



# CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

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

## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 18-096      **Version:** 1      **Name:**  
**Type:** Staff Report      **Status:** Passed  
**File created:** 2/21/2018      **In control:** Council  
**On agenda:** 2/26/2018      **Final action:** 2/26/2018  
**Title:** Rezoning Application - 669 Constance Avenue, "Corvette Landing", Staff Report DEV-18-011

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. Schedule A - Bylaw No. 2915, 2. Schedule B - Site Map Airphoto OCP LUD Map and Policies, 3. Schedule C - Green Building Check List, 4. Schedule D - Owner's Narrative, 5. Schedule E - Architect Narrative, 6. Schedule F - Parking Transportation Study, 7. Schedule G - Base Commander Letter, Landscaping, 8. Schedule H - Public Open House Report, 9. Schedule I - Drawings Rnd CB LP BCLS

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
2/26/2018	1	Council	approved	Pass

## REQUEST FOR DECISION

**DATE:** February 21, 2018

Report No. DEV-18-011

**TO:** Laurie Hurst, Chief Administrative Officer

**FROM:** Trevor Parkes, Senior Planner

### SUBJECT:

Rezoning Application, 'Corvette Landing', 669 Constance Avenue and 658 Admirals Road and 662 Admirals Road.

### RECOMMENDATION:

1. That Council resolves that Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050, Amendment Bylaw No. 2915, attached as Schedule 'A' to Staff Report DEV-18-011, which would amend Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050 by changing the zoning designation of PID 004-574-451, Lot 1, Suburban Lots 43 and 44, Esquimalt District, Plan 13563 [669 Constance Avenue] and PID 023-768-410, Lot A of Suburban Lots 43 and 44, Esquimalt District, Plan VIP65333 [658 Admirals Road] shown cross-hatched on Schedule 'A' of Amendment Bylaw No. 2915, from RM-4 [Multiple Family Residential] Zone to CD No. 107 [Comprehensive Development District No. 107], and by changing the zoning designation of PID 017-827-540, Lot 1, Suburban Lot 43, Esquimalt District, Plan VIP54521 [662 Admirals Road], also shown cross-hatched on Schedule 'A' of Amendment Bylaw No. 2915, from RM-1 [Multiple Family Residential] Zone to CD No. 107 [Comprehensive Development District No. 107], **be considered for first and second reading;** and

2. That Council authorizes the Corporate Officer to schedule a Public Hearing for Zoning Bylaw 1992,

No. 2050, Amendment Bylaw No. 2915, and to advertise for same in the local newspaper.

## **RELEVANT POLICY:**

Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2006, No. 2646

Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050

Parking Bylaw, 1992, No. 2011

Development Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw, 2012, No. 2791

Advisory Planning Commission Bylaw, 2012, No. 2792

Subdivision and Development Control Bylaw, 1997, No. 2175

## **STRATEGIC RELEVANCE:**

This Request for Decision does not directly relate to a specific strategic objective.

## **BACKGROUND:**

### **Purpose of the Application**

The applicant is requesting a change in zoning from the current mix of Medium Density Multiple Family Residential [RM-4] and Low Density Townhouse Multiple Family Residential [RM-1] zones to a Comprehensive Development District No. 107 [CD No.107]. This change is required to accommodate the proposed 12 storey, mass timber, 83 unit, multiple family, prefabricated, residential building including, as a principal feature, a generous, glass enclosed, two storey lobby, multiple purpose room and amenity space located at grade off Admirals Road and situated above mechanical and storage areas and 3 levels of underground parking totaling 83 spaces. The residential units rise in a staggered form from 5/6 storeys abutting Constance Avenue to 10 (11) storeys adjacent to Admirals Road. The building stretches between Admirals Road and Constance Avenue forming the shape of the letter 'U' surrounding a central courtyard. This design approach loads the building mass toward the edges of the property, claiming a minimum setback of 3.1m at the closest point to Admirals Road, 1.5m to the northern side lot line, 0.80m at the closest point to Constance Ave and 2.7m to the southern side lot line thereby retaining the south exposed central courtyard for use of residents.

**Evaluation of this application should focus on issues relevant to zoning such as the appropriateness of the proposed height, density and massing, proposed unit sizes, siting, setbacks, lot coverage, useable open space, how the building relates to adjacent and surrounding sites and whether the proposed uses are appropriate and consistent with the overall direction contained within the Official Community Plan.**

This site is located within Development Permit Area No. 1 - Multi-Unit Residential. Specific form and character issues relating to the aesthetics of the building, such as cladding materials, window materials, doorways, streetscape improvements and landscaping, will be evaluated in a separate application for Development Permit should this rezoning application be approved by Council.

### **Timeline**

- September 19, 2017: Application for rezoning received by Development Services.
- November 8, 2017: Application presented to Design Review Committee.
- November 28, 2017: Application presented to Advisory Planning Commission.
- December 13, 2017: Application was returned to Design Review Committee.
- February 26, 2018: Amendment Bylaw No. 2915 prepared by staff and presented to Council for consideration of first and second reading.

## **Context**

Applicant: Standing Stone Developments [Casey O'Byrne and Troy Grant]

Owner: 0776378 BC Ltd, Inc. BC0776378 [Standing Stone Developments]

Property Size: Metric: 1933 m<sup>2</sup> Imperial: 20800 ft<sup>2</sup>

Existing Land Use: 6 Unit, Multiple Family Apartment/ Duplex/ Vacant Land

Surrounding Land Uses:

North: Department of National Defense Lands

South: Multiple Family Residential

West: Department of National Defense Lands

East: Single Family Residential/ Two Family Residential Dwellings

Existing OCP Designation: Multi-Unit, High-Rise Residential [No Change Required]

Existing Zoning: Medium Density Multiple Family Residential [RM-4] and Low Density Townhouse Multiple Family Residential [RM-1]

Proposed Zoning: CD No. 107 [Comprehensive Development District No. 107]

## **Schedules**

Schedule A: Bylaw No. 2915 to Amend Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050

Schedule B: Subject Property Map, Air Photo, OCP LUD Map, OCP Policies

Schedule C: Green Building Checklist

Schedule D: Developer Narrative

Schedule E: Architects Narrative

Schedule F: Bunt Engineering Parking and Traffic Assessment

Schedule G: Canadian Forces Base Esquimalt Letter of Commitment - Landscaping

Schedule H: Developer Public Open House Summary

Schedule I: Architectural Drawings, Renderings, Shadow Diagrams, Concept Colour Board, Concept Landscape Plan and BC Land Surveyor Site Plan

## **Comments From Other Departments**

The plans for this proposal were circulated to other departments and the following comments were received by the Staff Report submission deadline:

**Community Safety Services:** Building to be constructed to requirements of BC Building Code and is subject to municipal bylaw compliance. A safety plan for construction of the building will be required should this rezoning application be approved.

After discussions with Township management and knowledgeable third parties, it has been determined that the applicant would be required to secure site specific building code regulations for this proposal to be constructed in Esquimalt.

**Engineering Services:** Engineering staff have completed a preliminary evaluation of Works and Services that would be required for the 83 unit multiple family residential building proposed to be located at 669 Constance Avenue. Staff confirms that the design appears achievable on the site and

that appropriate works and services are available in the immediate area. If approved the development must be serviced in accordance with bylaw requirements including, but not limited to, new sewer and drain connections, underground hydro, telephone and cable services and new road works may be required up to the centre line of both Constance Avenue and Admirals Road. Staff recommend a traffic study be provided to evaluate the function and potential issues associated with the proposed drop off area on the Admirals Road frontage. Staff also advise the applicant to complete a sewer capacity study to determine if the existing network has the capacity to accept the increased sewer flow generated by the proposed development.

Should the application be approved, additional comments will be provided when detailed civil engineering drawings are submitted as part of a Building Permit application.

**Parks Services:** Should the application for rezoning be approved, a Tree Survey of the trees proposed for retention on the site will be required as part of the consideration of the Development Permit. If all trees on the site are to be removed to accommodate development, Tree Removal Permits shall be required for their removal and either appropriate funds or installation of not less than five appropriately sized replacement trees shall be required.

**Fire Services:** Esquimalt Fire/ Rescue staff have completed a preliminary review of the proposal and note that a comprehensive Building Code and Fire Code Review report should be provided by the applicant regarding this development. Staff are of the opinion that unimpeded aerial access to the east, west, and north faces of the building is necessary to ensure adequate access to the building in the event of an emergency involving fire suppression or life safety. Accordingly, **Fire/ Rescue staff recommend to Council that approval of this development be subject to the developer agreeing to redirect overhead hydro lines abutting the site, as well as those immediately to the north of the subject properties, underground to avoid conflicts.** Additionally, given the size of the building, **Fire/ Rescue staff recommend that approval of this project also be conditional upon the provision of public realm fire hydrants on both the Constance Avenue and Admirals Road frontages to ensure access to adequate water supply in the event of a fire.** Development Services staff have addressed these issues with the applicant who has voluntarily offered to consider including these provisions in a Section 219 covenant registered on the property title in support of adoption of the proposed rezoning.

**Development Services:** In crafting Amendment Bylaw No. 2915, staff recognized that it would be appropriate to consolidate the three distinct property titles into one legal parcel and recommend Council make this a condition of consideration of adoption of Bylaw No. 2915. Staff also note the off-site amenities proposed by the applicant, consisting of the boulevard improvement on the west side of Constance Avenue, including civil works and landscaping, the landscaping installation proposed abutting the northern Side Lot Line located on Federal Government lands, and boulevard improvements abutting the site on both the Admirals Road and Constance Avenue frontages remain unsecured at this time [Schedule I]. Staff have addressed the issue of providing Council with assurance these features would be installed should the development be approved with the applicant who has voluntarily offered to secure these amenities within the structure of a Section 219 covenant in support of their rezoning application. Furthermore, staff confirm that the applicant has engaged the CFB Esquimalt Chief of Staff regarding the landscaping proposed for their property and secured a commitment to install landscaping adjacent to the northern Side Lot Line of the site should this development proposal be approved [Schedule G].

#### **Comments from Design Review Committee:**

This application was originally considered at the regular meeting of DRC held on November 8, 2017.

Members' comments were mixed, with some members indicating support for the passive house certification and innovative approach to building design while others stated concerns regarding the reduced setbacks, overall mass, height and lot coverage of the building. A member stated that the building fails to respect the scale of the built environment in the local area; however members also noted that the OCP designates this area for significant densification.

The DRC recommended to Council that the application be amended and presented again to the Design Review Committee with a focus on addressing the following:

1. Consider increasing setbacks;
2. Consider reducing lot coverage;
3. Consider reducing the proximity to adjacent neighbouring properties; and
4. Consider reducing the proximity to the public realm.

The reason: The proposal as presented raises a number of concerns as identified in the motion.

### **Comments from Advisory Planning Commission:**

This application was considered at the regular meeting of APC held on November 28, 2017.

Members' comments were generally positive, noting that this proposal would be a great improvement at the north end of Constance Street. Members expressed concerns with relationship between the building and Admirals Road stating it is a tall mass very close to Admirals Road. Other members elaborated on this theme stating the face of the building looks monolithic and imposing and the design or the facade needs something to make the building look a little less imposing and a little less institutional. Members questioned staff regarding the Township's ability to ensure Passive House Certification will be done and staff assured them tools are available to achieve this requirement. Members requested clarification on how the building would be approved as it does meet existing BC Building Code standard requirements and they were advised that either an "alternative solutions" approach or a site specific Building Code requirement approach could be applied to the design to allow the building to proceed. A member questioned the applicant regarding their definition of "affordable" and was advised by the applicant that affordability means that you have the possibility to get a space that you find desirable and that is flexible, while remaining attainable.

The APC recommended to Council that the application **be forwarded to Council with a recommendation for approval** as the proposed number of parking spaces are reasonable and the setback relaxations are reasonable given the irregular shape of the parcel and the context of the location.

*[Staff note that this recommendation was based, in part, on the assurance that only the number of parking spaces would be reduced to one space per unit, and that all other requirements of the parking bylaw would be met.]*

### **Applicant Response to DRC and APC:**

In response to the recommendations and comments received from both the DRC and APC, the applicant's design team revised the project plans in an effort to address the identified concerns. An amended set of architectural plans, stamped "Received December 7, 2017", was presented to staff with the applicant requesting the amendments be forwarded to the DRC for re-consideration. Specific changes identified by the applicant include the following:

- Breaking down the building massing into more clearly legible 'mini-towers'
- Breaking down the 'mini-towers' into scales of 2-3 floors with recessed floors in between; thus creating perceptions more in line with the scale of the adjacent neighbourhood or that of a house through the creation of a subtle screening abstraction with vertical facade elements
- Squaring off the Eastern most mini tower to create a less flat Admirals facade with a negative

- corner, therefore reducing and mitigating the impact of the front façade
- Further, setting back the lobby at the North East corner to relieve pressure on the sidewalk
- Add a 'bosque' of trees at North East corner
- Terracing the South East mini tower towards Admirals, thus complying with the OCP requirement for setbacks
- Update to the walkways, calming their appearance
- Amended lobby design resulting in a substantially increased setback from Admirals Road at grade
- Amended massing of the building towards Admirals Road

### **Comments from Design Review Committee [Second Review]:**

The application was reconsidered at the regular meeting of DRC held on December 13, 2017.

Members' comments included the following:

- A compliment to the applicant, stating the changes improved the project significantly
- Recognition that smart building technology and green building initiatives are really great
- Concerns that the design does not comply with the Official Community Plan policy stating that buildings with shallow setbacks must step down to no more than three storeys at street level in order to provide an appropriate human scale along the sidewalk
- Concerns about the fit of the development for the current community in that the proposal is not responding to the character of the existing neighbourhood
- Concerns were raised regarding the building wall on Admirals Road; the building turns its back on the community
- Suggestion the building be reoriented to face the other way to embrace the community. If the building was reoriented it would change the height profile by having the highest component at the low end of the slope and the shorter component at the high end of the slope
- Endorsement of the current design as appropriate as the building was designed as a gateway element and it does exactly that
- Concern the building seems adult oriented and the courtyard isn't age friendly; there is nothing for small children
- Concerns regarding the size of the parking spaces and their functionality
- Statement that 'Market affordability' is an oxymoron, as there is no such thing as market affordable housing; rather, this is market housing for Esquimalt. *The applicant clarified that they are targeting people who earn \$68,000.00 to \$72,000.00 per year.*
- Concerns expressed with the south elevation, particularly the large staircase and the exposed walkways including a statement that this 12 storey building will look extremely hard and uncomfortable in terms of its fit and design esthetics
- Question if the project would be feasible as a 6 storey building instead of the proposed 12 storey building

The DRC forwarded the application to Council **for consideration with the understanding that the Design Review Committee wants to bring to Council's attention that the project does not comply with the Official Community Plan step back guidelines.**

The Reason: The design as presented has a street wall on Admirals Road that is too high.

### **Official Community Plan**

This proposal is consistent with the current Land Use Designation applied to the subject Property, "Multi-Unit, High-Rise Residential".

*OCP Section 2 - Managed Growth - Land Use and Development* states that the objectives and policies in this section are designed to promote sustainable land use and development in the community.

OCP 2.0.1(a) states the Township should encourage high quality development that enhances and benefits the community as a whole.

OCP 2.0.2(a) states Esquimalt's future new development, infill and redevelopment will be in accordance with the land use designations shown on OCP Schedule A, together with the guidelines set out in Development Permit Areas (OCP Section 9).

OCP 2.0.2(e) states the Township will encourage development and redevelopment that minimizes and mitigates the risks associated with natural hazards and increases the community's resilience to hazard events. The applicant has provided staff with a tsunami review indicating the site is not in danger of significant damage by a tsunami.

*OCP Section 2.2 - Residential Land Use* of the Official Community Plan recognizes that modest growth is likely to occur through the infilling of vacant or under-utilized parcels, redevelopment of existing residential properties to higher densities (such as townhouses, apartment buildings and mixed commercial-residential uses) and the replacement of existing buildings. Objectives and policies of this section are intended to ensure residential growth occurs in a manner that maintains and enhances individual neighbourhoods and the community as a whole.

Section 2.2.1(a) states the Township should work toward a more complete community by maintaining a healthy mixture of housing types, accommodating people with a wide range of income levels.

Section 2.2.1(b) states the Township should encourage new residential development with high design standards for building and landscaping and which enhance existing and new neighbourhoods.

*OCP Section 2.2.4.1 Multi-Unit Residential Policies* [Schedule B] are intended to provide more predictability for residents and give direction to design teams preparing development proposals. This proposal for 83 Apartment Residential Units is consistent with many policies contained in this section with the following exceptions:

Section 2.2.4.1(f) states that wherever desirable and achievable consideration will be given to special needs and assisted housing including seniors, disabled persons and families. It is unclear at this time if any units are proposed to be constructed to accessibility standards or will be easily adaptable to meet special needs requirements.

Section 2.2.4.1(g) states that within the areas designated as Townhouse Residential, Multi-Unit, Low-Rise Residential and Multi-Unit, High-Rise Residential, the following criteria will be used to evaluate development proposals requiring an application for rezoning:

- The massing and height of the project will respond sensitively to the prevailing character of the immediate neighbourhood. This will vary by location;
- The project will relate to the street. Its exterior finishes, scale, treatment of parking areas, and landscaping, will enhance the appearance of the neighbourhood and contribute positively to the streetscape;
- The proponent will demonstrate that the neighbourhood has been consulted in a fair and

meaningful way, and that residents' concerns have been appropriately responded to in the proposal; and

- Where new multi-unit residential projects are proposed, they should not "land-lock", otherwise isolate, or negatively affect the development potential of adjacent parcels. Projects must either consolidate the isolated parcels or leave a sufficient area available to allow for the eventual redevelopment of the adjacent land.

Staff note that it would be challenging to design any building that would respond sensitively to the existing neighbourhood character of 2 to 4 storey construction while realizing 12 storeys in height as endorsed by the Multi-Unit, High Rise Residential Land Use Designation. Notwithstanding this, it is the opinion of staff that due to the substantial lot coverage proposed for this building, the significantly reduced setbacks, and the substantial height and mass of the project located in proximity to neighbouring parcels as well as the public realm on both Constance Ave and Admirals Road, this proposal is not consistent with Bullets 1 and 2 of this guideline.

*OCP Section 2.2.4.4 Multi-Unit, High-Rise Residential* states that in areas designated Multi-Unit, High-Rise Residential on Schedule A, building heights of up to 12 storeys are acceptable with a Floor Area Ratio of up to 3.0. Buildings with shallow setbacks must step down to no more than three storeys at street level in order to provide appropriate human scale along the sidewalk. The requirements and guidelines of Development Permit Area No. 1 apply.

The applicant has revised the design by enhancing the impact of the two storey lobby, multi-purpose room and amenity space on the pedestrian realm [Schedule I]. Noting this, the proposed building remains inconsistent with this policy as the lowest components of the building's residential floors rise to 5 and 6 storeys abutting Constance Avenue and to 7 and 11 storeys adjacent to Admirals Road. While the design includes a modest step back above the second storey lobby experienced from south end of the Admirals Road public realm, the building cantilevers on the north end of the Admirals Road frontage loading substantial building mass in close proximity to the sidewalk.

*OCP Section 3.3.1(a) Affordable Housing Objectives* states that the Township should encourage a range of housing by type, tenure, and price to ensure that people of all ages, household types, abilities and incomes have a diversity of housing choice in Esquimalt.

*OCP Section 9.3 Development Permit Area No. 1 - Multi-Unit Residential* [Schedule B] contains Development Permit Guidelines for land designated Multi-Unit Residential. As the Development Permit is not being considered at this time it would be inappropriate to address many of these guidelines with the following exceptions that are relevant to the discussion of zoning issues:

Section 9.3.5(b) states, in part, that new buildings should be designed and sited to minimize visual intrusion onto the privacy of surrounding homes and minimize the casting of shadows onto the private outdoor space of adjacent residential units. The proposed building is designed to be 36 metres in height with substantial mass therefore it is expected to cast shadows on properties to the east and west. Land to the north of this parcel is controlled by the Federal Government and staff are not currently aware of any proposed change of uses from the green space, roadway and parking lots currently in place, therefore shadowing is of less concern. Shadow analysis provided by the applicant [Schedule I] reveals that in the afternoon in spring, summer and fall, shadows would impact parcels located immediately across Admirals Road.

Residential units in this proposal are sited in particularly close proximity to the front and north and south interior side lot lines, when compared to established zoning standards for multiple family



residential development. Fortunately, there is little impact from overlook to the west and the north as these are dominantly unpopulated lands. This cannot be claimed on lands to the south and east where substantial overlook would occur due to the proposed setback profile, particularly at the southeastern and southwestern corners of the site. Staff note that overlook onto adjacent sites is an unavoidable consequence given the proposed height of the building.

Section 9.3.5(c) states that high density multi-unit residential buildings should be designed so that the upper storeys are stepped back from the building footprint with lower building heights along the street. It is the opinion of staff that, while the applicant has enhanced the lobby space adjacent to Admirals Road, this proposal is not consistent with this design guideline.

## **Zoning**

**Density, Lot Coverage, Siting and Setbacks:** The following chart details the setbacks, lot coverage, floor area ratio and parking of this proposal with the requirements of the RM-5 [Multiple Residential Zone] which is the most dense “base zone” in Bylaw No. 2050 which only accommodates a building up to 6 storeys in height. Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050 does not contain a zone that could accommodate this proposal:

	<b>RM-5 (MF High Density)</b>	<b>CD 107 Zone (MF 83 Units)</b>
<b>Minimum Unit Size</b>	N/A	35 m <sup>2</sup> to 90 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Floor Area Ratio</b>	1.5	3.0
<b>Lot Coverage</b>	30%/ 25% above 2 <sup>nd</sup> storey	87%/ 55% above 2 <sup>nd</sup> storey
<b>Setbacks:</b>		
<b>Front</b>	7.5 m	0.8 m (Constance Ave)
<b>Rear</b>	7.5 m	3.1 m (Admirals Road)
<b>Side</b>	7.5 m/ 7.5 m	2.7 m/ 1.5 m
<b>Building Height</b>	20.0 m (6 storeys)	36.0m (12 storeys)
<b>Off Street Parking</b>	1.3 spaces/ unit	1.0 space/ unit (including relaxations to maneuvering and stall dimension requirements)

**Floor Area Ratio:** Floor Area Ratio measures buildable space in ratio to the size of the lot on which a building sits. The F.A.R of this proposal is 3.0 (2.99) which is consistent with the maximum density of 3.0 identified within the OCP for lands designated Multi-Unit High-Rise Residential.

**Lot Coverage:** Lot Coverage measures 55% for the proposed building however this value does not accommodate the underground parking structure which adds significantly to the functional site coverage of the site, raising it to 87% coverage. Staff note a concern that the combination of the underground parking garage, as designed, and the proposed building results in limited opportunities for the planting of significant trees in native soil on the site as part of the landscaping plan.

**Height:** The OCP states that High-Rise developments in Esquimalt are limited to a height of 12 storeys [approximately 36 metres] measured to the highest portion of the roof from average grade. The applicant proposes a building consistent with this height measuring 36 metres from grade incorporating a total of 12 storeys.

**Setbacks:** As noted in the preamble to the table above, the Township zoning bylaw does not contain any zone that accommodates this proposal. Noting this, the zoning bylaw does contemplate taller multiple family residential buildings being setback to ensure the impact of mass and height are mitigated for those parcels adjacent to the development and the public realm. As noted, the RM-5 zone which accommodates buildings up to 6 storeys in height requires front, rear and side setbacks of 7.5m.

This design approach, proposing a building forming the shape of the letter 'U' surrounding a central courtyard, loads the building mass toward the edges of the property. The result is a building claiming a minimum setback of 3.1m at the closest point to Admirals Road, 1.5m to the northern side lot line, 0.8m at the closest point to Constance Ave and 2.7m to the southern side lot line thereby retaining the south exposed central courtyard for use of residents. Staff note that the applicant is seeking a custom zone to accommodate this proposal; however, as this is a residential, not a commercial mixed use building, staff have concerns with this unconventional approach to building siting, particularly as it relates to the parcels to the south of the site and to the public realm of both Constance Avenue and Admirals Road.

It is noteworthy that the applicant has amended the design in an attempt to mitigate the proximity of the building abutting Admirals Road with particular attention to the northeast corner of the site. While these changes, in the opinion of staff, positively impact the design, staff note that there has been no substantive changes made to overall building setbacks, with the exception of the recessed lobby/amenity room at the Admirals Road street level.

**Parking:** Parking Bylaw, 1992, No. 2011 requires 1.3 parking spaces per unit be provided in multiple family developments, with not less than 1 in 4 spaces dedicated to Visitor Parking. Parking areas (i.e. parking lots and underground parking garages) are required to be constructed to meet the standards for maneuvering aisle dimensions and associated parking stall dimensions detailed in Part 14, Table 2, of the Bylaw.

This development proposal incorporates 83 residential parking spaces within an underground parking structure including 8 visitor spaces and proposes a number of relaxations to Parking Bylaw No. 2011 requirements to achieve this number of spaces on three levels of underground parking. The applicant has provided a parking study, crafted by Bunt Engineering and stamped "Received January 31, 2018", detailing the effectiveness of this parking strategy including diagrams detailing the functionality of the proposed design based on the City of Vancouver parking standards. The applicant also proposes to voluntarily improve the southern portion of the west side of Constance Avenue to include clearly visible on-street parking adjacent to the development.

The following relaxations to Parking Bylaw No. 2011 are proposed:

- Reduction of the number of required parking spaces from 1.3 spaces/ unit to 1.0 spaces/ unit [i.e. from 108 spaces to 83 spaces].
- Reduction of the number of required Visitor parking spaces from 1 in 4 spaces to 1 in 11 spaces [i.e. from 27 spaces to 8 spaces].
- Increase of the number of permitted Small Car parking spaces from 50% to 59% [i.e. from 42 spaces to 49 spaces].
- Reduction of the width of a two way maneuvering aisle accessing two banks of parking from 7.6 metres to 6.6 metres.

- Reduction of the width of a two way maneuvering aisle accessing one bank of parking from 6.75 metres to 6.0 metres.
- Reduction of the width of a 90 degree regular parking stall from 2.6 metres to 2.5 metres.
- Reduction of the width of a 90 degree small car parking stall from 2.6 metres to 2.3 metres.
- Reduction of the width of a parking stall located parallel to the maneuvering aisle from 6.7 metres to 6.4 metres.
- Reduction of the requirement where any parking space abuts any portion of a fence or structure, the minimum stall width shall be increased by 0.3 metres from 0.3 metres to 0.0 metres.

Development Services and Engineering Services staff have reviewed the proposed design and confirm that it appears functional for small cars, mid-sized Sport Utility Vehicles [SUVs] and minivans. It is the opinion of staff that the proposed parking stall design could not functionally accommodate larger vehicles such as full sized trucks and full sized SUVs, nor would space widths proposed abutting walls allow larger doored vehicles [two door sedans and sports cars] to open their doors sufficiently for occupants to exit the vehicle when parked. This raises a concern from staff that potential residents who may require/ prefer larger vehicles will either be excluded from purchasing units or will choose to park on local streets adding unintended congestion in the local area.

## ISSUES:

### 1. Rationale for Selected Option

The proposed 12 storey, 83 unit, multiple family development is consistent with the current OCP land use designation and there are a number of OCP policies which support the use of this parcel as Multi-Unit, High Rise Residential. The site is located on a major road and transit route and in proximity to Esquimalt Village commercial services and Canadian Forces Base Esquimalt, a major employer in the Capital Region therefore densification is desirable. The site is also significant in that it is the northernmost privately held set of parcels on the west side of Admirals Road and therefore represents a “gateway” location being the first non-institutional development site experienced by southbound traffic after the Colville Road intersection.

The APC recommended approval of the application noting acceptance of the reduction to the number of parking spaces and the setbacks as presented.

The applicant has responded to some the concerns identified by staff and the DRC with revisions to the design thereby improving the proposal. The applicant has expressed interest in delivering units that may be affordable and appealing to a variety of buyers and offer a diversified stock of unit types to the community.

Notwithstanding the above, it is noteworthy that the DRC, having reviewed versions of the proposal twice, remained non-committal citing concerns with the context of the building’s relationship to Admirals Road and raising questions regarding the functionality of the proposed parking consistent with staff’s position on these issues.

### 2. Organizational Implications

This Request for Decision has no organizational implications.

### 3. Financial Implications

This Request for Decision has no financial implications.

### 4. Sustainability & Environmental Implications

The applicant has completed the Esquimalt Green Building Check List, detailing green features that will be considered for inclusion in the development should it be approved [Schedule C]. Of

particular note is the applicant's commitment to construct the building to meet 'Passive House' certification.

5. Communication & Engagement

As this is a rezoning application, should it proceed to a Public Hearing, a notice would be mailed to tenants and owners of properties located within 100 metres (328 ft) of the subject properties. Notice of the Public Hearing would be placed in two editions of the Victoria News and the sign indicating that the property is under consideration for both an OCP and Zoning amendment would be updated to show the date, time and location of the Public Hearing.

The applicant held a Public Open House [Schedule H] and met with local residents and neighbours on January 9, 2018 in order to comply with the public consultation procedures of Development Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Council consider reading Amendment Bylaw No. 2915 a first and second time, and direct staff to schedule a Public Hearing.
2. Council postpone consideration of Amendment Bylaw No. 2915 pending receipt of additional information.
3. Council deny first and second reading of Amendment Bylaw No. 2915.