhance landscaping

design.

\* Building rear: Increase visual interest.

Staff: *Open space is insufficient that's why application is applying for a variance.*

Would need to be allocated as communal. Applicant to fulfill open space.

Moved by Vice Chair Todesco and seconded by Member Vins: That the Esquimalt Design Review Committee recommends to Council that the application for a development permit authorizing the form and character of the proposed 3-unit residential development consistent with the architectural plans provided by MJM Architect Inc. and landscape plan provided by LADR Landscape Architects, both stamped "Received April 29, 2022", to be located at 1360 Lyall Street be forwarded to Council with a recommendation to approve the proposal with conditions, as it has a thoughtful design, has adequate landscaping, and has had overall acceptance of the massing.

The subject conditions are:

- 1) Address the communal space;
- 2) Included appropriate bike storage facilities; and,
- 3) Build to BC Energy Code Step 3 or higher.

Carried Unanimously

- 2) [22-361](#) Development Permit Application – 815 & 825 Selkirk Avenue, Staff Report No. DRC-22-014

Member Windjack returned to the meeting at 3:35 PM.

Alex Tang, Development Planner introduced the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Caitlin, Director of Projects, TLA Developments, Alan Lowe, Architect, Desi Alan Lowe Architect Inc.,

Jim Partlow, Principal Landscape Architect, Lombard North Group Inc., Hingley, Applicant, Sterling Living Limited Partnership presented an overview of the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Committee comments (Staff and Applicant responses in italics):

\* Positive reaction to the open green space off-slab, and utilizing this space to plant larger canopy projects.

\* Number and types of species for native plantings: *3-4 trees (maple, flower current multi-stem), offset by shrubs, pollinating plants.*

\* Public Art: *Provided by the Developer.*

\* Size of the depth of the private patios: *10' X 8'*

\* Positive reaction to accommodating community's concerns by reducing a storey

\* Concerns with the design: Refinement needed. Issue with the building's south elevation being very visible. Partial blank walls are unattractive.. *3D rendering includes the shadow showing the elevation: there are windows built into the units*

*facing south.*

\* Lobby is underwhelming - significant improvement needed to present better in relation to the street. Suggestion to accentuate the look of the lobby. Currently inset, low height, single door leading to a narrow corridor, not very prominent, no feeling of arrival. Not aesthetically pleasing - Suggestion to improve. *Substantial landscape elements to the entranceway. 2 large plantings, public art component, quite striking for the visitor experience.* Suggestion to the Applicant to incorporate double door at the entrance. Open up the landscape will provide a more pedestrian-centric realm by including benches, bike racks, facilitate outside chatting at building entrance - enhances building's friendliness to the street. Suggestion to leverage the public art by reorienting it away from the parkade because it screens it from the street. Suggestion to improve opening the lobby.

\* *Landscaping between the two properties to gently differentiate the parkade from the adjacent building.*

\* Suggestion to increase articulation to the building by considering a different building material to ease the impression.

\* Green amenities in the roof: Provide a mat.

\* Greenspace to the rear - positive, adds shade and doesn't block sunlight.

Moved by Vice Chair Todesco and seconded by Member Windjack: That the Esquimalt Design Review Committee recommends to Council that the application for a development permit authorizing the form and character of the proposed development of a multiple-family residential building consistent with the architectural plans provided by Alan Lowe Architects, Inc. and landscape plan provided by Lombard North Group Inc., both stamped "Received June 29, 2022", to be located at 815 Selkirk Avenue [PID 004-367-839 Lot 7, Section 10, Esquimalt District, Plan 1258] and 825 Selkirk Avenue [PID 007-656-483 Lot 8, Section 10, Esquimalt District, Plan 1258] be forwarded to Council with a recommendation to approve, with conditions, as the building is attractive, the complexity of the building articulation and presence on Selkirk Avenue, favorable landscape design with the rear greenspace and use of mature trees.

The subject conditions are:

- 1) Improvements be made to the lobby's visibility and its relationship to the streetscape; and,
- 2) The building's South elevation be addressed to mitigate the blank walls visible from Craigflower Road.

Carried Unanimously.

- 3) [22-227](#) Rezoning Application - Proposed 119-Unit 6-Storey Apartment Building - 884 Lampson Street

James Davison, Manager of Development Services introduced the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Neil Bannich, Architect and Principal, WA Architects, Gary Cowers, Co Associates,

presented an overview of the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Committee comments (Staff and Applicant responses in italics):

- \* Lot layout: No concerns from the Township to these lots and future intended use: *Awkward layout of the site is due to orphaned properties, can be used for future development. No concerns. Viability to the south building and to the east.*
- \* Parkade access: Concerns with access points from the street. *Contrast with individual driveways from private properties into 3 driveways*
- \* Parking Study in support of the proposed parking ratio.
- \* Traffic study from the Township: Left-turning vehicles from Lampson Street onto Craigflower Road will create vehicle conflicts. *Traffic impact assessment has been requested but not yet provided.* Turning right onto Lampson transfer still a concern.
- \* Craigflower and Tillicum Intersection: *Consideration of commercial area in relation to the project. Previous proposal of development of golf course rejected by Agricultural Land Commission. Other corners can be redeveloped. 3 quadrants of the intersection will remain commercial. Present use of gas stations can be redeveloped in future. Identified need for commercial.* Project's proximity to Craigflower and Tillicum, commercial considerations will rely on 1075 Tillicum Road.
- \* Construction: *Wood Frame on top of concrete. Level 1 and under is concrete.*
- \* Project location has unpleasant pedestrian experience:
- \* OCP calls for medium density: Nearby amenities such as playgrounds are there more amenities needed.
- \* Positive reaction to the ground floor units facing Tillicum Road.
- \* Positive reaction to the proposed density.
- \* Traffic impact assessment: needed
- \* Need for 3-bedroom units
- \* 1-bedroom proposed at 400 ft<sup>2</sup> is quite small; 2-bedroom at 670 ft<sup>2</sup> is small. *Intention of the project to be a strata building.*
- \* Service parking and laneway entrance: Concerns with surface stalls and suggestion to remove. Add more amenity space.
- \* Parking ratio: 0.8 stall to unit ratio is low but no further concerns
- \* Lack of commercial space: Rezoning application suitable to consider commercial in relation to the higher density. Big enough development ought to have some commercial. *Would require an OCP amendment.*
- \* Green Building checklist: Plantings in adequate soil volume for full growth trees. Concerns with mature size trees in planters - viability a concern. Small trees require less soil so project should limit the size of plantings to small trees for viability of tree health.
- \* Very long building at 6-storeys in relation to green frontage which is a storey high: Contrast is not favourable. Suggestion to the Applicant to improve landscape plan to significantly increase vertical greenery. Applicant will need to discuss with BC Hydro. Green wall is a positive in relation to the streetscape. Relocate outside

parking stalls so the increase of greenspace will make for a more attractive urban plaza amenity.

- \* No loading zone: Implications for move-in day. Would be a long way to transport items otherwise.

- \* Commercial: Some not in favour of an OCP amendment. But, adding a lot of density to the area given the population increase. *Not an area that's viable for commercial. More suitable for housing than retail space. Retail to work would require surface parking.*

- \* Length and scale of the building: Suggestion to the Applicant to further review needed to break up the frontage. Columnar trees appropriate for front to mediate space between street to lobby.

- \* East-side of project: Enhance the buffer of the project to adjacent building.

- \* Parkade entry is awkward. Proposed straight concrete ramp can be improved. Green plantings on retaining wall separating the parkade and pedestrian remains problematic due to the length of time for plantings to grow. Blank concrete wall is unattractive.

- \* Entrance to underground parkade: Suggestion to enhance materiality to distinguish it with lighting to improve look and feel.

- \* Public amenity area: Overly standard that do not consider children's use. Increase seating space, area of play, increase lawn space to enhance. Opportunity to add uniqueness

- \* Sheer length of building - can not be broken up by trees. Smaller building footprint is more desirable.

- \* Massing: Breaking up the middle of the building, demarcating it with more landscaping would be favourable.

- \* Green Building Checklist: Suggestion to the Applicant to reduce energy emissions from household waste. Water conservation: need more adherence.

- \* 6 Bike stalls being proposed: *2 full size bike rooms* with additional bike parking outside.

- \* Parking along the ramp: Suggestion to remove. Constrained space.

- \* Suggestion to consider a reduction in parking ratio: Would be appropriate given the site layout and busy drive aisle. Remove outside parking stalls. Would improve lobby access, landscaping, which would enhance the overall outdoor green space and be viewed as an amenity space. Parked cars at front of buildings are less desirable. Parking ramp with outside parking stalls is unconventional in an unfavourable look.

- \* Main entrance: Improve its relationship to the sidewalk due to tackiness.

- \* Play structure: Practical given the space. Structurally it would be problematic due to a need to dig into the slab.

- \* Off slab: *45' x 6'*

- \* Appropriate location for project.

- \* Density and Height: Appropriate

- \* Building footprint: Suggestion to the Applicant to underground the hydro lines which would make for a more functional building and resolve landscape concerns. Blank palette an issue. Scale and pedestrian comfort a major concern. Need a

blending of green to urban to account for latter issues with form and character considerations. Mature trees would then be feasible. Applicant to explore a compromise.

\* Township discussions with BC Hydro: *Very little discussion. Adds hundreds of thousands dollars in expenses to developer and would affect the construction of developing affordable housing.*

\* Tillicum frontage: Adding raised planters to offset the overhead powerlines.  
Remove outside visitor parking.

Moved by Vice Chair Todesco and seconded by Member Windjack: That the Esquimalt Design Review Committee recommends to Council that the rezoning application to authorize the proposed development of a 119-unit, 6-storey apartment building consistent with the architectural plans provided by WA Architects, attached as Appendix B to Staff Report DRC-22-012 and sited in accordance with a site plan prepared by Summit Land Surveying and included as page A100 in the architectural drawing package to be located at 884 Lampson Street and legally described as: LOT 2 SECTION 10 ESQUIMALT PLAN VIP7433 (004-312-821), LOT 5 BLOCK 6 SECTION 10 ESQUIMALT PLAN VIP2546 (004-801-849), LOT 14 BLOCK 6 SECTION 10 ESQUIMALT PLAN VIP2546 (006-323-987), LOT AM8 BLOCK 6 SECTION 10 ESQUIMALT PLAN VIP2546 (006-337-953), and LOT A SECTION 10 ESQUIMALT PLAN VIP14648 (004-243-307) be forwarded to Council with a recommendation to Approve, with conditions, as the project is of an appropriate density and provides housing options with a mix of studio to 3-bedroom units.

The subject conditions are:

- 1) Remove the exterior parking area to allow for a communal amenity space, and to acknowledge potential future property developments using Lampson Street as their frontage;
- 2) Project be built to Step 3 of the BC Energy Code;
- 3) Provide more information on the materials and waste, and water conservation measures; and,
- 4) Review landscape plan to include taller mature trees along Tillicum Road.

Carried Unanimously.

- 4) [22-404](#) Development Permit Application for an 8-storey mixed use building with 92 residential units and one commercial unit at 819-821-823 Esquimalt Road.

Bill Brown, Director of Development Services introduced the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Jason Craik, Applicant, Avenir Construction Inc. connected to the meeting conference call at 5:38 PM.

Brad, Landscape Architect and Zeidler Architecture presented an overview of the



application and responded to questions from the Committee.

Committee comments (Staff and Applicant responses in italics):

- \* *Care component of service is not provided.*

- \* Positive reaction to the landscape design: Circuit, exterior space, sensitivity of plantings used in relation to accounting for the sensitivity and sensory impressions among residents that will notice the changing of the seasons. Choice of plantings very positive. Tall planting emulating a waterfall, which is bolder and more impactful. Thoughtfulness of the landscape plan incorporating into the design and use among residents.

- \* Materiality: Positive reaction to the use of wood tops on the glass railings, a welcomed contrast to the standard aluminum railing on top of glass.

- \* Perimeter fence and shading

- \* Whether the garden bed is raised

- \* Type of turf on roof: *Sinn. Can incorporate a range of activities such as yoga.*

Moved by Member Windjack and seconded by Member Smakal: That the Esquimalt Design Review Committee [DRC] recommends that the application for a development permit to authorize development of ninety-two (92) seniors multi-family residential units and one commercial unit incorporating the height and massing consistent with the architectural plans provided by Zeidler Architecture, stamped "Received July 6, 2022", detailing the development proposed to be located at 819 Esquimalt Road [PID 009-205-292; Lot 20, Section 11, Esquimalt District, Plan VIP265]; 821 Esquimalt Road [PID 009-205-276; Lot 19, Section 11, Esquimalt District, Plan VIP265]; and 823 Esquimalt Road [PID 006-854-940; Lot 18, Section 11, Esquimalt District, Plan VIP265], be forwarded to Council with a recommendation to approve the application for the following reasons:

- \* Landscape Design is coherent with the architectural of the building which fuse together into a nice aesthetic. Landscape design also includes practical amenities for residents.

- \* Nice materiality and attractive detailing

- \* Care has been taken along Esquimalt Road to include suitable tall plantings

- \* Green screen is a major element that ties the landscape with the building architecture while providing an additional ecological benefit

- \* Major benefit for local residents

- \* Inclusion of urban agriculture is a major benefit for residents on site

- \* Form and character, scale is well done in keeping with the context of the development.

Carried Unanimously.

## 8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting of the APC Design Review Committee adjourned at 6:16 PM.

\_\_\_\_\_, CHAIR  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
THIS     DAY OF     , 2023

\_\_\_\_\_  
DEB HOPKINS, CORPORATE OFFICER  
CERTIFIED CORRECT