



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

LATE AGENDA ITEMS COUNCIL

Monday, March 7th, 2022 @ 7:00 pm
Esquimalt Council Chambers

(1) PERTAINING to Item No. 4. 1: **PUBLIC HEARING** – Rezoning Application, 820 Dunsmuir Road, Staff Report No. DEV-22-014

- Communications received from:
 - Ceri Williams
 - Paul and Gail Onderwater
 - Megan Parris
 - Murray and Chris Ambler
 - Cathy Baker
 - Valerie Hosteller
 - Harvey and Rosalie Queen
 - Josh Marrick
 - Cathie Lamont
 - Sarah Reynolds
 - Blaire Pardee

(2) PERTAINING to Item No. 5. 1: **PUBLIC HEARING** – Official Community Plan and Rezoning Application, 880 Fleming Street, Staff Report No. DEV-22-015

- Communications received from:
 - Susan Ellis
 - Kim Heffler and Jim Kelly
 - Lynn Mitchell
 - Louise Owen
 - smpedersen
 - Guuduniia LaBoucan
 - Pam Campbell
 - Lynn West
 - Joanne Winstanley
 - Dawn Massey
 - Ross Griffin
 - James Nadeau
 - Alan Barwin
 - Tara Harper and JP Restoule
 - S Greenaway
 - Charngit Sidhu
 - Alvin Menold
 - Kevin Smitten
 - Jag Mangat
 - Gurmeet Bal
 - Ravinder Chahal
 - Emanuela Bocancea

(3) PERTAINING to Item No. 7. 3: **STAFF REPORTS** – 2022 Local Grants Allocation, Staff Report No. FIN-22-002

- Correction to 2022 Local Grant Worksheet

(4) PERTAINING to Item No. 7. 6: **STAFF REPORTS** – Rezoning Application, 1075 Tillicum Road, Staff Report No. DEV-22-008

- Communications received from:
 - Gabrielle Doiron and James Martens
 - Erin Willis
 - Jeanette Kelly
 - Ryan Cole
 - Justin Temmel and Jennifer Horsfall
 - Sak Johl
 - Ron Pettapiece
 - Fred Billingham

Deborah Liske

From: Ceri Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: March-03-22 12:48 PM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: Karen Haze project

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 4 , 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From Ceri Williams
119-724 Sea Terrace
Victoria
BC V9A3R6

Dear Sir/Madam.

Regarding the planned rental unit for near me in Sea Terrace/Dunsmuir Road.

I would like to say the following:

What are you going to do to protect the natural habitat for the birds and deer and keep the noise levels down?

What are you going to do to ensure that the rental prices are realistic? Bear in mind most people cannot afford more than 1200 a month at the most on the wages in Victoria?

What are you going to do to ensure the area is safe for pedestrians and traffic -there is a lot of elderly people living around here and kids going to the park with their parents? How are you going to ensure their safety with the road being full of construction vehicles right slap bang in a residential area?

Ceri Williams

Deborah Liske

From: Paul Onderwater [REDACTED]
Sent: March-04-22 11:51 AM
To: Corporate Services; Mayor and Council
Cc: Gail Onderwater Prime
Subject: Rezoning Application 820 Dunsmuir Road Public Hearing 7 March 2022

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: _____ For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council Other _____ Referred to: _____ For __ Action __ Response __ Report For Agenda <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council __ COTW __ IC	March 4 , 2022 Late Item Deb H
--	--

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council,

We live at 845 Dunsmuir Road and will be directly affected by the proposed application to change the bylaw to allow CD No. 146 Comprehensive District Development.

We support this change as a positive improvement to our neighborhood and to the community as a whole.

Having read the proposal and the staff report of 13 January 2022, I see the development proposal as something which should be approved by council.

Thank you for all you do as a council in trying to improve our Township!

Paul and Gail Onderwater
#517 845 Dunsmuir Road
Esquimalt BC, V9A0A7

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Late Item</u>
Referred to:	<u>Deb H</u>
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

VIA EMAIL

DATE: March 02, 2022

TO: Mayor Barb Desjardins & Council, Township of Esquimalt

FROM: Megan Parris [REDACTED]

RE: Rezoning Application – 820 Dunsmuir Road

I have lived in Esquimalt since 2004. As a resident/owner at 815 Wollaston I have some concerns regarding the negative impact this proposal will have on the community. My concerns are as follows:

Traffic Density

I am concerned about the amount of density on the corner of Dunsmuir Rd at Sea Terrace, at 831 Dunsmuir Rd., the entrance to parking at 835 Dunsmuir, my driveway on Dunsmuir Road and the proposed Driveway for 820 Dunsmuir.

This can be a busy curve in the road, with the existing 831 Dunsmuir Rd. Dunsmuir House (85 units) and with the newest addition at 835 Dunsmuir (32 units), the proposal of Sea Terrace (19 units), the 820 Dunsmuir (7 units), not to mention all the additional proposed projects with about 282 units, that I am aware of, within 1 to 3 blocks also adding another element of traffic density.

If one is driving south from Esquimalt on Dunsmuir to 831 Dunsmuir, they have to cross over the center yellow line to reach the property driveway. This means they need to stop and look for traffic approaching the curve going east/north on Dunsmuir and often they don't. The existence of the speed bumps does help to slow traffic down, but are noisy when buses and some types of vehicles go over them.

I was told by Large & Co. that there will be an additional crosswalk, (I don't know if it is protected or not) going in at Dunsmuir and Wollaston on the north end of Wollaston corner. There is already a crosswalk about 150 to 200 feet away at the corner of Esquimalt and Dunsmuir. I am not sure what advantage this would be; I feel the hazard is at this curve of the road. I have lost a family pet on this corner.

I only use my driveway off Dunsmuir when necessary as it can be hazardous to back in or back out if someone is coming around the corner hopefully not too fast.

I do not know if the municipality or Large and Co. have done a comprehensive survey or had cameras monitor this corner; its impact with the density effects on the safety of the community. If not, I think it should be done.

Recycling and Garbage

Although this has nothing to do with the project at hand I think it merits mentioning. I think the garbage system at 835 Dunsmuir has been overlooked. Once a week they have been putting the buildings' garbage receptacle on the street, on the North side of Dunsmuir on a yellow line, right where the proposed driveway would be for 820 Dunsmuir. This is right beside my driveway and it is difficult for me to turn right into my driveway without going into the opposite lane. Buses also have to do this. This week, I noticed they have moved it to the other side of my driveway into a street parking spot on the north side of Dunsmuir. This is easier for me, but takes up a parking space for most of the day, and we all know that on street parking is also a hot topic. I don't know what the solution is, but I have concerns about how 820 Dunsmuir will address this issue.

From what I understand the residents of the proposed 820 Dunsmuir will put *their garbage* and recycling out on the boulevard. The proposed units on the Dunsmuir side will have to roll or carry the garbage bins and recycling receptacles out of their units' garage (I assume) and down the one lane driveway out to the boulevard. The units on Wollaston Str. will have to do the same; only they will either have to walk theirs up to Wollaston St. or if allowed will also put them out on the Dunsmuir boulevard. I think this is a cumbersome situation for anyone that will live there and a lot of bins on the boulevard each week. I put four bins out on each of my recycle days, and we are a family of two. Six or Seven units' worth of receptacles in front on a three unit boulevard is alot.

Design

I find the design at the proposed site unimaginative. I believe Large & Co. have tried to incorporate the design of the heritage home into the new modern building. The fish scale shingles and the addition of the trim element at the peaks of the roofs do nothing in my opinion to compliment the newer design styles in the neighbourhood. This effort to me has actually made it look like a design from the 1970's, and is not current, architecturally. I appreciate it must be difficult to make a 2022 project resemble an 1892 heritage home, maybe this is the wrong approach.

Landscape

It's tragic that a beautiful Douglas Fir that is in fair to good condition will be taken down for this project, to be replaced with an asphalt driveway. It behooves me to believe that during the several years under the newest ownership, that they ever cared about the trees on the property. Over the last 5 years or more, ivy has been allowed to grow up the trees' trunk damaging it. This tells me no one ever had any intentions of allowing this magnificent tree to survive. In 2005 and 2006 there was a heron nest high in the tree.

That being said, I think most of the proposed landscape plants are good with indigenous varieties. However, in the applicants' presentation of photo graphics, it shows some lovely trees (Douglas firs?) and others, on the South east corner (where the Douglas Firs are now) This is not

representative as how the finished project will look to me as they will be gone and there will be a driveway there. There will be no trees there as far as I can tell in the proposal.

In addition to the health of the Garry Oak on municipal property, abutting my property on Wollaston Str. and 820 Dunsmuir on the Wollaston side, I also have concerns about the beautiful Deadora Cedar tree on my property being damaged or killed during the blasting and construction. I have seen the "Construction Impact Assessment and Tree Preservation Plan" and it says that this may impact the health and safety of my tree.

I am not opposed to building to address the housing shortages we have, but I do call into question how this will affect the community as a whole, now, and in the future. I recommend that Council deny the current application for rezoning 820 Dunsmuir Road, until such time the proposers and the municipality address some of these issues.

These are my concerns. Thank you for taking the time to review them.

Megan Parris
815 Wollaston Str.

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Public Hearing; Rezoning Application for 820 Dusmuir

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED: _____	March 7, 2022
For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council	
Other _____	Late Item
Referred to: _____	Deb H
For __ Action __ Response __ Report	
For Agenda X Council __ COTW __ IC	

From: Murray Ambler [REDACTED]
Sent: March-06-22 4:07 PM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: Public Hearing; Rezoning Application for 820 Dusmuir

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello

We wish to express our support for this development. The inclusion of townhouses in the township’s plans is an important step towards attaining the diversity in housing we hope for in the community. The loss of the heritage house is regrettable but it is in poor condition and while there are many beautiful and well maintained older homes in the neighbourhood this is not one of them.

I have a concern, one that was touched on by the Mayor recently in a discussion of this proposal, that being the very short distance between the bend in Dunsmuir Rd just after Wollaston and the proposed exit from this development. Traffic has steadily increased as many use Dunsmuir Rd as the most direct route into West Bay and beyond. This will continue to rise as new developments, such as West Bay Quay, 530 West Bay Terrace, English Inn et al, come online. Also, the majority of traffic leaving the townhouse development will likely be turning left towards Esquimalt Rd. thus crossing this traffic and creating a potential for collision. I hope some form of mitigation can be implemented as the high speed at which many choose to drive at this corner make collisions here inevitable.

Best Regards
Murray and Chris Ambler
845 Dunsmuir Rd

Dear Council, please find below messages of approval for the 820 Dunsmuir development. These messages were delivered over video and voice note, as each individual wanted their voice heard, although they were not able to attend the hearing this evening.

1. Cathy Baker - Owner of the home directly facing 820 Dunsmuir at #4 733 Sea Terrace.

My name is Cathy Baker, I'm a home owner at 733 Sea Terrace, directly across Dunsmuir from the proposed development at 820 Dunsmuir. My husband and I support appropriate densification in our neighbourhood. Our own home is an example of this. It is the corner unit in a four-townhouse complex built about 20 years ago on a lot that was once a single family home. And while our preference would have been to see the original character home at 820 Dunsmuir restored, we understand that is not financially viable nor does it address densification needs. A 7-unit townhouse development does add densification on an appropriate scale that takes into consideration the character of the neighbourhood. I especially appreciate the planned landscaping, the location of the driveway access, and the plans to add a safe pedestrian crossing near Wollaston for the huge number of people who come across busier Dunsmuir street and down much quieter Sea Terrace to access the park and the west song walkway. This is a fabulous neighbourhood facing tremendous development pressure, and we are happy to see a plan by developers who seem to balance the need for more family housing with the existing character and feel of the neighbourhood. Thank you.

2. Valarie Hosteller - Neighbour at #2 733 Sea Terrace

My name is Valarie Hosteller, I am a resident at 733 Sea Terrace just across the new development that Large and Co has proposed of 7 townhouses. I am very much in support of townhouses being put in this neighborhood. Townhouses create a very friendly streetscape that is totally appropriate for the neighbourhood, and I really want to support that. I went to the initial meeting at the town office in December, and one of our concerns was traffic. I am interested to find out that there will be a proposal for a crosswalk to go in across Dunsmuir at Wollaston, that works out really well. Something that I noticed that I think will be a real plus is that the development will be taking down the existing quite high shrubbery that goes around the corner at Dunsmuir, and by getting the shrubbery down we will actually have an increased sight line for traffic around the corner. Great idea. The emphasis on native planting is really important, as this is a very unique ecosystem and we need to make sure that we are including native planning.

3. Harvey and Rosalie Queen - Local Neighbour- 846 Dunsmuir Road

Hello to our new neighbours at Large and Co. Rosalie and I have received and read your handout covering the development of the existing house at 820 Dunsmuir Road and wish to give the team a thumbs up on the complete package as the progress has evolved. We thank you for being proactive and keeping us informed on the changes of the site and proposed changes as

planned. We totally support this change from what is there today and what can be there tomorrow. We have been in the home with the previous owner and have seen first hand what is there. We are residents on this very beautiful street and have an interest in the future of the street. We sit facing Swallows Landing, directly across from the driveway. There used to be a view, but with the concessions for land use, it was well worth what we lost for what we gained. We can see so much can be gained by the neighborhood with this project and thank you for the thoughtfulness and detail and the concern for the neighborhood and the safety of the neighbors. Thank you.

4. Josh Marrick - Local neighbour in Esquimalt

Hello Council and friendly neighbors of Esquimalt. My name is Josh Marrick. I am here to speak in support of the development at 820 Dunsmuir. I have been in the neighborhood for about 8 years now, and am very familiar with the subject property as I was renting on Wollaston when the development proposal came up. I have a Red Seal in carpentry, and I love houses, and I have walked by the subject project and thought many times what a shame it was that such a beautiful home had been left to rot. I have also noticed over the years a lot of families struggling to find housing in Esquimalt and the need for density. When I saw this development proposal I was thrilled to see that they were going to be providing density on a site that looked like the perfect candidate, with development happening all around it, with only one neighboring property budding the parcel. I have been very familiar with the project, reading up on the efforts to try and save it as a heritage property, which is unfortunate that can't happen. In my opinion the design is very thoughtful and exactly what we need in the community. The setbacks seem generous and won't cast too many shadows on the neighboring property. I really hope that we see a lot more of this and am thrilled to have a local developer taking this on. I am very supportive of this project and its currency design and I hope that you will approve it.

5. Cathie Lamont - Local neighbour in Esquimalt - Sussex Street

Hi, my name is Cathie Lamont and I wanted to speak in favour of the Large and Co project at 820 Dunsmuir St. I live on Sussex Street, just around the corner from Dunsmuir. I would love to see some sensitively built higher density housing that is quality and looks great. I am familiar with other Large and Co projects, looking at some to possibly buy, and I have been very impressed with the way they make their homes fit into the neighborhood and to beautify the neighbourhoods that they build in. I fully support this project and hope that we can continue to build healthy housing in the area.

6. Sarah Reynolds- Local neighbour in Esquimalt - 472 Kinver Street

Hi my name is Sarah Reynolds and I own a property at 472 Kinver Street at Saxe Point in Esquimalt. I wanted to give my support for the development at 820 Dunsmuir. I have been in the area for awhile and I think that it is a great project to increase the density and improve the look for the neighborhood. I want to see Esquimalt bring in more people for the businesses to have a

shot at doing well. I think having some nice homes for people to live in does nothing but good things for Esquimalt. I wanted to put forth my vote of confidence for the developers and I hope to see that project go through.

7. Blaire Pardee - Neighbour at #3 733 Sea Terrace

Thank you for dropping by today in regards to the townhome development at 820 Dunsmuir. I mentioned that my primary concern is the increased traffic along a road that bends and the potential for accidents. I appreciate that a crosswalk will be put in at Wollaston and a "hidden driveway" sign at the townhome complex common entry location. It is a busy auto, bike and pedestrian area - especially given Sea Terrace is used frequently to access the Westsong Walkway and tennis courts.

Thank you,
Blair Pardee
[#3 733 Sea Terrace](#)

Deborah Liske

Subject: FW: No notices sent for 880 Fleming Street

From: Susan [REDACTED]
Date: March 2, 2022 at 12:48:58 PM PST
To: Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: No notices sent for 880 Fleming Street

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: _____ March 3, 2022 For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council Other _____ Referred to: _____ For __ Action __ Response __ Report For Agenda __ Council __ COTW __ IC

Why has council decided NOT to send notices of the public hearing for 880 Fleming Street to the homes located on Fleming Street!
This is outrageous! It is also undemocratic and probably violated the standards for public notice established in administrative law in this country. This type of thing is what makes ordinary people cynical about municipal politics.

It is even worse because many of us have sent in comments previously about this proposed development and met with many of you in person, so you very much aware that we have things to say and care very much about both whether this development goes ahead at all, and the details of it.

What is going on?

Susan Ellis
Fleming Street resident.

Deborah Liske

From: Kim Heffler [REDACTED]
Sent: March-02-22 5:14 PM
To: Corporate Services
Cc: Mayor and Council
Subject: 880 Fleming Street [PID 030-353-556 Legally Described as; Lot 1 . Section 10 Esquimalt District Plan EPP78715
Attachments: 880_874 Fleming Street Proposed developments.eml; Fleming Street Proposed Developments.eml; Township of Esquimalt.docx; Method Built Re_ The 880.eml; new development at 880 Fleming meeting Friday, September 27, 2021.eml
Categories: Mail Log

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT
RECEIVED: March 4 , 2022
For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council
Other Late Item
Referred to: Deb H
For __ Action __ Response __ Report
For Agenda X Council __ COTW __ IC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Submission please for Monday, March 7, 2022 public hearing/council meeting

Attn: Debra Hopkins
Corporate Officer
OR
To whom it may concern;

As you can see by the attachments included, I have written many letters regarding this matter.

Let me begin by saying, I am not against development and I understand the shortage of homes. However, I believe, sensibility and practicality are essential in any decision making. Taking a moment to look at the big picture, often provides clarity. That being said, this is crazy! I believe, it is more greed on the developer's part!

The Esquimalt Lions Lodge (previous 874 Fleming), provided ample parking for it's residents. Although many tenants didn't drive. With it's replacement, we now have a totally different story.

The whole end of Fleming street is yellow lined, I have a fire hydrant in front of my property. This is for emergency trucks, etc. to be able to properly do their job. The bottom of the street parking is already used by residents. This leaves maybe 3-4 free parking spaces on Fleming Street.

These available parking spots will probably be used by the new 874 development tenants.

You can now see why 880 Fleming Street development is just an impractical dream.

It's also, way to tall for the area and the much needed eco systems has to be preserved, for obvious reasons.

A 5-storey building with 45 units requires more than 26 parking stalls. It is pure speculation that not every family will have a vehicle, in fact, some may have 2.

There is a home shortage, for humans, but what about the many homes , for birds and animals, that you would be destroying if this development was approved. Where would they go?

Also, there was originally no such lot, that area was all one!

Solution: (for parking only)

Developer buy 883 Lampson Street and has access to new building from that street. Over flow parking can now use Lampson Street.

Also, there was never such lot. That area was originally all one.

Kim Heffler and Jim Kelly

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Township of Esquimalt
Developmental Services

December 4, 2020

Attn: Rachel Dumas, Corporate Officer

Re: Rezoning Application for 874 Fleming Street

Dear Ms. Dumas,

The value of our homes, on the street will depreciating in value because of this deveopment.

This new development doesn't allow for enough parking - result - parking on the street. Presently an issue, with the existing building. Where would the trades people park, our street is full.

The new building is too close to Fleming Pathway. The pathway would become more of an alley. Unsafe to walk to bus stop, etc. The walker would be completing blocked in if attacked.

I don't feel our street can accommodate such a large development.

Solution: the developer buy the vacant property off Craigflower Rd. Access would be off Craigflower Rd. and would allow for proper parking.

Owners of

867 Fleming Street

Township of Esquimalt

Developmental Services

December 4, 2020

Attn: Rachel Dumas, Corporate Officer

Re: Rezoning Application for 874 Fleming Street

Dear Ms. Dumas,

The value of our homes, on the street will depreciating in value because of this deveopment.

This new development doesn't allow for enough parking - result - parking on the street. Presently an issue, with the existing building. Where would the trades people park, our street is full.

The new building is too close to Fleming Pathway. The pathway would become more of an alley. Unsafe to walk to bus stop, etc. The walker would be completing blocked in if attacked.

I don't feel our street can accommodate such a large development.

Solution: the developer buy the vacant property off Craigflower Rd. Access would be off Craigflower Rd. and would allow for proper parking.

Owners of

867 Fleming Street

From: Kim Heffler
Sent: August 2, 2021 12:05 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Method Built Re: The 880

Dave,

I have many concerns (see attached letter to The Township of Esquimalt).
The one serious concern I have right now is parking.
There was never enough parking with the previous building. This building will have 45 rental units. I'm assuming each tenant is allowed 2 parking stalls. You would need at least 90 parking stalls. I don't know exactly, but I'm guessing, you only have 24. Where are the additional parking stalls?

Solution: Have a multi level parking lot. At least 2, maybe 3 are needed.

Why was the vacant lot on Craigflower Rd. not bought? This would have allowed access from Craigflower Rd., and would have probably solved the parking issue as well.
Now we're going to have many more people driving our quiet little street. The emergency vehicles, City street sweepers, garbage pickup trucks, recycling trucks, etc. already face challenges.

Kim Heffler and James Kelly
867 Fleming Street

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Kim Heffler
Sent: September 23, 2021 1:16 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca
Subject: submission please for meeting Friday, September 27, 2021

Re: 880 Fleming Street (proposed new development)
September 23, 2021


To whom it may concern,

I've written 2 letters already, explaining about the lack of parking (see attached).

I understand the housing issue, but this is NOT the solution!

I've had no correspondence, of any kind, and would appreciate knowing my voice matters.

30 year plus resident of 867 Fleming Street



Kim Heffler

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Kim Heffler
Sent: October 22, 2021 7:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca
Subject: 874/880 Fleming Street Proposed Developments

Thank you for your efforts to provide solutions for the many concerns regarding your proposed build. After reading your proposal many times and talking with neighbours, your efforts are lacking. For example: e-bikes do not completely solve the parking problems.

The 874 building does not provide enough parking, what made you think the 880 building was not going to cause parking problems too?

Let me ask you this, if a new tenant applied for occupancy, but they had a vehicle and all the parking stalls were taken.....would you still rent to them? My guess, is YES.

Who's going to enforce parking violations? I've checked with the Municipality and the City, they don't do anything unless someone calls and complains. You said, you would. My guess, is NO.

Residential parking signs was another suggestion of yours. People still park where they want. Oh, anyone living at either of these proposed buildings would be residents of Fleming Street. Not sure why you thought this would help?

I have called Watt Consulting Group, they have not gotten back to me yet. You said they provided a parking study. The study, you said, looked at surrounding buildings, I don't understand how something built over 30+ years ago can have any relevance on today's needs/codes.

Unlike building codes, parking recommendations probably don't require follow up inspections.

If you had bought the vacant lot off Craigflower Road, there may not have been parking problems and Craigflower Rd. can definitely handle the extra traffic much better than this small Fleming Street.

Unfortunately, nothing about this proposed development is for the right reason.

Thank you again for your efforts.

Kim Heffler and Jim Kelly
867 Fleming Street
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Kim Heffler
Sent: October 22, 2021 7:43 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca
Subject: 874/880 Fleming Street Proposed Developments

Thank you for your efforts to provide solutions for the many concerns regarding your proposed build. After reading your proposal many times and talking with neighbours, your efforts are lacking. For example: e-bikes do not completely solve the parking problems.

The 874 building does not provide enough parking, what made you think the 880 building was not going to cause parking problems too?

Let me ask you this, if a new tenant applied for occupancy, but they had a vehicle and all the parking stalls were taken.....would you still rent to them? My guess, is YES.

Who's going to enforce parking violations? I've checked with the Municipality and the City, they don't do anything unless someone calls and complains. You said, you would. My guess, is NO.

Residential parking signs was another suggestion of yours. People still park where they want. Oh, anyone living at either of these proposed buildings would be residents of Fleming Street. Not sure why you thought this would help?

I have called Watt Consulting Group, they have not gotten back to me yet. You said they provided a parking study. The study, you said, looked at surrounding buildings, I don't understand how something built over 30+ years ago can have any relevance on today's needs/codes.

Unlike building codes, parking recommendations probably don't require follow up inspections.

If you had bought the vacant lot off Craigflower Road, there may not have been parking problems and Craigflower Rd. can definitely handle the extra traffic much better than this small Fleming Street.

Unfortunately, nothing about this proposed development is for the right reason.

Thank you again for your efforts.

Kim Heffler and Jim Kelly
867 Fleming Street
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Deborah Liske

Subject: FW: 880 Fleming street

From: lynn mitchell [REDACTED]
Date: March 4, 2022 at 9:25:42 AM PST
To: Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: 880 Fleming street

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 4 , 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

I live in Esquimalt and vote in Municipal elections. I am opposition to the zoning proposal at 880 Fleming street. Fleming street has already agreed to host a massive affordable housing project. This additional development proposed for the forested area next door comes at too high an environmental cost for what will amount to a few additional, slightly below market-rate, one bedroom apartments. I support the East Esquimalt Community Association's efforts to preserve this green space and have it zoned as a park.

In fact, I am quite horrified at the rate in which we are losing mature trees in our community. Mayor and Council seem to be so focused on densifying any available land that tree protection of any kind has gone out the window. As a person who just built a garden suite for family and did everything in my power to protect two mature trees and have planted 12 more during the process, I shudder every time I hear a chainsaw wondering which giants are coming down now.

Please consider the wishes of your community and stop this development.

Thank you
Lynn Mitchell

Deborah Liske

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Mayor and Council re..880 Fleming St

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 4 , 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Late Item</u>
Referred to:	<u>Deb H</u>
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March-03-22 7:26 PM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: Fwd: Mayor and Council re..880 Fleming St

Dear Mayor and Council

I am writing to you to ask you to reject the proposal to rezone 880 Fleming Street from Single family dwelling (it is currently a wild forest with more than 70 mature trees) to a high density housing complex. The developer, who won and the municipal led RFP process, has met with some of us and sent a letter to answer some of our concerns. There remain, however, grave concerns about the development proposal in this lot at 880 Fleming Street.

We understand that the owner of 833 Lampson is willing to sell and that the same developer who won the RFP has engaged in negotiations to purchase 833 Lampson street over the last few months. My understanding is that they did not agree on a price. I ask the council to reject the rezoning and development and request that the developer buy 833 Fleming or another similar property instead. I also ask that that a road between Lampson and the Lions Lodge be constructed and that Fleming Street remains a cul de sac with only foot and bike traffic access to Fleming Street from the Lions Building. This proposal asks for the hammerhead turn around for the emergency vehicles attending to issues at the Lions Building to be built on a road coming from Lampson with no accessibility from Fleming Street at all. The building of the hammerhead will require using a large piece of parkland that is currently a steep hill.

My request is based on the following reasons:

1. I/ we have supported the new Lions Lodge doubling in size even though the municipality and the proposal did not adequately address parking and traffic issues that almost all of us raised. We are a small closely knit neighbourhood who is used to having a reasonable number of affordable housing units (77). We did not actively fight the expansion (we did not act as NIMBY's) to 137 (approx.) even though 137 is way more than what a small street and neighbourhood should be expected to adapt to. We did this because we agree that people need affordable housing. This rezoning and development at 880 Fleming assumes that our neighbourhood would agree to add almost 40 more. Instead of pushing even more units onto our street, why not appreciate our goodwill and move on to find an alternative site. Many residents, including me, feel the municipality is taking advantage of our goodwill.
2. Access. We have problems with emergency vehicles accessing the Lion's Lodge over the past 20 or so years. Emergency vehicles rush up and down the street 24/7 waking everyone up at night. They have courteously turned off the alarms

once they turn onto Fleming, which we appreciate, however, we hear the alarms clearly from Coleville and beyond. The Lions Lodge is doubling in size which means double the emergency vehicles and double the general traffic. The ability for the emergency vehicles to turn around is only one of the issues. Fleming Street has no sidewalks and there is a walkway between Craig flower where there is a bus stop and the school and parks. This route is used by thousands of people weekly including high school kids, walking school buses, dog walkers, bike riders, skateboarders, runners, tennis players and people walking from Craigflower/Selkirk to the nearest food shopping. In my opinion Fleming Street should only be used for local traffic and walkers/ riders. Car traffic, trucks and emergency vehicles to and from the Lions club should be diverted through a new street built out to Lampson or possibly from Craigflower. I understand the resistance to using park land for a road (even though an easement was indicated on the old maps) but if you rezoned the 880 Fleming as a wild woodland and sacrificed a few feet of grassed parkland and moved the baseball diamond (which is just a wrought iron fence) you would be creating more parkland and preserving scarce and irreplaceable forest.

3. Traffic. We are all aware that caregivers and residents who do not want to pay for parking at the Lions Building have used Fleming Street as their parking lot for the last 20 or so odd years so causing crowding and scarce parking issues for the residents in houses and apartments. This parking will only increase with doubling of residents and making it for residents only will still allow residents to park there as their address is also Fleming Street. The proposed increase in parking spaces are inadequate and unrealistic. Those with lower income do indeed have cars despite the traffic study (conducted during the pandemic). I applaud the municipality for thinking ahead and ensuring there is a shared car and electric bikes for residents to borrow. I am not sure how long it will take for us to realize that we need to share cars and not own them? I hope its soon. The switch has not happened yet. I have had an electric bike for over 15 years and unfortunately can really only use it for exercise in the summer due to rainy weather for half the year and bike theft. Bike theft is particularly high for electric bikes worth approx. Unfortunately, I fear the shared electric bikes will not last long in shared housing and are very expensive to fix and the electric bicycle mechanics are not easily accessible without a truck (as I have learned over the last 15 year period).
4. Infrastructure. It would be great to have an upgrade on infrastructure on Fleming Street and behind Fleming Street (in the Baseball park) as it is certainly outdated. With the floods on the mainland on the Malahat this year, it is clear that all our systems need to be upgraded and run smoothly. As you probably know Chan River runs under 880 Fleming Street and was buried underneath the baseball park. The storm drains at the back of our houses were overflowing during the first environmental river. The question for me is: "Is this worth the cost of selling a piece of land with a mature forest for \$1 million and \$80K for reforestation and infrastructure improvements. With house prices and the land rising daily, it does not look to me that the municipality has negotiated a good deal. Also if our taxes are not meant to pay for upgrades to outdated infrastructure, what are they meant for?"

To summarize, I have grave concerns about the Mayor and Council passing the 2nd reading of the rezoning of 880 Fleming Street which include that we already have 137 affordable housing units on a small cul de sac, access, traffic, infrastructure and conservation. It takes half a century for 70 plus trees to mature and they provide natural habitat and absorb massive amounts of flood water. Cutting them down is short sighted and illogical given climate change that is clearly upon us.

Please think strategically which is 10 to 50 years into the future. We are not against the developer developing his project but rather the location. We want multiplex units on the main roads and off the smaller streets like Fleming and Phoenix and parts of Coleville. We also want more green space and less high density concrete.

In fact, if he developed 833 Lampson instead and created a road that serviced the Lions Building so Fleming could remain a cul de sac for local traffic, walkers and rider, the mayor, Council and developer would be hero's in the neighbourhood. Thank you for coming out to our neighbourhood and listening to us.

Please continue to work with us, not against us.

Sincerely,

Louise Owen

A grey rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Deborah Liske

From: smpedersen [REDACTED]
Sent: March-06-22 10:16 AM
To: Guuduniia LaBoucan; Mayor and Council; Tim Morrison
Cc: Corporate Services; lynnwest1; kevinsmitten; Tara Harper; James nadeau; susanevelynellis
Subject: RE: Sent on behalf of Louise Owen

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. If you do not recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Well said.

From [REDACTED]
Sent: March 6, 2022 9:22 AM
To: [mayorandcouncil](#); [Tim Morrison](#)
Cc: [corporate services](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: Sent on behalf of Louise Owen

Dear Mayor and Council

I am writing to you to ask you to reject the proposal to rezone 880 Fleming Street from Single family dwelling (it is currently a wild forest with more than 70 mature trees) to a high density housing complex. The developer, who won and the municipal led RFP process, has met with some of us and sent a letter to answer some of our concerns. There remain, however, grave concerns about the development proposal in this lot at 880 Fleming Street.

We understand that the owner of 833 Lampson is willing to sell and that the same developer who won the RFP has engaged in negotiations to purchase 833 Lampson street over the last few months. My understanding is that they did not agree on a price. I ask the council to reject the rezoning and development and request that the developer buy 833 Fleming or another similar property instead. I also ask that that a road between Lampson and the Lions Lodge be constructed and that Fleming Street remains a cul de sac with only foot and bike traffic access to Fleming Street from the Lions Building. This proposal asks for the hammerhead turn around for the emergency vehicles attending to issues at the Lions Building to be built on a road coming from Lampson with no accessibility from Fleming Street at all. The building of the hammerhead will require using a large piece of parkland that is currently a steep hill.

My request is based on the following reasons:

1. I/ we have supported the new Lions Lodge doubling in size even though the municipality and the proposal did not adequately address parking and traffic issues that almost all of us raised. We are a small closely knit neighbourhood who is used to having a reasonable number of affordable housing units (77). We did not actively fight the expansion (we did not act as NIMBY's) to 137 (approx.) even though 137 is way more than what a small street and neighbourhood should be expected to adapt to. We did this because we agree that people need affordable housing. This rezoning and development at 880 Fleming assumes that our neighbourhood would agree to add almost 40 more. Instead of pushing even more units onto our street, why not appreciate our goodwill and move on to find an alternative site. Many residents, including me, feel the municipality is taking advantage of our goodwill.
2. Access. We have problems with emergency vehicles accessing the Lion's Lodge over the past 20 or so years. Emergency vehicles rush up and down the street 24/7 waking everyone up at night. They have courteously turned off the alarms once they turn onto Fleming, which we appreciate, however, we hear the alarms clearly from Coleville and beyond. The Lions Lodge is doubling in size which means double the emergency vehicles and double the general traffic. The ability for the emergency vehicles to turn around is only one of the issues. Fleming Street has no sidewalks and there is a walkway between Craig flower where there is a bus stop and the school and parks. This route is used by thousands of people weekly including high school kids, walking school buses, dog walkers, bike riders, skateboarders,

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: _____ March 7, 2022 For Information __CAO __Mayor/Council Other _____ Late Item Referred to: _____ Deb H For __Action __Response __Report For Agenda <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council __COTW __IC

runners, tennis players and people walking from Craigflower/Selkirk to the nearest food shopping. In my opinion Fleming Street should only be used for local traffic and walkers/ riders. Car traffic, trucks and emergency vehicles to and from the Lions club should be diverted through a new street built out to Lampson or possibly from Craigflower. I understand the resistance to using park land for a road (even though an easement was indicated on the old maps) but if you rezoned the 880 Fleming as a wild woodland and sacrificed a few feet of grassed parkland and moved the baseball diamond (which is just a wrought iron fence) you would be creating more parkland and preserving scarce and irreplaceable forest.

3. Traffic. We are all aware that caregivers and residents who do not want to pay for parking at the Lions Building have used Fleming Street as their parking lot for the last 20 or so odd years so causing crowding and scarce parking issues for the residents in houses and apartments. This parking will only increase with doubling of residents and making it for residents only will still allow residents to park there as their address is also Fleming Street. The proposed increase in parking spaces are inadequate and unrealistic. Those with lower income do indeed have cars despite the traffic study (conducted during the pandemic). I applaud the municipality for thinking ahead and ensuring there is a shared car and electric bikes for residents to borrow. I am not sure how long it will take for us to realize that we need to share cars and not own them? I hope its soon. The switch has not happened yet. I have had an electric bike for over 15 years and unfortunately can really only use it for exercise in the summer due to rainy weather for half the year and bike theft. Bike theft is particularly high for electric bikes worth approx. Unfortunately, I fear the shared electric bikes will not last long in shared housing and are very expensive to fix and the electric bicycle mechanics are not easily accessible without a truck (as I have learned over the last 15 year period).

4. Infrastructure. It would be great to have an upgrade on infrastructure on Fleming Street and behind Fleming Street (in the Baseball park) as it is certainly outdated. With the floods on the mainland on the Malahat this year, it is clear that all our systems need to be upgraded and run smoothly. As you probably know Chan River runs under 880 Fleming Street and was buried underneath the baseball park. The storm drains at the back of our houses were overflowing during the first environmental river. The question for me is: "Is this worth the cost of selling a piece of land with a mature forest for \$1 million and \$80K for reforestation and infrastructure improvements. With house prices and the land rising daily, it does not look to me that the municipality has negotiated a good deal. Also if our taxes are not meant to pay for upgrades to outdated infrastructure, what are they meant for?"

To summarize, I have grave concerns about the Mayor and Council passing the 2nd reading of the rezoning of 880 Fleming Street which include that we already have 137 affordable housing units on a small cul de sac, access, traffic, infrastructure and conservation. It takes half a century for 70 plus trees to mature and they provide natural habitat and absorb massive amounts of flood water. Cutting them down is short sighted and illogical given climate change that is clearly upon us.

Please think strategically which is 10 to 50 years into the future. We are not against the developer developing his project but rather the location. We want multiplex units on the main roads and off the smaller streets like Fleming and Phoenix and parts of Coleville. We also want more green space and less high density concrete.

In fact, if he developed 833 Lampson instead and created a road that serviced the Lions Building so Fleming could remain a cul de sac for local traffic, walkers and rider, the mayor, Council and developer would be hero's in the neighbourhood. Thank you for coming out to our neighbourhood and listening to us.

Please continue to work with us, not against us.

Sincerely,

Louise Owen



Deborah Liske

From: smpedersen [REDACTED]
Sent: March-06-22 10:21 AM
To: Guuduniia LaBoucan; Mayor and Council; Tim Morrison; Corporate Services
Cc: James nadeau; lynnwest1; susanevelynellis; kevinsmitten; Louise Owen
Subject: RE: Proposal to develop 880 Fleming Street

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Please verify you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Well said.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March 6, 2022 10:15 AM
To: [mayorandcouncil](#); [Tim Morrison](#); [corporate services](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposal to develop 880 Fleming Street

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

Dear mayor and Council,

I am extremely humbled and grateful to be an uninvited guest on the unceded lands of the Lekwungen speaking peoples. For their and our sake, I am writing this letter. I would ask you to read it thoroughly, consider it thoughtfully and yes, please take action to address mine and others concerns in a sincere and meaningful way.

SAVE FLEMING FOREST

I am a resident of Fleming Street since 2000. Over the last year, I have seen a lot of alarming and what people are calling, unprecedented, events occurring. The ones that most speak to the issue of the sale of 880 Fleming Street and the destruction of a forest of more than 70 mature trees including arbutus and Gary Oak, are the heat bomb and the flooding that we experienced here in our own backyard.

According to the developer's arborists report, there are more than 70 trees and they are all to be cut down. They are protected under Esquimalt bylaws, a bylaw that acknowledges the role that forests play in our world. I know that each of the councilors are well aware that trees provide a free antidote to these environmental events, the soaking up of the carbon dioxide, the shelter of their branches and their roots taking up water that would otherwise be let into people's houses. So I am pleading with the Council to make the long term and right decision to let Fleming Forest remain as it is, a refuge for people, animals and part of the sustainability that we are all going to require for today and the future.

WE HAVE ALOT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING ALREADY

We are not in need of another supposed affordable housing building as the Lion's Lodge at 874 Fleming is being rebuilt and nearly doubling its capacity from 77 to 134 units. The parking from that alone is going to be horrendous as we know from the previous lodge. Please do not think that low income and elderly folks don't have cars, that is discrimination against these folks and completely ignores the reality which I am well aware of as I have lived here for more than 20 years. They have cars and in some cases, multiple cars. so that means that there will be potentially 134 cars at one per unit. If I am being somewhat optimistic, even at half the amount, 67 cars, the planned parking will not accommodate that many. The result will be parking mayhem on our street, where as we know their address on Fleming Street will allow them to park there. So there is no relief. This does not count visitors who will also require parking. Additionally, there will be heavier traffic as the new strata housing that is occurring on the corner of Colville and Lampson where 3 houses were replaced by 19 and there are another four being built as I write. That makes the parking situation nearly impossible and the traffic is already impacted as the time to get onto Lampson has become longer and longer especially when the end of the day happens the dockyard is emptying. I have noticed that cars are now coming up Dominion in hopes of avoiding the long waits but that means that we who live in between are going to be hemmed in for longer.

PARKING CHAOS

The proposed 45 unit building has a parking deficit according to our own bylaws. You know the numbers required by bylaw and the number that is being proposed. (see the developer submissions previously on Dec. 6 council meeting) The argument that we are trying as a society to remove people out of cars is a noble one with the use of an electric car membership and the use of electric bikes. But neither of those proposed mitigations will be sufficient as we all know. The car share is not a proven strategy as the developer's report one parking points out, it is an idea, optimistic, but unproven. The electric bikes are great on sunny days and maybe for the more dedicated, on rainy days. But it is not a solution, one cannot carry groceries on bicycles for a family, let alone have small children as well. The roads are not safe enough also, my daughter was nearly killed by a car when she was traveling to the university. She was in a bike lane when the car cut in front of her as it was turning right. There was a sign saying bikes had the right of way. That would have been cold comfort to my family should she have been seriously injured or died. Not everyone wants to bike and one electric car is not going to stop folks from using their own cars and parking wherever they can find space. Also, the traffic report was flawed in a

major fashion. It was done after Lions Lodge had been emptied out and while we are in a pandemic. Those two factors alone make it invalid.

RENTAL UNITS AND HIL RENTAL STIPULATION:

The council seems to believe that the Sale Agreement states that the rental units are supposed to be distributed (1, 2 and 3 bedroom) amongst the HIL and 10% below market rate. However, the sale agreement doesn't actually say this, if you read below at para. 5. The distribution of the 2-3 bedroom are to be in keeping with para. 2 which does not mention the rental rates. Please address this immediately as this removes the building from the much heard cry that we need more affordable housing. I have attached the developer's own submission to the Council in December which on page 23 or 24 of the 90 page report states that the only apartments that will be at the lower rental rates are one bedroom units.

1. The Housing Agreement will state that the housing units in the Project cannot be strata titled or otherwise made available for ownership by individual owners, except as described in Schedule B to this Agreement. The Project is to remain in rental tenure for 25 years from the date of occupancy, except for three residential units which may be owner-occupied.
2. The Housing Agreement will require that if the Project is strata titled as referred to in section 1 of this Schedule D, the strata bylaws must not provide for any restrictions on rental of the 42 residential units that are to be rental units (the "Residential Rental Units").
3. The Housing Agreement will include such other terms and conditions that the Vendor and Purchaser agree are required to ensure that the strata subdivision of the Project does not compromise the functioning of the residential rental portion of the Project.
4. The Housing Agreement will set out an agreed-on initial rental rate structure for the Residential Rental Units in the Project. The rent structure is anticipated to be along these lines:
 - a. Category 1: Approximately one-third of the Residential Rental Units will be rented at Market Rent. Prior to the Vendor producing the Housing Agreement, the Purchaser will propose the Market Rent for consideration by the Vendor.
 - b. Category 2: Approximately one-third of the Residential Rental Units will be rented at 90% of the agreed-on market rent for Category 1.
 - c. Category 3: Approximately one-third of the Residential Rental Units will be rented at rates that equal 30% of the Housing Income Limits for respective unit types, as defined by BC Housing for the Victoria area for the year in which the Project is ready for occupancy.
5. As nearly as possible, the 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units will each be distributed equally among the three rental Categories defined in paragraph 2.
6. The Housing Agreement will set out a schedule or formula for determining future rent increases, or alternatively will specify that rent increases are subject to provincial regulations pursuant to the BC Residential Tenancy Act.

I have heard from Meagan Klassen who administers the Esquimalt Community facebook page that this point will be brought up and clarified. I hope that it is clarified and that if we are going to destroy Fleming Forest that it has a purpose beyond building unaffordable apartments for families rather than couples.

There are many reasons why our neighbourhoods are being less than welcome around dense living in the hopes of alleviating an affordable housing shortage for families. But we didn't create this situation, we didn't ask for our houses to become unaffordable. Nor are the rental units below 10% of the market rate really

affordable. The going rate is around \$2000 for a two bedroom unit. That is not affordable.

In addition, there are moves to make public hearings on Community plans amendments not mandatory. That is stripping away the voices of those who will be most impacted. We are going to be writing the government about this undemocratic process as well.

In closing, we are asking you to make a decision. Do not destroy a forest that has been there for over 100 years. If you allow the opportunity to do the right thing to go by, please do not do so without making significant changes to the proposal, if it should go through. More parking is required, less density is required, more affordable housing is required. No matter what happens, we are in this together, we are neighbours.

Sincerely,

Deborah Liske

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Proposal to develop 880 Fleming Street signed version SORRY FORGOT TO SIGN THE LAST SUBMISSION SENT

From: [REDACTED]
To: "mayorandcouncil" <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>, "Tim Morrison" <tim.morrison@esquimalt.ca>, "corporate services" <corporate.services@esquimalt.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, 6 March, 2022 10:14:52
Subject: Proposal to develop 880 Fleming Street

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am extremely humbled and grateful to be an uninvited guest on the unceded lands of the Lekwungen speaking peoples. For their and our sake, I am writing this letter. I would ask you to read it thoroughly, consider it thoughtfully and yes, please take action to address mine and others concerns in a sincere and meaningful way. I appreciate the Mayor Barb Desjardins and Councillor Tim Morrison for taking the time to visit the neighbourhood and hear our views.

SAVE FLEMING FOREST

I am a resident of Fleming Street since 2000. Over the last year, I have seen a lot of alarming and what people are calling, unprecedented, events occurring. The ones that most speak to the issue of the sale of 880 Fleming Street and the destruction of a forest of more than 70 mature trees including arbutus and Gary Oak, are the heat bomb and the flooding that we experienced here in our own backyard.

According to the developer's arborists report, there are more than 70 trees and they are all to be cut down. They are protected under Esquimalt bylaws, a bylaw that acknowledges the role that forests play in our world. I know that each of the councilors are well aware that trees provide a free antidote to these environmental events, the soaking up of the carbon dioxide, the shelter of their branches and their roots taking up water that would otherwise be let into people's houses. So I am pleading with the Council to make the long term and right decision to let Fleming Forest remain as it is, a refuge for people, animals and part of the sustainability that we are all going to require for today and the future.

WE HAVE ALOT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING ALREADY

We are not in need of another supposed affordable housing building as the Lion's Lodge at 874 Fleming is being rebuilt and nearly doubling its capacity from 77 to 134 units. The parking from that alone is going to be horrendous as we know from the previous lodge. Please do not think that low income and elderly folks don't have cars, that is discrimination against these folks and completely ignores the reality which I am well aware of as I have lived here for more than 20 years. They have cars and in some cases, multiple cars. so that means that there will be potentially 134 cars at one per unit. If I am being somewhat optimistic, even at half the amount, 67 cars, the planned parking will not accommodate that many. The result will be parking mayhem on our street, where as we know their address on Fleming Street will allow them to park there. So there is no relief. This does not count visitors who will also require parking. Additionally, there will be heavier traffic as the new strata housing that is occurring on the corner of Colville and Lampson where 3 houses were replaced by 19 and there are another four being built as I write. That makes the parking situation nearly impossible and the traffic is already impacted as the time to get onto Lampson has become longer and longer especially when the end of the day happens the dockyard is emptying. I have noticed that cars are now coming up Dominion in hopes of avoiding the long waits but that means that we who live in between are going to be hemmed in for longer.

PARKING CHAOS

The proposed 45 unit building has a parking deficit according to our own bylaws. You know the numbers required by bylaw and the number that is being proposed. (see the developer submissions previously on Dec. 6 council meeting) The argument that we are trying as a society to remove people out of cars is a noble one with the use of an electric car membership and the use of electric bikes. But neither of those proposed mitigations will be sufficient as we all know. The car share is not a proven strategy as the developer's report one parking points out, it is an idea, optimistic, but unproven. The electric bikes are great on sunny days and maybe for the more dedicated, on rainy days. But it is not a solution, one cannot carry groceries on bicycles for a family, let alone have small children as well. The roads are not safe enough also, my daughter was nearly killed by a car when she was traveling to the university. She was in a bike lane when the car cut in front of her as it was turning right. There was a sign saying bikes had the right of way. That would have been cold comfort to my family should she have been seriously injured or died. Not everyone wants to bike and one electric car is not going to stop folks from using their own cars and parking wherever they can find space. Also, the traffic report was flawed in a

major fashion. It was done after Lions Lodge had been emptied out and while we are in a pandemic. Those two factors alone make it invalid.

RENTAL UNITS AND HIL RENTAL STIPULATION:

The council seems to believe that the Sale Agreement states that the rental units are supposed to be distributed (1, 2 and 3 bedroom) amongst the HIL and 10% below market rate. However, the sale agreement doesn't actually say this, if you read below at para. 5. The distribution of the 2-3 bedroom are to be in keeping with para. 2 which does not mention the rental rates. Please address this immediately as this removes the building from the much heard cry that we need more affordable housing. I have attached the developer's own submission to the Council in December which on page 23 or 24 of the 90 page report states that the only apartments that will be at the lower rental rates are one bedroom units.

1. The Housing Agreement will state that the housing units in the Project cannot be strata titled or otherwise made available for ownership by individual owners, except as described in Schedule B to this Agreement. The Project is to remain in rental tenure for 25 years from the date of occupancy, except for three residential units which may be owner-occupied.
2. The Housing Agreement will require that if the Project is strata titled as referred to in section 1 of this Schedule D, the strata bylaws must not provide for any restrictions on rental of the 42 residential units that are to be rental units (the "Residential Rental Units").
3. The Housing Agreement will include such other terms and conditions that the Vendor and Purchaser agree are required to ensure that the strata subdivision of the Project does not compromise the functioning of the residential rental portion of the Project.
4. The Housing Agreement will set out an agreed-on initial rental rate structure for the Residential Rental Units in the Project. The rent structure is anticipated to be along these lines:
 - a. Category 1: Approximately one-third of the Residential Rental Units will be rented at Market Rent. Prior to the Vendor producing the Housing Agreement, the Purchaser will propose the Market Rent for consideration by the Vendor.
 - b. Category 2: Approximately one-third of the Residential Rental Units will be rented at 90% of the agreed-on market rent for Category 1.
 - c. Category 3: Approximately one-third of the Residential Rental Units will be rented at rates that equal 30% of the Housing Income Limits for respective unit types, as defined by BC Housing for the Victoria area for the year in which the Project is ready for occupancy.
5. As nearly as possible, the 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units will each be distributed equally among the three rental Categories defined in paragraph 2.
6. The Housing Agreement will set out a schedule or formula for determining future rent increases, or alternatively will specify that rent increases are subject to provincial regulations pursuant to the BC Residential Tenancy Act.

I have heard from Meagan Klassen who administers the Esquimalt Community facebook page that this point will be brought up and clarified. I hope that it is clarified and that if we are going to destroy Fleming Forest that it has a purpose beyond building unaffordable apartments for families rather than couples.

There are many reasons why our neighbourhoods are being less than welcome around dense living in the hopes of alleviating an affordable housing shortage for families. Dense living is not a solution but a bandaid. Studies are out there that show building lots of apartment buildings does not build community. In fact, one study states that apartment dwellers are lonelier and more isolated because they don't talk to

their neighbours the way people in less dense areas do i.e. townhomes, single dwelling homes. We didn't create this situation, we didn't ask for our houses to become unaffordable. Nor are the rental units below 10% of the market rate really affordable. The going rate is around \$2000 for a two bedroom unit. That is not affordable. There are many studies which I can send along, which point out the unaffordability of rent in cities including Victoria.

In addition, there are moves to make public hearings on Community plans amendments not mandatory. That is stripping away the voices of those who will be most impacted. We are going to be writing the government about this undemocratic process as well.

In closing, we are asking you to make a decision. Do not destroy a forest that has been there for over 100 years. If you allow the opportunity to do the right thing to go by, please do not do so without making significant changes to the proposal, if it should go through. More parking is required, less density is required, more affordable housing is required. No matter what happens, we are in this together, we are neighbours.

Sincerely,

Guuduniia La Boucan

18 October 2021

Mayor and Council
Director, Development Services
Township of Esquimalt
1229 Esquimalt Road
Esquimalt, BC, V9A 3P1

Dear Mayor, Council and Development Director,

Re: 880 Fleming Street (the “Proposal”) First Reading

As you are aware, the Proposal was given first reading on 27 September 2021, on the condition that a traffic study be commissioned, and that further consultation & engagement occur with neighbours to the Proposal. We write to provide an update in this regard.

A) Proposal Primer

Please find enclosed at Appendix A, a “Proposal Primer” which highlights the key benefits of the Proposal and how it has been amended to address some of the concerns that have been raised by stakeholders. This Proposal Primer has been hand delivered to all those who provided feedback to the Township *including* those who only provided their name and address.

B) Traffic Study

Watt Consulting Group was commissioned and produced a Traffic Study noting that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, the Traffic Study concluded that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

Enclosed at Appendix B is the Traffic Study.

C) Revised Parking Study

Following feedback from the initial Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the additional 14 e-bikes will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls, and
- 4) secured bicycle parking ratio of nearly 2:1.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots.

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each of the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each of the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

Enclosed at Appendix C is the Revised Parking Study.

D) Revised Landscape Plan

Following feedback from neighbours and Council, we explored a variety of creative ways we could add significant trees to this proposal and have managed to engineer a solution to add 5 significant, indigenous trees to the North of the Proposal.

Enclosed at Appendix D is the Revised Landscape Plan.

E) Further Neighbour Engagement and Consultation

Eleven neighbours delivered correspondence to the Township in the days leading up to the 27 September 2021 Council Meeting. To ensure neighbours are fully informed about

the Proposal and to address the concerns raised, we first responded in writing to each of the neighbours.

Please find enclosed at Appendix E, copies of such correspondence.

In addition, please note that we are “door knocking” in the neighbourhood on 22 October 2021 to address any remaining questions or concerns that some neighbours may have.

Finally, we have scheduled a second, non-mandatory, community meeting for 01 November 2021 at the Esquimalt Recreation Centre to highlight the benefits of the Proposal and address any remaining questions or concerns that some neighbours may have.

Summary

We look forward to working with the Township and neighbours to bring this much needed Proposal online in the near future.

Kind regards,

Hardave S. Sahota

880 Fleming Street Proposal Primer



Developer

Method Built is a local, boutique developer, that focuses solely on residential and commercial projects committed to social and environmental sustainability. This includes a substantial commitment to affordable rental homes and green building methods. Our very first development projects were undertaken in Esquimalt more than 35 years ago and the ownership group remains rooted with their families living and working in Esquimalt.

Township Request for Proposal

In 2016 the Township of Esquimalt (the “Township”) issued a request for expressions of interest and in 2018 the Township issued a Request for Proposals to acquire 880 Fleming Street. The Township expressed a desire for:

- a) “[n]ew housing supply, including some housing that addresses housing affordability”ⁱ, and
- b) “[r]evenue that the Township intends to apply to civic projects including parks”ⁱⁱ.

In addition, the Township made it clear that “[p]roponents are encouraged to propose creative approaches to provide a mix of housing on the Site”.

Following the RFP, managed by the arms-length Coriolis Consulting Corp., Method Built’s proposal was selected from amongst several competitive proposals from a variety of local housing providers, including non-profit housing providers.

This led to an executed purchase and sales agreement between the Township and Method Built with the following key Requirements from the Township:

1. a minimum of 35,000 finished square feet,
2. a minimum of 40 residential homes,
3. a maximum of six stories, and
4. a mix of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom homes with no less than 5% being 3-bedroom homes.

The Proposal

Method Built worked extensively and collaboratively with the Township over the course of nearly four years. The Proposal exceeds the Requirements and provides the following:

1. 37,140 finished square feet,
2. 45 residential homes,
3. 5 stories, with the 4th and 5th stories stepped back significantly, and
4. a mix of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom plus den homes with 13% being 3 bedroom homes.

In addition, the Proposal offers the highest levels of affordability ever offered for a mid-rise multi-family project developed entirely without public dollars by a private developer in Greater Victoria. The Proposal provides for the following:

1. 1/3 of rental homes with deep affordability discounts – BC Housing Income Limits (14 homes),
2. 1/3 of rental homes with affordability discounts at 90% of market rent (14 homes),
3. 1/3 of rental homes at market rent (14 homes), and
4. 3 strata condominium homes (3 homes).

The affordability provisions of the Proposal are to be secured by a Housing Agreement registered to title of 880 Fleming Street. Critically, this mix of housing encourages social interaction and engagement, as opposed to social division and distance, between a full spectrum of socio-economic households at the Project.

Community Consultation

As part of the rezoning and development process, Method Built held an “Open House” to discuss the Proposal. The process required Method Built to produce and pay for notices of the Open House mailed out by the Township to homes within a fixed proximity to the Site. Two primary concerns with the Proposal were raised at the Open House:

1. the environmental consequences of removing the trees at 880 Fleming Street,

2. parking and traffic consequences on Fleming Street as a result of adding 45 homes.

These concerns, and a concern with respect to infrastructure, were highlighted and expanded upon in correspondence delivered to the Township by neighbours to 880 Fleming Street in late September 2021.

This Primer highlights important elements of the Proposal and addresses the concerns raised by neighbours and Council (see underlined portions).

Design Development and Massing

Method Built collaborated with the Township for nearly four years on the massing and design of the Proposal. Keeping in mind the requirement for a minimum of 35,000 finished square feet, at least 40 mixed residential homes, and a maximum of six floors, the Proposal exceeds each of the Requirements and sits sympathetically within the site and masses downwards to the west and south along with the natural grade and borders with single-family homes. This sympathetic siting and massing is particularly transparent when compared and contrasted to the approved development next door.

In order to meet all of the Requirements, the Proposal had to cover 55% of the lot. To cover less, would have required the Proposal to mass vertically (much like a high-rise building) to a much greater extent and not sit contextually within the neighbourhood. According to the consulting arborist report of Talbot McKenzie the Proposal and excavations associated with the Proposal will require all 77 trees on the site to be removed; this was known to the Township when the RFP was issued and the Requirements were mandated.

The loss of 77 trees is significant to our natural environment and our place within it. To offset this environmental loss, Method Built and the Proposal provide the following mitigation measures:

1. approximately \$80,000 to the Township tree replacement fund to acquire, develop and install new significant trees within the Township in the immediate future, and
2. more than \$1 million (via the purchase price) to the Township to acquire new parkland within the Township.

In addition, it is critical to keep in mind that the development of sensitive, sustainable, in-fill homes within the core will help prevent the development of insensitive, unsustainable, single-family homes in the suburbs or western communities following the clearing of trees to make way for 45 lots and homes, and additional clearing for ancillary roadways and services. So long as housing demand remains at unprecedented levels, the Proposal provides a more environmentally sensitive and sustainable form of housing (see below), than the alternative noted herein.

Following feedback from neighbours and Council, we explored a variety of creative ways we could add significant trees to this proposal and have managed to engineer a solution to add 5 significant, indigenous trees to the North of the Proposal.

The unprecedented step-backs of the fourth and fifth floors means that from street level, the Proposal will appear to be a three-story building only. Our architectural brief was to design a multi-family apartment building that is no different in design and materials from a high-end condominium building. The result is a Proposal with a very high quality and attractive envelope using natural materials including brick and specialty single-skin steel cladding.

Though not required to, the Proposal is expected to meet the latest standards in environmental efficiency and design – Step Code Three. This represents a significant financial commitment to reducing environmental footprint of the building over the course of its lifetime. The Proposal also includes a high quality and permeable hardscape and softscape plan, including a green roof offering outdoor amenities (patio, barbeque, sport court) and vegetable planters for residents to garden. All of these elements represent significant financial commitments from the ownership group, and were not requirements of the RFP or purchase and sales agreement. In addition, such a high level of construction and environmental sustainability is unprecedented in an affordable housing project, let alone from a private developer committed to affordable housing.

In response to feedback from neighbours and Council, The Proposal includes a commitment to both physical-health and mental-health accessibility. This is achieved by ensuring accessibility within some of the units and by ensuring the building is pet-friendly and will include a pet-washing station.

Design Review Committee

The Design Review Committee unanimously approved the Proposal subject to a review of increasing the secure bicycle spots from 45.

Parking, Traffic, and Access

Method Built engaged the engineers at Watt Consulting Group to produce a parking study for the Proposal. After reviewing comparable buildings and comparable homes in the Core, they determined that the parking demand for the Proposal is expected to be 42 parking stalls. They recommended the following three initiatives to reduce the parking demand:

- 1) a shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided by the owner,
- 2) e-bike parking as follows:
 - a. 50% long-term bicycle parking spaces with 110V outlets, and
 - b. secured long-term bicycle parking,
- 3) a car-share program as follows:

- a. one parking space compliant with MODO construction standards for a shared vehicle to park 24 hours/day,
- b. the purchase of one MODO vehicle at a cost of approximately \$31,500 to be located at the parking space, and
- c. purchasing memberships for up to 63 units and promotional credits of \$100 per resident.

Following feedback at the Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the **additional** 14 e-bikes will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls,
- 4) secured bicycle parking for 75 (as opposed to 45) bicycles, of which 57 are indoor and 18 outdoor are outdoor.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this **exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots.**

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each fo the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each fo the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

In addition, to mitigate against the risk that tenants with vehicles will park on neighbouring roadways, every lease will contain a provision whereby the tenant discloses any vehicles they own or lease, and warrant not to park on neighbouring roadways but in their designated parking spot (if any). A penalty clause equal to one-months-rent for residents parking on neighbourhood streets will be implemented. Any revenue generated from this penalty clause will be dedicated to the Township with a request that such funds be earmarked for spending at Lampson Park.

Further to feedback from neighbours and Council with respect to alternative access routes, the Township advises that providing road access via Lampson Street is not feasible as it will require removing parkland from Lampson Park and the baseball

diamond; the Township is prioritizing this public amenity over improved motor-vehicle traffic access from Fleming Street to Lampson Street.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, we have consulted with the Township who advise that current residents on Fleming Street may initiate a Residential Parking Only process whereby Fleming Street would become designated with signage for parking by local residents only and subject to fines. We are prepared to liase with neighbours to help advance this process.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

Public Realm and Infrastructure Contributions

In addition to contributing approximately \$80,000 to the Township’s tree replacement fund, and more than \$1million to the Township to acquire additional parkland, the Proposal includes a commitment to construct and extend Fleming Road and to build a hammer-head designed to meet the significant engineering requirements of the Esquimalt Fire Department. Moreover, the Proposal includes a commitment to upgrade the existing water, sewer, and storm lines in the neighbourhood, all of which are beyond capacity. These are substantial financial commitments to both the Township and the neighbourhood from an ownership group that lives in, and is committed to, Esquimalt.

Team

The ownership group has partnered with Method Built, Steller Architects, Biophilia Landscape Architects and Campbell Construction to develop and construct the Proposal to the highest of standards.

Summary

As part of the RFP the Township identified two concurrent macro-crisis it wished to address:

1. the lack of affordable housing in the Township, and
2. the climate emergency.

This Proposal is a direct response to both of these crises.

Note that you are invited to a second “Open House” that will be held at the Esquimalt Recreation Centre on 01 November 2021 at 6PM.

ⁱ Request for Proposals for the Acquisition and Development of a Multi-family Housing Site at 880 Fleming Street, Esquimalt, Issued on Friday, July 6, 2018 (“RFP”), at pg.4.

ⁱⁱ RFP at pg.4.

MEMORANDUM

To: Rajinder Sahota – Method Build Homes
From: MJ Oh, Transportation Technologist and Andy Kading, P.Eng.
Our File #: 2977.B01
Project: 880 Fleming Street Development
Date: October 8, 2021
RE: Traffic Impact Review

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Watt Consulting Group was retained by Method Build Homes (1237932 BC LTD.) to conduct a traffic impact review of the proposed residential development at 880 Fleming Street, in the Township of Esquimalt, BC. The site is located just north of Lampson Park at the northern terminus of Fleming Street. This memo reviews the expected traffic impacts from the proposed development, assesses the impacts to the study intersection of Colville Road / Fleming Street. The analysis includes the adjacent development traffic (874 Fleming Street) which uses the same access road (Fleming Street). See **Figure 1** for the study area and site location.

1.1 ROADWAY NETWORK

Colville Road provides east-west connectivity between Admirals Road and Dominion Road. Fleming Road is a short local road connected to Colville Road and leads to the development site. The intersection of Colville Road / Fleming Street is stop controlled with no separate turn lanes. Currently there is no access road to the site using existing public right-of-way. With the development, an access road connection will be required from Fleming Street to the development site (see **Figure 1**).

1.2 DATA COLLECTION

Traffic counts were collected from a previous study for 874 Fleming Street (Esquimalt Lions Lodge Redevelopment: Transportation and Parking Study, August 2019, Bunt). Traffic counts were originally undertaken on January 31 and February 1, 2019, for both the AM and PM peak hours. On Colville Road, low volumes (100 vph for both directions) were observed during the peak hours.




Figure 1: Study Area and Site Location

2.0 DEVELOPMENT TRIPS

2.1 TRIP GENERATION

The site is currently undeveloped. The proposed development is a multi-family rental building that has a total of 45 dwelling units. Based on the 10th Edition ITE Trip Generation Manual, the development will generate 16 trips in the AM peak hour and 20 trips in the PM peak hour.

Trip generation rates for the weekday AM and PM peak hours are shown in **Table 1**. **Table 2** shows the estimated trips generated by proposed land use.

TABLE 1: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION RATES

ITE Land Use		Weekday AM			Weekday PM		
Code	Description	Rate	In	Out	Rate	In	Out
221	Multi-Family Housing (Mid-Rise)	0.36	26%	74%	0.44	61%	39%

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

2.2 TRIP ASSIGNMENT

The trips generated by the proposed development were assigned based on existing traffic patterns at the Colville Road / Fleming Street intersection. The trip assignment for the AM and PM peak hours is shown in **Figure 2**.




Figure 2: Trip Assignment

3.0 TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

3.1 2032 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

For the analysis 2032 horizon year (10 years after development completion) background volumes were used. 2032 Background traffic was estimated by using a 1.0% annual growth rate applied to

the 2019 counts. Background volumes also include the adjacent site trips estimated from the 874 Fleming Street redevelopment. **Figure 3** shows 2032 10-year horizon background volumes during the peak hours.




Figure 3: 2032 Background Volumes

At Colville Road / Fleming Street, 2032 background conditions (without the development) were analysed with Synchro. In the 2032, the intersection of Colville Road / Fleming Street will continue to operate at a LOS A for all movements. The southbound movement with stop control will operate at a LOS A with a delay of 9 seconds on average during the peak hours.

3.2 2032 POST DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

2032 post development conditions were analysed by adding the development trips to 2031 background traffic volumes. See **Figure 4** for 2032 10-year horizon post development volumes.





Figure 4: 2032 Post Development Volumes

The development will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road / Fleming Street. The intersection will continue to operate at a LOS A for all movements during the AM and PM peak hours in 2032 with the traffic from the 880 and 874 Fleming Street developments. Additional delays by the development will be minor, adding less than 1sec of additional delay for all movements. No capacity issues were found at the Colville Road / Fleming Street intersection in the long term with the developments.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed development will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road / Fleming Street for the long term. The intersection will continue to operate at a LOS A for all movements during the 2032 post development peak hours. The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road / Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required at the intersection.





880 FLEMING STREET

Parking Study

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Lilly".

Author: Matthew Lilly, BSc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Shah".

Reviewer: Tim Shah, RPP, MCIP

October 1, 2021
File No. 2977.B01



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Subject Site.....	1
1.2	Site Characteristics and Policy Context.....	2
2.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	6
2.1	Land Use.....	6
2.2	Proposed Parking Supply.....	7
2.3	Proposed Bicycle Parking Supply.....	7
3.0	PARKING BYLAW REQUIREMENTS	7
4.0	EXPECTED PARKING DEMAND.....	7
4.1	Market and Below Market Rental Parking Demand.....	7
4.2	Housing Income Limit Parking Demand	15
4.3	Visitor Parking Demand.....	18
4.4	Summary of Expected Parking Demand.....	19
5.0	ON-STREET PARKING ASSESSMENT.....	20
6.0	TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT.....	22
6.1	Provision of Electric Bicycles	22
6.2	Shared Electric Bike Program.....	25
6.3	Electric Bike Parking.....	26
6.4	Provision of a Carshare Program.....	28
6.5	TDM Summary.....	31
7.0	CONCLUSIONS.....	32
8.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	32



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Watt Consulting Group (WATT) was retained by Method Build Homes (1237932 BC LTD.) to conduct a parking study for a proposed multi-family residential building with a mix of housing tenures including: market rate, below market, and housing income limit (HIL) units at 880 Fleming Street in the Township of Esquimalt, BC. The purpose of this study is to determine the total parking demand for the subject site.

1.1 SUBJECT SITE

The proposed development site is 880 Fleming Street in the Township of Esquimalt, BC (see **Figure 1**). It is currently zoned as RS-1 Single-Family Residential; however, an application for rezoning has been submitted.



Figure 1. Subject Site: 880 Fleming Street



1.2 SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND POLICY CONTEXT

The following provides information regarding services and transportation options in proximity to the subject site. In addition, the Township of Esquimalt's Official Community Plan (OCP) and other community policies pertaining to sustainable transportation and parking management are summarized.

COMMUNITY POLICIES



The Township of Esquimalt's Official Community Plan (OCP) contains policies that provide direction on future planning and land use management.¹ Per Schedule B of the OCP (Proposed Land Use Designations), the subject site is designated as 'Medium Density Residential.' Section 5.3 of the OCP (Medium/High Density Residential Development) outlines the Township's support of compact, efficient medium density residential developments that integrate with the local neighbourhood. Additionally, section 5.3 outlines the Township's prioritisation of proposed medium and high density residential developments that:

1. Reduce single occupancy vehicle use;
2. Support transit services;
3. Are located in proximity to employment centres; and
4. Accommodate young families

Sections 11 (Transportation) and 13 (Environment, Energy, & Climate Change) of the Esquimalt OCP, contain policies focused on promoting multi-modal and low-carbon transportation such as:

- Support densification along frequent and regional transit routes;

¹ Township of Esquimalt (2018). Corporation of the Township of Esquimalt Official Community Plan. Available online at: https://www.esquimalt.ca/sites/default/files/docs/business-development/OCP/Esquimalt_OCP_2020-01-09.pdf



- Consider improving and expanding cycling infrastructure to an All Ages and Abilities standard to encourage cycling as a healthy form of transportation; and
- Prioritise walking, cycling and public transit as preferred modes of transportation in infrastructure improvements.



SERVICES

Within 400m of the subject site there are many commercial, recreational, and institutional amenities including Gorge Vale Golf Club, several small-scale restaurants, a thrift store, Lampson Park, and Esquimalt High School.

- Tillicum Centre is located around two kilometres north of the subject site containing multiple amenities including a grocery store, drug store, movie theatre, recreation centre, many small-scale restaurants, a medical clinic and other amenities.
- The site is also located about 1.5 kilometres north of Esquimalt Plaza on Esquimalt Road, where there is a grocery store, a liquor store, and several small-scale restaurants.
- Lastly, the proposed development is located around three kilometres (10-minute transit ride, 15-minute bike ride, and 45-minute walk) from downtown Victoria, where even more services and amenities are available.



TRANSIT

The site has access to transit within walking distance. There are stops along Craigflower Road—servicing Route 14—that are within 200m (2-minute walk) from the site. There are also bus stops on Tillicum Road within 450 m of the site that are serviced by Route 26 (See [Figure 2](#)).



Route 14 | Vic General/UVic travels west to Victoria General Hospital and east to Downtown Victoria, then north to the University of Victoria (UVic). This route is classified as a Frequent Transit Route.

- Weekday service starts at ~5:45am and continues until midnight, except on Fridays when the service runs later.
- Service runs at a 15-minute frequency between 7am and 10pm, before and after which it runs at 20-minute frequency.

Route 26 | Dockyard/UVic is also a Frequent Transit Route that connects Esquimalt to UVic via Uptown Mall. It travels along the Tillicum Road and Lampson Street.

- Weekday service starts at 6am and ends slightly past midnight.
- This route runs at a 15-minute frequency most of the day except early mornings and late nights when frequency is reduced to 20 minutes.



WALKING

According to Walk Score, the development has a score of 54, suggesting that it is somewhat walkable.² This means that some errands may be accomplished on foot. Each of the adjacent roads to Fleming Street (Craigflower Road, Colville Road, and Lampson Street) have sidewalks on both sides allowing good walking access to the local neighbourhood. There are also multiple parks within 250m; despite this, there are few additional amenities within walking distance. Walk Score is a useful tool in determining the current walkability of a location; additionally, as areas develop and new amenities are added, Walk Score ratings may change.

² Walk Score (2021), More information about the site's walk score is available online at: <https://www.walkscore.com/score/880-fleming-st-victoria-bc-canada>



CYCLING

The site is within 150m of via a connector pathway. Craigflower Road has unbuffered bike lanes on both sides of the street providing a connection to downtown Victoria. The site is also within 800m of the E&N Rail Trail, which may be accessed via local streets with low traffic volumes. The E&N Rail Trail provides access to Downtown Victoria, the Western Communities, as well as the Galloping Goose Regional Trail. The Township is also undertaking an Active Transportation Network Plan. The draft Plan Summary document identifies a future protected bicycle lane on Lampson Street from Craigflower Road to Esquimalt Road and a protected bike facility on Tillicum Road from Craigflower Road to the Gorge Bridge. These proposed improvements, if implemented, are anticipated to improve north-south cycling connectivity—and safety—for future residents of 880 Fleming Street.



Figure 2. Transportation Context of Subject Site



2.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

2.1 LAND USE

The proposed development is a multi-family residential building comprising 17 market rental units, 14 below market units, and 14 housing income limited (HIL) rental units, for a total of 45-units, as shown in **Table 1**. Definitions for each tenure are as follows:

- Market Rental: is the market rental cost of an apartment without rental income restrictions or subsidies.
- Below Market Rental: is 90% (or 10% below) that of the cost of a market rental unit of the same size.
- Housing Income Limit Rental: represent the maximum gross household income for eligibility in many affordable housing programs. The HILs are based on figures established by CMHC and are intended to reflect the minimum income required to afford appropriate accommodation in the private market. According to BC Housing’s 2021 Housing Income Limits, the maximum gross household income for a one-bedroom in Victoria was \$44,500.³

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF HOUSING TENURE & UNIT DISTRIBUTION

Unit Type	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	3-Bedroom	Total
Market Rental	2	9	6	17
Below Market Rental	14	0	0	14
Housing Income Limit Rental	14	0	0	14
Total Units	30	9	6	45

³ BC Housing. (2021). 2021 Housing Income Limits. Available online at: <https://www.bchousing.org/publications/2021-Housing-Income-Limits-HILs.pdf>



2.2 PROPOSED PARKING SUPPLY

A total of 26 parking spaces are proposed, with 24 for residents (22 regular and two accessible parking spaces) a rate of 0.53 spaces per unit, as well as two parking spaces for visitors.

2.3 PROPOSED BICYCLE PARKING SUPPLY

A total of 45 bicycle parking spaces are proposed (a rate of 1.0 spaces per unit)

3.0 PARKING BYLAW REQUIREMENTS

Based on Part 5 – Table 1 of the Esquimalt Parking Bylaw, a RM-4 and RM-5 class building (Medium and High Density Apartment) is required to provide 1.3 spaces per dwelling unit. In addition to this, one of every four required parking spaces must be designated as a visitor space. By applying this rate to the proposed development, the required parking supply is 59 spaces (44 resident spaces, and 17 visitor spaces). This means that the development is 33 spaces short of the Township’s parking requirement.

4.0 EXPECTED PARKING DEMAND

Expected parking demand for this site was estimated in the following sections to determine if the proposed supply will adequately accommodate the parking demand. Expected demand is based on [a] parking observations collected from representative sites in the Township of Esquimalt, [b] vehicle ownership data obtained by local affordable housing providers, and [c] research based on previous parking studies.

4.1 MARKET AND BELOW MARKET RENTAL PARKING DEMAND

4.1.1 REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Observations of parked vehicles were completed at 15 market rental buildings in the Township of Esquimalt representing a total of 598 units. A summary of the representative sites is outlined in **Table 2**. Even though all of the sites are market rental buildings, they were deemed to be representative of parking demand for both market and below market rental housing. This judgment was based on past parking studies completed by WATT in Greater Victoria along with conversations with local housing



providers, which confirmed that parking demand for both housing tenures is similar.

Each location was chosen based on the following criteria:

- Proximity of Frequent Transit Network (FTN). The location of this proposed development is within 200m of bus stops on the FTN on Craigflower Road. The BC Transit Future Plan describes the FTN as receiving reliable and frequent service (every 15 minutes or better) between 7:00am and 10:00pm seven days a week. Representative sites were selected based on the criteria that they were either on the FTN or within 400m.
- Walk Score. This is a tool that ranks the walkability of a location based on its proximity to seven types of amenities: Dining and drinking, groceries, shopping, errands, parks, schools/education, and culture and entertainment. It is a useful tool for determining if a trip will require a vehicle, and may inform parking needs. The Walk Score of this development is 54, and the average Walk Score of the chosen representative sites is 60.5.
- Countable Parking Spaces. To accurately collect observational data, parking lots must be accessible to a data collector. Sites with gated or underground parking were ruled out as they prohibited data collection.
- Geography. To account for variations in parking that may be unique to the Township of Esquimalt, all representative sites fall within the geographical boundaries of the municipality with special consideration to sites that fell within 450m of the proposed development.



TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Address	Units	Walk Score	Proximity to FTN
899 Craigflower Road	49	61	On FTN
827 Selkirk Avenue	23	63	240m
843 Craigflower Road	48	59	On FTN
830 Craigflower Road	31	55	On FTN
820 Craigflower Road	58	55	On FTN
831 Ellery Street	31	61	350m
837 Ellery Street	36	61	395m
734 Lampson Street	35	58	On FTN
801 Esquimalt Road	32	67	On FTN
885 Dunsmuir Road	77	56	210m
404 Dundas Street	19	70	65m
630 Head Street	30	63	145m
628 Head Street	22	63	125m
980 Wordsley Street	65	60	210m
464 Lampson Street	42	55	350m

4.1.2 OBSERVATIONS

Observations were conducted during the following periods:

- Tuesday, 26 January 2021, after 10:30pm
- Wednesday, 27 January 2021, after 10:30pm

Observations of parking utilisation were conducted at representative sites during peak period for residential land uses (typically weekday evenings). The peak observation for each site over the two observation periods was selected to calculate parking demand



(see **Table 3**). Average parking demand ranged from 0.50 vehicles per unit to 1.14 vehicles per unit. The average across the 15 sites was 0.79 vehicles per unit.

TABLE 3. OBSERVATIONS AT REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Address	Units	Peak Observed Vehicles	Parking Demand (Vehicles/Unit)
899 Craigflower Road	49	32	0.65
827 Selkirk Avenue	23	19	0.83
843 Craigflower Road	48	25	0.52
830 Craigflower Road	31	34	1.10
820 Craigflower Road	58	42	0.72
831 Ellery Street	31	21	0.67
837 Ellery Street	36	31	0.79
734 Lampson Street	35	22	0.63
801 Esquimalt Road	32	16	0.50
885 Dunsmuir Road	77	68	0.88
404 Dundas Street	19	15	0.79
630 Head Street	30	26	0.87
628 Head Street	22	25	1.14
980 Wordsley Street	65	63	0.97
464 Lampson Street	42	36	0.86
Average			0.79



4.1.3 ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

Observations are a useful method of assessing parking demand rates; however, there are limitations to this method. The main limitation is that resident vehicles may not be present at the time of observation. To mitigate this factor, observations were conducted after 10:30pm to maximise likelihood of residents being home. Observations were conducted during the global pandemic of COVID-19 and subsequent social and physical distancing orders from the Provincial Health Officer.⁴ There is still a chance that residents' vehicles may not be present for a multitude of other factors.

To address this potential discrepancy, a 5% adjustment was applied to the observational data in accordance with the Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study.⁵ The Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study recommends a 5% parking occupancy adjustment factor if observations are conducted after 10:30pm. This resulted in an adjusted parking demand ranging from 0.53 vehicles per unit to 1.19 vehicles per unit, with an average parking demand of 0.83 vehicles per unit as shown in **Table 4**.

⁴ BC CDC. (2020). COVID-19 – Common Questions: Physical Distancing, Available online at: <http://www.bccdc.ca/health-info/diseases-conditions/covid-19/common-questions>

⁵ Metro Vancouver. (2012). The Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study, Technical Report. Available online at: http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/Apartment_Parking_Study_TechnicalReport.pdf



TABLE 4. ADJUSTED PARKING DEMAND, OBSERVED REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Address	Units	Parking Demand (Vehicles/Unit)	Adjusted Parking Demand (Vehicles/Unit)*1.05
899 Craigflower Road	49	0.65	0.69
827 Selkirk Avenue	23	0.83	0.87
843 Craigflower Road	48	0.52	0.55
830 Craigflower Road	31	1.10	1.15
820 Craigflower Road	58	0.72	0.76
831 Ellery Street	31	0.67	0.70
837 Ellery Street	36	0.79	0.83
734 Lampson Street	35	0.63	0.66
801 Esquimalt Road	32	0.50	0.53
885 Dunsmuir Road	77	0.88	0.93
404 Dundas Street	19	0.79	0.83
630 Head Street	30	0.87	0.91
628 Head Street	22	1.14	1.19
980 Wordsley Street	65	0.97	1.02
464 Lampson Street	42	0.86	0.90
Average		0.79	0.83



4.1.4 PARKING DEMAND BY UNIT TYPE

Unit size type refers to the number of bedrooms provided within a residential unit. Research has shown that larger units will generally have more occupants or a family, therefore increasing the likelihood that additional vehicles will be owned by occupants and growing the parking demand.⁶ Parking data collected for this study was assessed to reflect unit type using the following steps:

- Parking demand was calculated and adjusted by 5%;
- Parking demand by unit type was calculated based on the demand ratios of bedrooms per unit at each site acquired from the Metro Vancouver Parking Study from 2018; and
- The assumed “ratio differences” (from 2018 Metro Vancouver Parking study) for parking demand between each site was applied to unit data and vehicle observations. These “ratio differences” are as follows.⁷
 - 1-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 117% higher than studio unit rates;
 - 2-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 26% higher than 1-Bedroom unit rates; and
 - 3-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 23% higher than 2-Bedroom unit rates.

Table 5 illustrates the adjusted average parking demand by unit type.

⁶ Potoglou, D., & Kanaroglou, P.S. (2008). Modelling car ownership in urban areas: a case study of Hamilton, Canada. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 16(1): 42–54.

⁷ Metro Vancouver. (2018). Regional Parking Study – Technical Report, pg. 18. Available online at: <http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/PlanningPublications/RegionalParkingStudy-TechnicalReport.pdf>



TABLE 5. ADJUSTED PARKING DEMAND BY UNIT SIZE

Site / Address	Adjusted Parking Demand	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	3-Bedroom
899 Craigflower Road	0.69	0.59	0.75	--
827 Selkirk Avenue	0.87	0.87		--
843 Craigflower Road	0.55	0.52	0.66	--
830 Craigflower Road	1.15	1.02	1.29	--
820 Craigflower Road	0.76	0.76	0.95	--
831 Ellery Street	0.70	--	0.70	--
837 Ellery Street	0.83	0.75	0.94	--
734 Lampson Street	0.66	0.66	--	--
801 Esquimalt Road	0.53	0.57	0.72	--
885 Dunsmuir Road	0.93	0.88	1.10	1.36
404 Dundas Street	0.83	0.83	--	--
630 Head Street	0.91	0.84	1.06	--
628 Head Street	1.19	1.18	1.49	--
980 Wordsley Street	1.02	0.95	1.20	--
464 Lampson Street	0.90	0.77	0.97	--
Average	0.83	0.80	0.99	1.21*

*Due to the limited number of observed 3-bedroom units the assumed ratio difference has been applied to the findings of the 2-bedroom rate.



Results show that the average parking demand when factored for number of bedrooms and applied to the proposed development, are as follows:

- 1-Bedroom Units | $0.80 \text{ spaces per unit} * 16 \text{ units} = 13 \text{ spaces}$ (12.80 spaces, rounded)
- 2-Bedroom Units | $0.99 \text{ spaces per unit} * 9 \text{ units} = 9 \text{ spaces}$ (8.88 spaces, rounded)
- 3-Bedroom Units | $1.21 \text{ spaces per unit} * 6 \text{ units} = 8$ (7.28 spaces, rounded)
- **Total Market and Below Market Rental Parking Demand = 30 parking spaces**

4.2 HOUSING INCOME LIMIT PARKING DEMAND

4.2.1 REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Vehicle ownership data was obtained from Pacifica Housing and the Greater Victoria Housing Society to gain insight into the parking demand of other buildings with units that are Rent Geared to Income and/or based on Housing Income Limits. These organisations provided information for 272 units. A summary of the representative sites is outlined in **Table 6**.



TABLE 6. SUMMARY OF HOUSING INCOME LIMITED REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Address	Units	Number of Stalls Rented	Parking Demand Rate (Vehicles/Unit)
1025 North Park Street	10	10	1.00
450 Superior Street	40	8	0.20
1130 Fort Street	21	22	1.05
3015 Jutland Road	21	45	2.14
3226 Alder Street	32	20	0.63
1253 Johnson Street	21	8	0.38
921 North Park Street	74	26	0.35
2993 Tillicum Road	53	27	0.51
Average			0.78

4.2.2 PARKING DEMAND BY UNIT TYPE

As above in **Section 4.1.4**, the parking demand data was adjusted to reflect the demand based on unit type. However, as the data collected is based on the number of rented parking stalls, and not based on observations, it was not adjusted by 10% the same way as the data from **Section 4.1**.

The following steps were followed for this analysis:

- Parking demand by unit type was calculated based on the demand ratios of the unit sizes for ‘Affordable Housing’ in the City of Victoria’s Off-Street Parking Regulations⁸ (Schedule C); and

⁸ City of Victoria. (2020). Zoning Regulation Bylaw (80-159) – Off Street Parking. Available online at: <https://www.victoria.ca/assets/Departments/Planning~Development/Development~Services/Zoning/Bylaws/Schedule%20C.pdf>



- The assumed “ratio differences” for parking demand between each site was applied to the unit data and vehicle observations. These “ratio differences” are as follows.
 - 1-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 86% higher than studio unit rates;
 - 2-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 40% higher than 1-Bedroom unit rates; and
 - 3-Bedroom units’ parking demand rates will be 20% higher than 2-Bedroom unit rates.

Table 7 illustrates the average parking demand by unit type.

TABLE 7. PARKING DEMAND BY UNIT SIZE

Site / Address	Parking Demand	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	3-Bedroom
1025 North Park Street	1.00	0.75	1.05	1.26
450 Superior Street	0.20	0.15	0.21	0.25
1130 Fort Street	1.05	0.67	0.94	1.13
3015 Jutland Road	2.14		2.56	3.07
3226 Alder Street	0.63	0.44	0.61	0.73
1253 Johnson Street	0.38		0.35	0.42
921 North Park Street	0.35	0.27	0.38	0.46
2993 Tillicum Road	0.51	0.43	0.60	
Average	0.78	0.45	0.84	1.04

Results show that the average parking demand when factored for number of bedrooms and applied to the proposed development, are as follows:

- 1-Bedroom Units | 0.45 spaces per unit * 14 units = 7 spaces (6.3 spaces, rounded)
- **Total Parking Demand for HIL Units = 7 parking spaces**



4.3 VISITOR PARKING DEMAND

Observational visitor parking data was collected at six of the representative sites, showing a demand rate of 0.07 vehicles per unit (see **Table 8**). These observations are similar to the results from the Metro Vancouver study, which concluded visitor parking demand is typically less than 0.1 vehicles per unit.⁹ Findings from similar studies conducted by WATT Consulting Group have reported visitor parking in the range of 0.05 to 0.10 across different geographical regions including Greater Victoria and Nanaimo.

TABLE 8. VISITOR PARKING DEMAND AT REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Address	Units	Peak Observed Visitor Vehicles	Visitor Parking Demand (Vehicles/Unit)
899 Craigflower Road	49	4	0.08
801 Esquimalt Road	32	4	0.12
885 Dunsmuir Road	77	1	0.03
630 Head Street	30	3	0.13
980 Wordsley Street	65	2	0.03
464 Lampson Street	42	2	0.05
Average			0.07

Based on the available research and observational data, a conservative rate of 0.1 is recommended for the subject site. With 45 units and applying a visitor demand rate of 0.1, the recommended visitor parking is five spaces (4.5, rounded).

⁹ Metro Vancouver. (2012). The Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study, Technical Report. Available online at: <http://www.metrovancouver.org/services/regional-planning/transportation/regional-parking-studies/Pages/default.aspx>



4.4 SUMMARY OF EXPECTED PARKING DEMAND

The expected parking demand for this building is 37 residential spaces and five visitor spaces, bringing the total demand to 42 parking spaces—16 greater than the proposed supply (see [Table 9](#)).

TABLE 9. SUMMARY OF TOTAL EXPECTED PARKING DEMAND

Housing Tenure	Unit Type	Units	Demand Rate	Rounded Totals
Market Rental	1-Bedroom	2	0.8	2
	2-Bedroom	9	0.99	9
	3-Bedroom	6	1.21	8
Below Market Rental	1-Bedroom	14	0.8	11
Housing Income Limit	1-Bedroom	14	0.45	7
Visitor Parking		45	0.10	5
Total Parking Demand (Spaces)				42



5.0 ON-STREET PARKING ASSESSMENT

An on-street parking analysis was conducted in the area surrounding the subject site. A total of 105 on-street spaces were observed. Two counts were completed after 9:30pm on the 2nd and 3rd of February 2021. Counts were completed on the following street segments:

- Fleming Street – Colville Rd to End
- Colville Road – Lampson Street to Fleming Street
 - Note: there are four spaces from 908 Colville Road to Fleming Street that are denoted as 'Resident Parking Only'.
- Colville Road – Fleming Street to Phoenix Street
- Lampson Street – Craigflower to Transfer Street

The on-street counts were intended to capture the peak parking conditions for residential parking conditions when residents (particularly on Fleming Street) are most likely to be home.

The peak parking demand was 55 vehicles (105 spaces) for a maximum utilisation of 53% (65% on Fleming Street, 81% on Lampson Street, and 44% on Colville Road). See **Table 10**. These data indicate that the surrounding on-street parking conditions are generally not busy during the peak time.



TABLE 10. SUMMARY OF ON-STREET PARKING DEMAND

Street	Segment	Side	Available Spaces	Observed	% Occupied
Lampson Street	Craigflower - Transfer Street	W	16	13	81.25%
Colville Road	Lampson Street - 908 Colville Rd	N	16	6	37.50%
	908 Colville Rd - Fleming Street	N	4	0	0.00%
	Lampson Street - Fleming Street	S	25	4	16.00%
	Fleming Street - Phoenix Street	N	9	9	100.00%
		S	17	11	64.71%
Fleming Street	Colville Road - End	E	8	4	50.00%
		W	10	8	80.00%
Total			105	55	53%



6.0 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Transportation demand management (TDM) is the application of strategies and policies to influence individual travel choice, most commonly to reduce single-occupant vehicle travel. TDM measures typically aim to encourage sustainable travel, enhance travel options and decrease parking demand. The following sections present a number of TDM measures that the applicant could pursue to reduce the amount of vehicle parking required for the development. All of the TDM measures are recommended but the applicant will ultimately need to decide what they will commit to. For all of the TDM measures, an approximate reduction in parking demand is provided.

6.1 PROVISION OF ELECTRIC BICYCLES

6.1.1 OVERVIEW

Electric bicycles (e-bikes) are bicycles with an electric motor of 500 watts or less, and functioning pedals. The e-bike will assist a rider pedalling up to a top speed of 32 km/h at which point the electric motor will no longer assist the rider. In other words, it is possible to achieve speeds greater than 32 km/h on an e-bike—such as when going downhill, similar to what is possible on a conventional bicycle—but the electric mechanism will no longer assist the rider above 32 km/h and at that point the rider can still pedal but without benefit of the electric motor.

Electric bicycles make cycling more attractive for a greater diversity of the population, particularly for seniors, women, and people with disabilities, as they increase the maximum length of bicycle trips, minimize the impact of hills and other terrain challenges, and allow people to bike with heavier cargo loads. Further, electric bicycles can help communities achieve their GHG emission reduction targets. With supportive cycling infrastructure in place, e-bikes have the potential to substitute for, or completely replace, almost all trips taken by a gasoline powered car, which could address congestion issues within urban areas.



Recent research on e-bikes has reported the following impacts on vehicle ownership:

- A 2020 scoping review looked at 76 studies that have been published to date on electric bikes. It found that the proportion of car journeys substituted following acquisition of an e-bike ranged from 20% to 86%, with three studies reporting the substitution of short car journeys with the e-bike.¹⁰
- A 2020 study found that people who purchased an e-bike increased their bicycle use from 2.1 to 9.2 km per day on average.¹¹
- A 2019 study found that approximately 39 kilometres of driving per week is displaced by the average e-bike adopter along with 14 kilometres of travel by conventional bicycle.¹²
- A 2018 study presented results of a North American survey of electric bike owners. The study reported that 62% of e-bike trips replaced trips that otherwise would have been taken by car. Of these trips previously taken by car, 45.8% were commute trips to work or school, 44.7% were other utilitarian trips (entertainment, personal errands, visiting friends and family, or other), and 9.4% were recreation or exercise trips. The average length of these previous car trips was 15 kilometres.¹³

Based on travel data from the 2017 CRD Origin Destination Household Travel Survey, the majority of trips from the Township are for work and shopping, which could both be completed on an electric bike. Further, within the Capital Region, the average bike trip is 3 kilometres and the average car trip is 6 kilometres. A 2019 study found that e-bike

¹⁰ Bourne, J.E., Cooper, A.R., Kelly, P., Kinnear, F.J., England, C., Leary, S., and A. Page. (2020). The impact of e-cycling on travel behaviour: A scoping review. *Journal of Transportation Health*, 19.

¹¹ Fyhri, A & H.B. Sundfor. (2020). Do people who buy e-bikes cycle more? *Transportation Research Part D*, 86, 1-7.

¹² Bagasse, A & E Borgesian. (2019). *Electric Bicycles: Can they reduce driving and emissions in Canada*. Plan Canada Fall 2019.

¹³ MacArthur, J., Harpool, M., & D. Scheppke. (2018). *A North American Survey of Electric Bicycle Owners*. National Institute for Transportation and Communities, NITC-RR-1041.



trips in North American and Europe are 6 kilometres on average, which indicates that e-bikes have considerable potential to displace vehicle trips in the CRD.¹⁴

Based on the data and research above, e-bikes can be a suitable TDM strategy for the subject site.

6.1.2 RECOMMENDATION

The applicant is considering the provision of electric bicycles as part of the proposed development. According to research completed in Greater Victoria, the cost of an electric bike is the largest barrier preventing purchases of e-bikes.¹⁵ The price of an electric bike ranges considerably depending on the model and brand. However, the price is typically in the range of \$2,000-\$10,000.

As such, the provision of an electric bike can make e-bike ownership possible for future residents. It is recommended that the applicant provide an e-bike to all 14 units that qualify for the Housing Income Limit Rental. Tenants in these units will have a gross household income that does not exceed \$44,500. The provision of an e-bike to these units will provide residents with greater transportation choice and further disincentivize vehicle ownership. To create more flexibility and suit residents' needs, it is recommended that the applicant, as part of the tenant selection process, work with future residents to determine which electric bike is most suitable for their needs.

A parking demand reduction of 20% is supported for the proposed development if an electric bicycle is provided to each HIL unit.

¹⁴ Berjisian, E & A Bigazzi. (2019). Summarizing the Impacts of Electric Bicycle Adoption on Vehicle Travel, Emissions, and Physical Activity. React Lab, UBC. Available online at: http://civil-reactlab.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2019/07/BerjisianBigazzi_ImpactsofE-bikes_Report_July2019.pdf

¹⁵ WATT Consulting Group. (2018). Capital Region Local Government Electric Vehicle + Electric Bike Infrastructure Backgrounder. Available online at: https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/climate-action-pdf/reports/electric-vehicle-and-e-bike-infrastructure-backgrounder-sept-2018.pdf?sfvrsn=a067c5ca_2



6.2 SHARED ELECTRIC BIKE PROGRAM

6.2.1 OVERVIEW

The applicant is considering the provision of a shared electric bike program in the proposed development, which will make cycling more attractive for residents and help them complete a variety of trips that would otherwise require a car, transit, or another mode. The program would be open to all residents but be intended for the residents living in the market rental and below market rental units.

6.2.2 RECOMMENDATION

As the applicant continues to determine the operational and logistical details for the proposed shared e-bike program, it is recommended that they consider the following:

- A minimum of five electric bicycles should be provided (just over 10% of the total units).
- To create more flexibility and suit tenant needs, it is recommended that the applicant provide different types of electric bikes. For example, a young family looking to rent a three-bedroom unit may be more interested in an electric cargo bike, which are better for transporting children and heavier items such as groceries.
- The e-bikes should be owned and maintained by the property manager.
- The cost to use (i.e., reserve) an e-bike should be determined by the property manager.
- The process to reserve an e-bike will most likely be on a first come first serve basis but will ultimately need to be determined by the property manager.
- Overall e-bike utilization should be carefully monitored in the first year. If demand is consistently high, consideration should be given to adding more e-bikes to the fleet after year 1.
- Building tenants should be discouraged from using the e-bikes for work trips. The e-bikes should be intended for various trip purposes including errands, shopping, appointments, etc., which are all shorter duration trips and would allow the e-bikes to be more available to the site for other residents.

With the provision of a shared electric bike program, a 10% reduction in resident parking demand is supported.



6.3 ELECTRIC BIKE PARKING

6.3.1 OVERVIEW

To support the provision of shared electric bicycles in the proposed development, it is recommended that the applicant provide adequate e-bike parking. According to research completed in Greater Victoria, one of the top barriers facing prospective e-bike users is the fear that their bicycle might be stolen.¹⁶ Further this research showed that users would feel more comfortable if they could park their bicycle in a locked or supervised area.

The Capital Region Local Government Electric Vehicle + Electric Bike Infrastructure Planning Guide¹⁷ includes e-bike parking design guidelines to help address the concerns of current and prospective e-bike owners as well as to increase overall e-bike ownership in the Capital Region. The guide recommends that new developments provide 50% of the long-term bicycle parking with access to an 110V wall outlet. Further, 10% of the long-term spaces are recommended to be provided as cargo racks to accommodate e-bikes.

6.3.2 RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the applicant commit to the following:


- **Cargo Bike Parking** | Design 10% of the long-term bicycle parking spaces (approximately five spaces) to accommodate cargo bicycles. Cargo bikes are typically longer than regular bicycles because they can carry cargo and/or multiple passengers and can be a popular option for young families. The spaces should be designed to be a minimum of 3.0 metres in length and 0.9 metres wide. They should also be provided as ground anchored racks.
- **Access to Charging** | Provide at least 50% of the long-term bicycle parking spaces with direct access to an 110V wall outlet to help facilitate charging for e-bike owners and/or prospective e-bike owners.

¹⁶ WATT Consulting Group. (2018). Capital Region Local Government Electric Vehicle + Electric Bike Infrastructure Backgrounder. Available online at: https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/climate-action-pdf/reports/electric-vehicle-and-e-bike-infrastructure-backgrounder-sept-2018.pdf?sfvrsn=a067c5ca_2

¹⁷ Ibid.



- **Secured Location** | Ensure that all long-term bike parking spaces will be in a secure access-controlled location, which is especially important for e-bike users to minimize bike theft.



Typical dimensions for cargo and longer bicycles. Source: BC Active Transportation Design Guide

With the provision of electric bike parking, a 5% reduction in resident parking demand is supported.



6.4 PROVISION OF A CARSHARE PROGRAM

6.4.1 OVERVIEW

Carshare is a form of car rental where people can book vehicles for varying lengths of time. They are usually co-operative and users must sign up as a member to be able to use the vehicles and pay the costs associated with it. An external carshare program could be considered for the site, as carsharing can be a viable option for those who sometimes need access to a vehicle but may not want to or be able to pay the costs associated with owning a vehicle (or second vehicle). The external carshare program would be through Modo, which is the largest carsharing company in the Greater Victoria area. Modo is a co-operative, and this means that the vehicles would not be reserved exclusively for employees at the site as other Modo members in the area could also use the vehicle(s).

At the time of writing this report, there are currently four Modo carshare vehicles in Esquimalt according to their website.¹⁸ Even though four vehicles may seem trivial for a population of 19,000 people, the data indicate that prior to COVID-19, Modo membership was growing in the Capital Region and will likely continue to do so following the pandemic. Further, according to the 2017 CRD Regional Household Travel Survey, Esquimalt has one of the highest shares of households in the region with one vehicle (54%), which can make carsharing an even more viable option for families who may require a vehicle for only select trips.¹⁹

Part of the reason why carsharing is expanding locally and being supported by municipalities is because of its ability to reduce household vehicle ownership and parking demand. A recent 2018 study from Metro Vancouver analyzed 3,405 survey respondents from carsharing users in the region and found that users of Car2go and Modo reported reduced vehicle ownership after joining a carsharing service. The impact

¹⁸ More information about Modo carshare vehicle location is available online at: <https://modo.coop/car-map>

¹⁹ Capital Regional District. (2017). CRD Origin-Destination 2017 Household Travel Survey, pg. 105. Available online at: https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/regional-planning-pdf/transportation/crd-2017-od-survey-report-20180622-sm.pdf?sfvrsn=4fcbe7ca_2



was larger for Modo users; households joining Modo reduced their ownership from an average of 0.68 to 0.36 vehicles. Further, Modo members were close to five times more likely to reduce car ownership compared to Car2go users. Additional research has found the following:

- A 2016 study in San Francisco reported that the potential for carsharing to reduce vehicle ownership is strongly tied to the built environment, housing density, transit accessibility, and the availability of parking.²⁰
- A 2013 study from the City of Toronto looked at the relationship between the presence of carsharing in a residential building and its impact on vehicle ownership. The study surveyed residents of buildings with and without dedicated carshare vehicles. The study found that the presence of dedicated carshare vehicles had a statistically significant impact on reduced vehicle ownership and parking demand. Specifically, 29% of carshare users gave up a vehicle after becoming a member and 55% of carshare users forgone purchasing a car as a result of carsharing participation.²¹

While a study has not yet been completed in Greater Victoria to understand the impacts of carsharing on vehicle ownership, the results would likely be similar especially for households living in more urban areas such as Esquimalt and Victoria where there is greater access to multiple transportation options.

²⁰ Clewlow, R.R. (2016). Carsharing and sustainable travel behaviour: Results from the San Francisco Bay Area. *Transport Policy*, 51, 158-164.

²¹ Engel-Yan, D., & D. Passmore. (2013). Carsharing and Car Ownership at the Building Scale. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 79(1), 82-91.



6.4.2 RECOMMENDATION

Given the location of the site and the proposed housing tenure, it is recommended that the applicant approach Modo to determine whether they would be supportive of providing a vehicle at the subject site. Based on previous correspondence with Modo, the provision of a Modo vehicle would include the following conditions:

- The applicant would provide, at no cost to Modo, one designated parking space at the proposed development, compliant with Modo Construction Standards For Shared Vehicle Parking Space and accessible to all Modo members on a 24 hour basis every day of the year;
- The applicant would provide to Modo a one-time financial contribution of approximately \$31,500 including taxes and fees to be used for the purchase of one new shared vehicle to be located in the parking space designated for carsharing;
- Modo would provide the applicant with a Partnership Membership in Modo with a public value of \$31,500, valid for the lifetime of the development and allowing a maximum of 63 units²² of the development to benefit at any given time from Modo membership privileges and lowest usage rates without the need to themselves pay a \$500 membership fee; and
- Modo would provide a promotional incentive worth \$100 of driving credits to each resident of the development joining Modo for the first time.

A 15% reduction would be supported if the applicant purchases a vehicle and locates it on-site or adjacent to the site.

²² \$31,500 divided by \$500, rounded down to the closest whole number.



6.5 TDM SUMMARY

A summary of the proposed TDM measures and parking reductions is provided below. **Table 11** presents the recommended TDM package, which includes carshare vehicle + memberships, the provision of electric bicycles for the HIL units, a shared e-bike program, and e-bike parking. This would result in a resident parking reduction of 50%. This represents a reduction in the estimated parking demand by 19 spaces, resulting in a parking demand of 23 spaces (18 resident, 5 visitor), which is three spaces less than the proposed supply.

TABLE 11. SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED PARKING DEMAND WITH TDM

TDM Measure	Parking Demand / Reduction
Resident Parking requirement per Bylaw	59 spaces
Estimated Resident Parking Demand, Baseline	37 spaces (per Table 9)
Total Parking Demand Reduction	-50%
Provision of Electric Bicycles	-20%
Shared Electric Bike Program	-10%
Electric Bicycle Parking	-5%
Carsharing Vehicle (includes memberships)	-15%
Total Parking Demand Reduction	19 spaces
Estimated Resident Parking Demand with TDM	18 spaces
Total Site Parking Demand with TDM (including 5 visitor)	23 spaces (18 + 5)
Proposed Parking Supply	26 spaces
Difference	+3



7.0 CONCLUSIONS

The proposed development at 880 Fleming Street is for a 45-unit multi-family rental building comprised of 17 market rental units, 14 below market units, and 14 housing income limited (HIL) rental units. The building includes 26 proposed parking spaces comprising 24 residential spaces (a rate of 0.53 spaces per unit), and two visitor. In addition, the applicant is proposing 45 long-term bicycle parking spaces, which results in 1.0 space per unit.

The peak parking demand is 42 spaces (37 resident, five visitor spaces), which exceeds the proposed supply by 16 spaces. Four TDM measures are recommended for the applicant's consideration. These include the provision of electric bicycles for each HIL unit, electric bicycle parking, a shared electric bicycle program, and a carshare program. If the applicant commits to all four TDM measures, a total resident parking reduction of 50% would be supported, which would lower the parking demand to 23 parking spaces, or three less than the supply.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions of this study, it is recommended that the applicant commit to:

1. Provision of electric bicycles to each HIL unit.
2. Provision of a shared electric bike program with five e-bikes (11% unit coverage).
3. Provision of electric bike parking, which includes at least 50% of the long-term bicycle parking spaces having access to 110V electrical outlets along with 10% of the long-term spaces designed to accommodate cargo e-bikes.
4. Purchasing a Modo carshare vehicle for the site, which will provide a viable mobility option for residents and reduce dependency on vehicle ownership.
5. Pursuing a conversation with the Township of Esquimalt to determine whether visitors to the subject site could park on-street. The on-street parking assessment determined that there is available parking during the peak time (evenings), which can accommodate some spillover from the site. In their



conversation with the Township, the applicant could consider one of the following strategies:

- a. Explore whether a Residential Parking Only Zone or Residential Permit Zone could be created for Fleming Street. This would provide some flexibility to 880 Fleming Street and the future redevelopment of Esquimalt Lions Lodge (874 Fleming Street) to allow a select number of residents and/or visitors to park on-street.
- b. Explore whether a few on-street spaces on Fleming Street could be designated as limited time parking zones intended for visitors of 880 Fleming Street.

PROJECT
Fleming Apartments



ADDRESS
880 Fleming Street,
Esquimalt, BC

DESIGNED BY



Bianca Bodley

DRAWN BY

KH/ KT



CUSTOM WOOD BENCH



CONCRETE SLAB WITH GEOMETRIC CUT LINES

ISSUED FOR REZONING
April 20, 2021

Scale: 1:150



L1 Landscape Site
Plan

DATE: April, 2021

PROJECT
 Fleming Apartments

ADDRESS
 880 Fleming Street,
 Esquimalt, BC

DESIGNED BY

Bianca Bodley

DRAWN BY


KH/ KT










 ISSUED FOR REZONING
 April 20, 2021

Scale: 1:150


L2 Planting Plan

DATE: April, 2021



PLANT SCHEDULE					
ID	Quantity	Symbol	Latin Name	Common Name	Size
Th	2		<i>Tsuga heterophylla</i>	Western Hemlock	4.5m
Ck	3		<i>Malus fusca</i>	Pacific Crabapple	6cm cal.
Vo	25		<i>Vaccinium ovatum</i>	Evergreen Huckleberry	#3 pot
Oc	75		<i>Oemleria cerasiformis</i>	Indian Plum	\$3 pot
Pm	20		<i>Polystichum munitum</i>	Sword Fern	#1 pot
Pp	97		<i>Polystichum polyblepharum</i>	Tassel Fern	#1 pot
Hi	84		<i>Helleborus 'Ivory Prince'</i>	Christmas Rose	#1 pot
Cc	50		<i>Cornus canadensis</i>	Bunchberry	flat
Sh	31		<i>Sarcococca hookeriana</i> var. <i>humilis</i>	Sweetbox	#1 pot

SHADE PLANT PALETTE



SWORD FERN

HELLEBORUS 'IVORY PRINCE' TASSEL FERN

BUNCHBERRY

 SARCOCOCCA HOOKERIANA
 VAR. HUMILIS

INDIAN PLUM



PACIFIC CRABAPPLE

WESTERN HEMLOCK

PROJECT
 Fleming Apartments


 ADDRESS
 880 Fleming Street,
 Esquimalt, BC









DESIGNED BY

Bianca Bodley

DRAWN BY

KH/ KT



PLANTING SCHEDULE					
ID	Quantity	Symbol	Latin Name	Common Name	Size
Pc	20		<i>Prostanthera cuneata</i>	Australian Mint	#1 pot
Ro	5		<i>Rosmarinus officinalis</i> 'Prostratus'	Creeping Rosemary	Flat
Ts	100		<i>Thymus serpyllum</i>	Woolly Thyme	Flat
Ss	101		<i>Sedum sarmentosum</i>	Stringy Stonecrop	Flat
Sp	102		<i>Saxifraga paniculata</i>	White Mountain Saxifrage	Flat
Sa	103		<i>Sedum album</i>	White Stonecrop	Flat
Ss	104		<i>Sedum spathulifolium</i> 'Cape Blanco'	Broadleaf Stonecrop	Flat
Ss	105		<i>Sedum spurium</i> 'Dragon's Blood'	Stonecrop	Flat

SUN PLANT PALETTE




CAREX TESTACEA

RUBECKIA




MISCANTHUS MORNING LIGHT AUSTRALIAN MINT WOOD'S COMPACT KINNIKINNICK AZALEA HINO WHITE



KARL FOERSTER

WHITE ECHINACEA


SUPER BLUE LAVENDER



MEXICAN ORANGE BLOSSOM

JAPANESE PLUM YEW

Woolly thyme




KATSURA

 ISSUED FOR REZONING
 April 20, 2021


Scale: 1:150


L3 Planting Plan

DATE: April, 2021



GREEN ROOF PLANTS




Woolly Thyme Stringy Stonecrop Saxifraga paniculata White Stonecrop Sedum spathulifolium 'Cape Blanco' Sedum spurium 'Dragon's Blood'

PLANTER PLANTS



WEEPING ROSEMARY AUSTRALIAN MINT



Bistro lights



Rooftop dining



Lounge chairs



Green roof



Raised planter

ISSUED FOR REZONING
April 20, 2021

Scale: 1:150



L4 Rooftop and
Green Roof Plan

DATE: April, 2021

18 October 2021

Alan Barwin
891 Lampson Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Alan Barwin,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 23 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following concerns:

1. Removal of Greenspace;
2. Increased traffic.

1) Greenspace

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built collaborated with the Township for over three years on the massing and design of the Proposal. Keeping in mind the requirement for a minimum of 35,000 finished square feet, at least 40 mixed residential homes, and a maximum of six floors, the Proposal exceeds each of the Requirements and sits sympathetically within the site and masses downwards to the west and south along with the natural grade and borders with single-family homes.

In order to meet all of the Requirements, the Proposal had to cover 55% of the lot. To cover less, would have required the Proposal to mass vertically (much like a high-rise building) to a much greater extent and not sit contextually within the neighbourhood. According to the consulting arborist report of Talbot McKenzie the Proposal and excavations associated with the Proposal will require all 77 trees on the site to be removed; this was known to Esquimalt when the RFP was issued and the Requirements were mandated.

The loss of 77 trees is significant to our natural environment and our place within it. In an effort to offset loss, Method Built and the Proposal have committed to the following mitigation measures:

1. Providing approximately \$80,000 to the Township tree replacement fund to acquire, develop and install new significant trees within the Township in the immediate future, and
2. Providing more than \$1 million to the Township to acquire new parkland within the Township.

In addition, it is critical to keep in mind that the development of sensitive, sustainable, in-fill homes within the core will help prevent the development of insensitive, unsustainable, single-family homes in the suburbs or western communities following the clearing of logs to make way for 45 lots and homes, and additional clearing for ancillary roadways and services. So long as housing demand remains at unprecedented levels, the Proposal provides a more environmental sensitive and sustainable form of housing (see below), than the alternative.

2) Increased Traffic

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

Further Engagement

We also take this opportunity to attach a Proposal Primer to this letter for your review and consideration. It provides additional context and perspective on the Proposal.

Should you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us by email (amarsahotalive@gmail.com) and we can schedule a telephone call or an in-person meeting. We will be walking through the neighbourhood and knocking on doors to discuss this proposal in person. In addition, we will be engaging in a further voluntary “Open House” session that is not mandated by the rezoning process, to ensure that everyone living in the neighbourhood and community has a full understanding of the depth and breadth of this Proposal.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Dr. Jean-Paul Restoule
891 Lampson Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Dr. Jean-Paul Restoule,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 23 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following concerns:

- 1. Increased Traffic;
- 2. Access for Emergency Vehicles;
- 3. Removal of Greenspace
- 4. Lack of Communication;

1) Increased Traffic

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

2) Access for Emergency Vehicles

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, the Proposal includes a commitment to construct and extend Fleming Road and to build a hammer-head designed to meet the significant engineering requirements of the Esquimalt Fire Department. In addition, the Proposal includes a commitment to upgrade the existing water, sewer, and storm lines in the neighbourhood, all of which are beyond capacity. These are substantial financial commitments to both the Township and the neighbourhood.

3) Greenspace

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built collaborated with the Township for over three years on the massing and design of the Proposal. Keeping in mind the requirement for a minimum of 35,000 finished square feet, at least 40 mixed residential homes, and a maximum of six floors, the Proposal exceeds each of the Requirements and sits sympathetically within the site and masses downwards to the west and south along with the natural grade and borders with single-family homes.

In order to meet all of the Requirements, the Proposal had to cover 55% of the lot. To cover less, would have required the Proposal to mass vertically (much like a high-rise building) to a much greater extent and not sit contextually within the neighbourhood. According to the consulting arborist report of Talbot McKenzie the Proposal and excavations associated with the Proposal will require all 77 trees on the site to be removed; this was known to Esquimalt when the RFP was issued and the Requirements were mandated.

The loss of 77 trees is significant to our natural environment and our place within it. In an effort to offset loss, Method Built and the Proposal have committed to the following mitigation measures:

1. Providing approximately \$80,000 to the Township tree replacement fund to acquire, develop and install new significant trees within the Township in the immediate future, and
2. Providing more than \$1 million to the Township to acquire new parkland within the Township.

In addition, it is critical to keep in mind that the development of sensitive, sustainable, in-fill homes within the core will help prevent the development of insensitive, unsustainable, single-family homes in the suburbs or western communities following the clearing of logs to make way for 45 lots and homes, and additional clearing for ancillary roadways and services. So long as housing demand remains at unprecedented levels, the Proposal provides a more environmental sensitive and sustainable form of housing (see below), than the alternative.

4) Lack of Communication

From the outset, please accept my apologies for a lack of additional public engagement.

The Rezoning process in the Township requires the developer, when submitting a rezoning application, to provide a notice of “Open House” to the Township. The Township then takes responsibility to circulate the notice to the affected neighbours. Though the developer pays for the notice to be distributed, it is the Township that executes the delivery.

In addition, the Township requires the developer to place a rezoning sign within the property to be developed. We discussed the possibility of installing the rezoning closer to Fleming Street to make it more visible, but it was determined that the bylaw is prescriptive and does not allow us to deviate from the requirement to install it on the site itself.

In addition to this correspondence and the attached Proposal Primer, please note the further engagement we are planning below.

Further Engagement

We also take this opportunity to attach a Proposal Primer to this letter for your review and consideration. It provides additional context and perspective on the Proposal.

Should you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us by email (amarsahotalive@gmail.com) and we can schedule a telephone call or an in-person meeting. We will be walking through the neighbourhood and knocking on doors to discuss this proposal in person. In addition, we will be engaging in a further voluntary “Open House” session that is not mandated by the rezoning process, to ensure that everyone living in the neighbourhood and community has a full understanding of the depth and breadth of this Proposal.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Guuduniia Laboucan
850 Fleming Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Guuduniia Laboucan,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 24 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following primary concerns:

1. Access to the Proposal;
2. Parking Study;
3. Traffic Study;
4. Public Realm and Infrastructure.

1) Access to the Proposal

Further to your feedback on this issue, we consulted with the Township about the possibility of providing access to the Proposal via Lampson Street. It turns out this would require removing parkland from Lampson Park and the baseball diamond. The Township has advised that it is prioritizing this public amenity over improved vehicular traffic from Fleming Street to Lampson Street. This also coincides with a strong commitment to environmental sustainability and effective urban planning.

2) Parking Study

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built engaged the engineers at Watt Consulting Group to produce a parking study for the Proposal. After reviewing comparable buildings and comparable homes in the Core, they determined that the parking demand for the Proposal is expected to be 42 parking stalls. They recommended the following three initiatives to reduce the parking demand:

- 1) a shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided by the owner,
- 2) e-bike parking as follows:

- a. 50% long-term bicycle parking spaces with 110V outlets, and
- b. secured long-term bicycle parking,
- 3) a car-share program as follows:
 - a. one parking space compliant with MODO construction standards for a shared vehicle to park 24 hours/day,
 - b. the purchase of one MODO vehicle at a cost of approximately \$31,500 to be located at the parking space, and
 - c. purchasing memberships for up to 63 units and promotional credits of \$100 per resident.

Following feedback at the Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the **additional 14 e-bikes** will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls,
- 4) secured bicycle parking for 81 (as opposed to 45) bicycles, of which 63 are indoor and 18 outdoor are outdoor.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this **exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots**.

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each fo the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each fo the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

In addition, to mitigate against the risk that tenants with vehicles will park on neighbouring roadways, every lease will contain a provision whereby the tenant discloses any vehicles they own or lease, and warrant not to park on neighbouring roadways but in their designated parking spot (if any). A penalty clause equal to one-months-rent for residents parking on neighbourhood streets will be implemented. Any revenue generated from this penalty clause will be dedicated to the Township with a request that such funds be earmarked for spending at Lampson Park.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, we have consulted with the Township who advise that current residents on Fleming Street may initiate a Residential Parking Only process whereby Fleming Street would become designated with signage for parking by local residents only and subject to fines. We are prepared to liase with neighbours to help advance this process.

3) Traffic Study

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

4) Public Realm and Infrastructure

In addition to contributing approximately \$80,000 to the Township’s tree replacement fund, and more than \$1million to the Township to acquire additional parkland, the Proposal includes a commitment to construct and extend Fleming Road and to build a hammer-head designed to meet the significant engineering requirements of the Esquimalt Fire Department. Moreover, the Proposal includes a commitment to upgrade the existing water, sewer, and storm lines in the neighbourhood, all of which are beyond capacity. These are substantial financial commitments to both the Township and the neighbourhood from an ownership group that lives in, and is committed to, Esquimalt.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

James Nadeau
854 Fleming Street
Victoria, BC

Dear James Nadeau,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 24 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following primary concerns:

1. Access to the Proposal;
2. Parking Study;
3. Traffic Study;
4. Communication/Engagement.

1) Access to the Proposal

Further to your feedback on this issue, we consulted with the Township about the possibility of providing access to the Proposal via Lampson Street. It turns out this would require removing parkland from Lampson Park and the baseball diamond. The Township has advised that it is prioritizing this public amenity over improved vehicular traffic from Fleming Street to Lampson Street. This also coincides with a strong commitment to environmental sustainability and effective urban planning.

2) Parking Study

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built engaged the engineers at Watt Consulting Group to produce a parking study for the Proposal. After reviewing comparable buildings and comparable homes in the Core, they determined that the parking demand for the Proposal is expected to be 42 parking stalls. They recommended the following three initiatives to reduce the parking demand:

- 1) a shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided by the owner,
- 2) e-bike parking as follows:

- a. 50% long-term bicycle parking spaces with 110V outlets, and
- b. secured long-term bicycle parking,
- 3) a car-share program as follows:
 - a. one parking space compliant with MODO construction standards for a shared vehicle to park 24 hours/day,
 - b. the purchase of one MODO vehicle at a cost of approximately \$31,500 to be located at the parking space, and
 - c. purchasing memberships for up to 63 units and promotional credits of \$100 per resident.

Following feedback at the Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the **additional 14 e-bikes** will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls,
- 4) secured bicycle parking for 81 (as opposed to 45) bicycles, of which 63 are indoor and 18 outdoor are outdoor.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this **exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots**.

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each fo the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each fo the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

In addition, to mitigate against the risk that tenants with vehicles will park on neighbouring roadways, every lease will contain a provision whereby the tenant discloses any vehicles they own or lease, and warrant not to park on neighbouring roadways but in their designated parking spot (if any). A penalty clause equal to one-months-rent for residents parking on neighbourhood streets will be implemented. Any revenue generated from this penalty clause will be dedicated to the Township with a request that such funds be earmarked for spending at Lampson Park.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, we have consulted with the Township who advise that current residents on Fleming Street may initiate a Residential Parking Only process whereby Fleming Street would become designated with signage for parking by local residents only and subject to fines. We are prepared to liase with neighbours to help advance this process.

3) Traffic Study

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

4) Lack of Communication

From the outset, please accept my apologies for a lack of additional public engagement.

The Rezoning process in the Township requires the developer, when submitting a rezoning application, to provide a notice of “Open House” to the Township. The Township then takes responsibility to circulate the notice to the affected neighbours. Though the developer pays for the notice to be distributed, it is the Township that executes the delivery.

In addition, the Township requires the developer to place a rezoning sign within the property to be developed. We discussed the possibility of installing the rezoning closer to Fleming Street to make it more visible, but it was determined that the bylaw is prescriptive and does not allow us to deviate from the requirement to install it on the site itself.

In addition to this correspondence and the attached Proposal Primer, please note the further engagement we are planning below.

Further Engagement

We also take this opportunity to attach a Proposal Primer to this letter for your review and consideration. It provides additional context and perspective on the Proposal.

Should you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us by email (amarsahotalive@gmail.com) and we can schedule a telephone call or an in-person meeting. We will be walking through the neighbourhood and knocking on doors to discuss this

proposal in person. In addition, we will be engaging in a further voluntary “Open House” session that is not mandated by the rezoning process, to ensure that everyone living in the neighbourhood and community has a full understanding of the depth and breadth of this Proposal.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Kevin Smitten
844 Fleming Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Kevin Smitten,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 24 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following primary concerns:

1. Access to the Proposal;
2. Parking Study;
3. Traffic Study;
4. Communication/Engagement;
5. Greenspace;
6. Public Realm & Infrastructure.

1) Access to the Proposal

Further to your feedback on this issue, we consulted with the Township about the possibility of providing access to the Proposal via Lampson Street. It turns out this would require removing parkland from Lampson Park and the baseball diamond. The Township has advised that it is prioritizing this public amenity over improved vehicular traffic from Fleming Street to Lampson Street. This also coincides with a strong commitment to environmental sustainability and effective urban planning.

2) Parking Study

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built engaged the engineers at Watt Consulting Group to produce a parking study for the Proposal. After reviewing comparable buildings and comparable homes in the Core, they determined that the parking demand for the Proposal is expected to be 42 parking stalls. They recommended the following three initiatives to reduce the parking demand:

- 1) a shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided by the owner,
- 2) e-bike parking as follows:
 - a. 50% long-term bicycle parking spaces with 110V outlets, and
 - b. secured long-term bicycle parking,
- 3) a car-share program as follows:
 - a. one parking space compliant with MODO construction standards for a shared vehicle to park 24 hours/day,
 - b. the purchase of one MODO vehicle at a cost of approximately \$31,500 to be located at the parking space, and
 - c. purchasing memberships for up to 63 units and promotional credits of \$100 per resident.

Following feedback at the Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the **additional** 14 e-bikes will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls,
- 4) secured bicycle parking for 81 (as opposed to 45) bicycles, of which 63 are indoor and 18 outdoor are outdoor.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this **exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots**.

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each fo the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each fo the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

In addition, to mitigate against the risk that tenants with vehicles will park on neighbouring roadways, every lease will contain a provision whereby the tenant discloses any vehicles they own or lease, and warrant not to park on neighbouring roadways but in their designated parking spot (if any). A penalty clause equal to one-months-rent for residents parking on neighbourhood streets will be implemented. Any revenue generated from this penalty clause will be dedicated to the Township with a request that such funds be earmarked for spending at Lampson Park.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, we have consulted with the Township who advise that current residents on Fleming Street may initiate a Residential Parking Only process whereby Fleming Street would become designated with signage for parking by local

residents only and subject to fines. We are prepared to liaise with neighbours to help advance this process.

3) Traffic Study

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

4)) Lack of Communication

From the outset, please accept my apologies for a lack of additional public engagement.

The Rezoning process in the Township requires the developer, when submitting a rezoning application, to provide a notice of “Open House” to the Township. The Township then takes responsibility to circulate the notice to the affected neighbours. Though the developer pays for the notice to be distributed, it is the Township that executes the delivery.

In addition, the Township requires the developer to place a rezoning sign within the property to be developed. We discussed the possibility of installing the rezoning closer to Fleming Street to make it more visible, but it was determined that the bylaw is prescriptive and does not allow us to deviate from the requirement to install it on the site itself.

In addition to this correspondence and the attached Proposal Primer, please note the further engagement we are planning below.

Further Engagement

We also take this opportunity to attach a Proposal Primer to this letter for your review and consideration. It provides additional context and perspective on the Proposal.

Should you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us by email (amarsahotalive@gmail.com) and we can schedule a telephone call or an in-person meeting. We will be walking through the neighbourhood and knocking on doors to discuss this proposal in person. In addition, we will be engaging in a further voluntary “Open House” session that is not mandated by the rezoning process, to ensure that everyone living in the neighbourhood and community has a full understanding of the depth and breadth of this Proposal.

5) Removal of Greenspace

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built collaborated with the Township for over three years on the massing and design of the Proposal. Keeping in mind the requirement for a minimum of 35,000 finished square feet, at least 40 mixed residential homes, and a maximum of six floors, the Proposal exceeds each of the Requirements and sits sympathetically within the site and masses downwards to the west and south along with the natural grade and borders with single-family homes.

In order to meet all of the Requirements, the Proposal had to cover 55% of the lot. To cover less, would have required the Proposal to mass vertically (much like a high-rise building) to a much greater extent and not sit contextually within the neighbourhood. According to the consulting arborist report of Talbot McKenzie the Proposal and excavations associated with the Proposal will require all 77 trees on the site to be removed; this was known to Esquimalt when the RFP was issued and the Requirements were mandated.

The loss of 77 trees is significant to our natural environment and our place within it. In an effort to offset loss, Method Built and the Proposal have committed to the following mitigation measures:

1. Providing approximately \$80,000 to the Township tree replacement fund to acquire, develop and install new significant trees within the Township in the immediate future, and
2. Providing more than \$1 million to the Township to acquire new parkland within the Township.

In addition, it is critical to keep in mind that the development of sensitive, sustainable, in-fill homes within the core will help prevent the development of insensitive, unsustainable, single-family homes in the suburbs or western communities following the clearing of logs to make way for 45 lots and homes, and additional clearing for ancillary roadways and services. So long as housing demand remains at unprecedented levels, the Proposal provides a more environmental sensitive and sustainable form of housing (see below), than the alternative.

6) Public Realm & Infrastructure

In addition to contributing approximately \$80,000 to the Township's tree replacement fund, and more than \$1million to the Township to acquire additional parkland, the Proposal includes a commitment to construct and extend Fleming Road and to build a hammer-head designed to meet the significant engineering requirements of the Esquimalt Fire Department. Moreover, the Proposal includes a commitment to upgrade the existing water, sewer, and storm lines in the neighbourhood, all of which are beyond capacity. These are substantial financial commitments to both the Township and the neighbourhood from an ownership group that lives in, and is committed to, Esquimalt.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Kim Heffler
867 Fleming Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Kim Heffler,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 23 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email expressed a concern in respect of there being insufficient parking for residents. Watt Consulting Group were engaged to provide a parking study. After examining similar buildings in the area with a similar tenant makeup, Watt Consulting Group recommended that we provide the following transportation demand management (**TDM**) measures to mitigate the parking demand at this building. These include:

- a) A shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided to residents;
- b) Secured e-bike parking with 50% of such spaces having 110V outlet;
- c) A car-share program with the purchase of one dedicated MODO car and memberships for all residents.

In response to concerns from neighbours and Council, we have voluntarily increased the TDM measures to include the following:

- d) Dedicated e-bikes being provided to each of the 14 deeply discounted homes (at BC Housing HIL rates).

According to Watt Consulting Group, these initiatives will be more than sufficient to address all of the parking supply issues with the Proposal. As noted in the attached Primer, we will have strong contractual language in all leases with tenants requiring them to disclose if they own or purchase motor vehicles, and if they do not have a parking spot allocated to them in the Proposal, they will be penalized heavily for parking on neighbouring streets. This will provide a substantial disincentive for any tenant who may choose to be less than honest in their vehicle ownership hoping to park on the street. Any funds gathered from this program will be diverted to the Township of Esquimalt and earmarked for Lampson Park.

In addition, all of these initiatives will contribute to our global efforts to combat human-induced climate change by mandating the use of alternatives to single-vehicle ownership.

Further Engagement

We also take this opportunity to attach a Proposal Primer to this letter for your review and consideration. It provides additional context and perspective on the Proposal.

Should you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us by email (amarsahotalive@gmail.com) and we can schedule a telephone call or an in-person meeting. We will be walking through the neighbourhood and knocking on doors to discuss this proposal in person. In addition, we will be engaging in a further voluntary “Open House” session that is not mandated by the rezoning process, to ensure that everyone living in the neighbourhood and community has a full understanding of the depth and breadth of this Proposal.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Lynn West
851 Fleming Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Lynn West,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 23 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following concerns:

1. Parking Study;
2. Traffic Study.

2) Parking Study

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built engaged the engineers at Watt Consulting Group to produce a parking study for the Proposal. After reviewing comparable buildings and comparable homes in the Core, they determined that the parking demand for the Proposal is expected to be 42 parking stalls. They recommended the following three initiatives to reduce the parking demand:

- 1) a shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided by the owner,
- 2) e-bike parking as follows:
 - a. 50% long-term bicycle parking spaces with 110V outlets, and
 - b. secured long-term bicycle parking,
- 3) a car-share program as follows:
 - a. one parking space compliant with MODO construction standards for a shared vehicle to park 24 hours/day,
 - b. the purchase of one MODO vehicle at a cost of approximately \$31,500 to be located at the parking space, and
 - c. purchasing memberships for up to 63 units and promotional credits of \$100 per resident.

Following feedback at the Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the **additional 14 e-bikes** will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls,
- 4) secured bicycle parking for 81 (as opposed to 45) bicycles, of which 63 are indoor and 18 outdoor are outdoor.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this **exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots**.

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each fo the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each fo the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

In addition, to mitigate against the risk that tenants with vehicles will park on neighbouring roadways, every lease will contain a provision whereby the tenant discloses any vehicles they own or lease, and warrant not to park on neighbouring roadways but in their designated parking spot (if any). A penalty clause equal to one-months-rent for residents parking on neighbourhood streets will be implemented. Any revenue generated from this penalty clause will be dedicated to the Township with a request that such funds be earmarked for spending at Lampson Park.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, we have consulted with the Township who advise that current residents on Fleming Street may initiate a Residential Parking Only process whereby Fleming Street would become designated with signage for parking by local residents only and subject to fines. We are prepared to liase with neighbours to help advance this process.

3) Traffic Study

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Pam Campbell

Spiral Cafe

Victoria, BC

Dear Pam Campbell,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 23 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following concerns:

1. Removal of Greenspace.

1) Greenspace

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built collaborated with the Township for over three years on the massing and design of the Proposal. Keeping in mind the requirement for a minimum of 35,000 finished square feet, at least 40 mixed residential homes, and a maximum of six floors, the Proposal exceeds each of the Requirements and sits sympathetically within the site and masses downwards to the west and south along with the natural grade and borders with single-family homes.

In order to meet all of the Requirements, the Proposal had to cover 55% of the lot. To cover less, would have required the Proposal to mass vertically (much like a high-rise building) to a much greater extent and not sit contextually within the neighbourhood. According to the consulting arborist report of Talbot McKenzie the Proposal and excavations associated with the Proposal will require all 77 trees on the site to be removed; this was known to Esquimalt when the RFP was issued and the Requirements were mandated.

The loss of 77 trees is significant to our natural environment and our place within it. In an effort to offset loss, Method Built and the Proposal have committed to the following mitigation measures:

1. Providing approximately \$80,000 to the Township tree replacement fund to acquire, develop and install new significant trees within the Township in the immediate future, and
2. Providing more than \$1 million to the Township to acquire new parkland within the Township.

In addition, it is critical to keep in mind that the development of sensitive, sustainable, in-fill homes within the core will help prevent the development of insensitive, unsustainable, single-family homes in the suburbs or western communities following the clearing of logs to make way for 45 lots and homes, and additional clearing for ancillary roadways and services. So long as housing demand remains at unprecedented levels, the Proposal provides a more environmental sensitive and sustainable form of housing (see below), than the alternative.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Sharon Pedersen
904 Colville Road
Victoria, BC

Dear Sharon Pedersen,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 24 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following primary concerns:

1. Access to the Proposal;
2. Parking Study;
3. Traffic Study;
4. Public Realm and Infrastructure.

1) Access to the Proposal

Further to your feedback on this issue, we consulted with the Township about the possibility of providing access to the Proposal via Lampson Street. It turns out this would require removing parkland from Lampson Park and the baseball diamond. The Township has advised that it is prioritizing this public amenity over improved vehicular traffic from Fleming Street to Lampson Street. This also coincides with a strong commitment to environmental sustainability and effective urban planning.

2) Parking Study

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built engaged the engineers at Watt Consulting Group to produce a parking study for the Proposal. After reviewing comparable buildings and comparable homes in the Core, they determined that the parking demand for the Proposal is expected to be 42 parking stalls. They recommended the following three initiatives to reduce the parking demand:

- 1) a shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided by the owner,
- 2) e-bike parking as follows:

- a. 50% long-term bicycle parking spaces with 110V outlets, and
- b. secured long-term bicycle parking,
- 3) a car-share program as follows:
 - a. one parking space compliant with MODO construction standards for a shared vehicle to park 24 hours/day,
 - b. the purchase of one MODO vehicle at a cost of approximately \$31,500 to be located at the parking space, and
 - c. purchasing memberships for up to 63 units and promotional credits of \$100 per resident.

Following feedback at the Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the **additional 14 e-bikes** will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls,
- 4) secured bicycle parking for 81 (as opposed to 45) bicycles, of which 63 are indoor and 18 outdoor are outdoor.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this **exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots**.

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each fo the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each fo the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

In addition, to mitigate against the risk that tenants with vehicles will park on neighbouring roadways, every lease will contain a provision whereby the tenant discloses any vehicles they own or lease, and warrant not to park on neighbouring roadways but in their designated parking spot (if any). A penalty clause equal to one-months-rent for residents parking on neighbourhood streets will be implemented. Any revenue generated from this penalty clause will be dedicated to the Township with a request that such funds be earmarked for spending at Lampson Park.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, we have consulted with the Township who advise that current residents on Fleming Street may initiate a Residential Parking Only process whereby Fleming Street would become designated with signage for parking by local residents only and subject to fines. We are prepared to liase with neighbours to help advance this process.

3) Traffic Study

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

4) Public Realm and Infrastructure

In addition to contributing approximately \$80,000 to the Township’s tree replacement fund, and more than \$1million to the Township to acquire additional parkland, the Proposal includes a commitment to construct and extend Fleming Road and to build a hammer-head designed to meet the significant engineering requirements of the Esquimalt Fire Department. Moreover, the Proposal includes a commitment to upgrade the existing water, sewer, and storm lines in the neighbourhood, all of which are beyond capacity. These are substantial financial commitments to both the Township and the neighbourhood from an ownership group that lives in, and is committed to, Esquimalt.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Tara Harper
849 Fleming Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Tara Harper,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 24 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following primary concerns:

1. Access to the Proposal;
2. Parking Study;
3. Traffic Study;
4. Communication/Engagement;
5. Greenspace;
6. Public Realm & Infrastructure.

1) Access to the Proposal

Further to your feedback on this issue, we consulted with the Township about the possibility of providing access to the Proposal via Lampson Street. It turns out this would require removing parkland from Lampson Park and the baseball diamond. The Township has advised that it is prioritizing this public amenity over improved vehicular traffic from Fleming Street to Lampson Street. This also coincides with a strong commitment to environmental sustainability and effective urban planning.

2) Parking Study

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built engaged the engineers at Watt Consulting Group to produce a parking study for the Proposal. After reviewing comparable buildings and comparable homes in the Core, they determined that the parking demand for the Proposal is expected to be 42 parking stalls. They recommended the following three initiatives to reduce the parking demand:

- 1) a shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided by the owner,
- 2) e-bike parking as follows:
 - a. 50% long-term bicycle parking spaces with 110V outlets, and
 - b. secured long-term bicycle parking,
- 3) a car-share program as follows:
 - a. one parking space compliant with MODO construction standards for a shared vehicle to park 24 hours/day,
 - b. the purchase of one MODO vehicle at a cost of approximately \$31,500 to be located at the parking space, and
 - c. purchasing memberships for up to 63 units and promotional credits of \$100 per resident.

Following feedback at the Open House and from the Design Review Committee, the Proposal has been modified to offer the following additional environmental and parking offsets:

- 1) electric charging capacity for 100% (as opposed to 50%) of long-term bicycle parking spaces,
- 2) increasing the number of e-bikes provided to residents from 5 to 19 and the **additional** 14 e-bikes will be provided in perpetuity to the deep discount homes (HIL rates),
- 3) electric charging capacity for future electric charging stations at all 26 (as opposed to 1) parking stalls,
- 4) secured bicycle parking for 81 (as opposed to 45) bicycles, of which 63 are indoor and 18 outdoor are outdoor.

With these additional transportation and demand management measures in place, the Watt Consulting Group's opinion is that anticipated parking demand for the Proposal will be 23 total spaces; 18 for residents and 5 for visitors. After a lengthy and detailed review, the Proposal has maximized the number of parking spots (26) that the lot can accommodate, and this **exceeds the anticipated demand by 3 parking spots**.

In addition, and following feedback at the Open House and from Council, the 21 resident parking stalls will be allocated as follows:

- a) 1 parking spot for each fo the 6 three-bedroom homes (6 parking spots),
- b) 1 parking spot for each fo the 9 two-bedroom homes (9 parking spots),
- c) the remaining 6 parking spots to be allocated evenly amongst the one-bedroom homes (noting the provision of dedicated e-bikes to all 14 deep discount homes).

In addition, to mitigate against the risk that tenants with vehicles will park on neighbouring roadways, every lease will contain a provision whereby the tenant discloses any vehicles they own or lease, and warrant not to park on neighbouring roadways but in their designated parking spot (if any). A penalty clause equal to one-months-rent for residents parking on neighbourhood streets will be implemented. Any revenue generated from this penalty clause will be dedicated to the Township with a request that such funds be earmarked for spending at Lampson Park.

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, we have consulted with the Township who advise that current residents on Fleming Street may initiate a Residential Parking Only process whereby Fleming Street would become designated with signage for parking by local

residents only and subject to fines. We are prepared to liaise with neighbours to help advance this process.

3) Traffic Study

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

4)) Lack of Communication

From the outset, please accept my apologies for a lack of additional public engagement.

The Rezoning process in the Township requires the developer, when submitting a rezoning application, to provide a notice of “Open House” to the Township. The Township then takes responsibility to circulate the notice to the affected neighbours. Though the developer pays for the notice to be distributed, it is the Township that executes the delivery.

In addition, the Township requires the developer to place a rezoning sign within the property to be developed. We discussed the possibility of installing the rezoning closer to Fleming Street to make it more visible, but it was determined that the bylaw is prescriptive and does not allow us to deviate from the requirement to install it on the site itself.

In addition to this correspondence and the attached Proposal Primer, please note the further engagement we are planning below.

Further Engagement

We also take this opportunity to attach a Proposal Primer to this letter for your review and consideration. It provides additional context and perspective on the Proposal.

Should you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us by email (amarsahotalive@gmail.com) and we can schedule a telephone call or an in-person meeting. We will be walking through the neighbourhood and knocking on doors to discuss this proposal in person. In addition, we will be engaging in a further voluntary “Open House” session that is not mandated by the rezoning process, to ensure that everyone living in the neighbourhood and community has a full understanding of the depth and breadth of this Proposal.

5) Removal of Greenspace

As noted in the attached Proposal Primer, Method Built collaborated with the Township for over three years on the massing and design of the Proposal. Keeping in mind the requirement for a minimum of 35,000 finished square feet, at least 40 mixed residential homes, and a maximum of six floors, the Proposal exceeds each of the Requirements and sits sympathetically within the site and masses downwards to the west and south along with the natural grade and borders with single-family homes.

In order to meet all of the Requirements, the Proposal had to cover 55% of the lot. To cover less, would have required the Proposal to mass vertically (much like a high-rise building) to a much greater extent and not sit contextually within the neighbourhood. According to the consulting arborist report of Talbot McKenzie the Proposal and excavations associated with the Proposal will require all 77 trees on the site to be removed; this was known to Esquimalt when the RFP was issued and the Requirements were mandated.

The loss of 77 trees is significant to our natural environment and our place within it. In an effort to offset loss, Method Built and the Proposal have committed to the following mitigation measures:

1. Providing approximately \$80,000 to the Township tree replacement fund to acquire, develop and install new significant trees within the Township in the immediate future, and
2. Providing more than \$1 million to the Township to acquire new parkland within the Township.

In addition, it is critical to keep in mind that the development of sensitive, sustainable, in-fill homes within the core will help prevent the development of insensitive, unsustainable, single-family homes in the suburbs or western communities following the clearing of logs to make way for 45 lots and homes, and additional clearing for ancillary roadways and services. So long as housing demand remains at unprecedented levels, the Proposal provides a more environmental sensitive and sustainable form of housing (see below), than the alternative.

6) Public Realm & Infrastructure

In addition to contributing approximately \$80,000 to the Township's tree replacement fund, and more than \$1million to the Township to acquire additional parkland, the Proposal includes a commitment to construct and extend Fleming Road and to build a hammer-head designed to meet the significant engineering requirements of the Esquimalt Fire Department. Moreover, the Proposal includes a commitment to upgrade the existing water, sewer, and storm lines in the neighbourhood, all of which are beyond capacity. These are substantial financial commitments to both the Township and the neighbourhood from an ownership group that lives in, and is committed to, Esquimalt.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

18 October 2021

Valerio Giaretta
887 Lampson Street
Victoria, BC

Dear Valerio Giaretta,

Re: 880 Fleming Street Development Proposal (the “Proposal”)

We are developing the Proposal at 880 Fleming Street and your email of 23 September 2021 has been brought to our attention. We write to address the concerns you have raised in your email and to provide you with additional information about the Proposal in the attached “Proposal Primer”.

Your email identified the following concerns:

1. Insufficient setback from your shared property line with the Proposal;
2. Concern for high-density residential developments in this neighbourhood.
3. A lack of common areas for residents;
4. Increased traffic;
5. Insufficient parking for residents;

1) Insufficient Setback

You referenced a 36 inch setback from the Proposal to your shared property line at 887 Lampson Street to the northwest of the Proposal. The drawings can be difficult to read, but the setback from the Proposal to the shared property line, however, is 3.0meters (9 feet and 10 inches). The setback from the patio/deck of the Proposal to the shared property line is 2.0meters (6 feet and 6 inches). To provide additional space and distance along the north and west property lines (where single family homes exist), we have stepped back the fourth and fifth floors of the Proposal substantially; this results in the Proposal appearing to be a three-story proposal from the west and north (and south where Lampson Park is).

2) High Density Residential

This neighbourhood is a mix of single family homes and medium-density residential. The GVHS project approved for 874 Fleming Street is six-stories and is massed more substantially than the Proposal. This is a medium-density residential building with substantial setbacks on the fourth and fifth floors precisely to avoid the concerns you have identified – i.e. a higher density looking building. As a result, from nearly all vantage points, the Proposal will appear to be a three story building nestled sympathetically into the sloping site.

3) Lack of Common Areas

The Proposal offers a number of common area amenities for residents. These are highlighted in the attached Proposal Primer, but I can summarize them as follows:

- a) Rooftop vegetable gardens;
- b) Rooftop sport court;
- c) Rooftop barbeque and eating area;
- d) Ground level soft-scaped yard/gathering area; and
- e) Enhanced accessibility to Lampson Park via a pathway to be designed, developed and constructed by us as part of the Proposal.

4) Increased Traffic

Further to the feedback from neighbours and Council, a traffic study was commissioned for the Proposal. The Traffic Study noted that peak (rush) hour trip generation as a result of the Proposal would be as follows:

TABLE 2: PEAK HOUR TRIP GENERATION

Proposed Land Use	Peak Hour	Inbound	Outbound	Total
45 multi-family units	AM	4	12	16
	PM	12	8	20

As a result, Watt Consulting Group concluded in its traffic study that the Proposal “will not impact traffic operations at the intersection of Colville Road/Fleming Street for the long term... The development does not trigger the need for any capacity improvements at Colville Road/Fleming Street in the long term. No mitigation measures will be required...”

5) Insufficient Parking

Watt Consulting Group were engaged to provide a parking study. After examining similar buildings in the area with a similar tenant makeup, Watt Consulting Group recommended that we provide the following transportation demand management (**TDM**) measures to mitigate the parking demand at this building. These include:

- a) A shared e-bike program with 5 e-bicycles being provided to residents;
- b) Secured e-bike parking with 50% of such spaces having 110V outlet;
- c) A car-share program with the purchase of one dedicated MODO car and memberships for all residents.

In response to concerns from neighbours and Council, we have voluntarily increased the TDM measures to include the following:

- d) Dedicated e-bikes being provided to each of the 14 deeply discounted homes (at BC Housing HIL rates).

According to Watt Consulting Group, these initiatives will be more than sufficient to address all of the parking supply issues with the Proposal. As noted in the attached Primer, we will have strong contractual language in all leases with tenants requiring them to disclose if they own or purchase motor vehicles, and if they do not have a parking spot allocated to them in the Proposal, they will be penalized heavily for parking on neighbouring streets. This will provide a substantial disincentive for any tenant who may choose to be less than honest in their vehicle ownership hoping to park on the street. Any funds gathered from this program will be diverted to the Township of Esquimalt and earmarked for Lampson Park.

In addition, all of these initiatives will contribute to our global efforts to combat human-induced climate change by mandating the use of alternatives to single-vehicle ownership.

Further Engagement

We also take this opportunity to attach a Proposal Primer to this letter for your review and consideration. It provides additional context and perspective on the Proposal.

Should you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to us by email (amarsahotalive@gmail.com) and we can schedule a telephone call or an in-person meeting. We will be walking through the neighbourhood and knocking on doors to discuss this proposal in person. In addition, we will be engaging in a further voluntary "Open House" session that is not mandated by the rezoning process, to ensure that everyone living in the neighbourhood and community has a full understanding of the depth and breadth of this Proposal.

Thank your time and your feedback,

Hardave S. Sahota

Kim Maddin

Subject: FW: 880 Fleming St

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT
RECEIVED: _____ March 7, 2022
For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council
Other _____ <u>Late Item</u>
Referred to: <u>Deb H</u>
For __ Action __ Response __ Report
For Agenda <u>X</u> Council __ COTW __ IC

On Mar 6, 2022, at 1:17 PM, Pam [REDACTED] wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Esquimalt City councillors,

Fleming forest, also known as [880 Fleming St.](#) should not have been considered for rezoning without massive public consultation. Truly, the whole process has been skewed.

I am opposed to any building on that wooded lot. Especially given the already approved development in the former Lion's facility, which will already be increasing the impact on the neighbourhood. Impact on a quiet, kid oriented area, bringing too much traffic, and chopping down trees. Holy. It's bad bad planning.

I urge you to back-track to what should have happened before you sought out proposals from developers.

There is no way that this initiative should go through. We understand the need for affordable housing, but this building barely provides any, and only for a limited time. It is not worth chopping down an established eco system.

Please, be wise.

Thank you,
Pam Campbell
Resident [891 Lampson St](#)

Kim Maddin

Subject: FW: 880 Fleming Street development proposal

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

On Mar 5, 2022, at 11:11 AM, smpedersen [redacted] wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Well said, Lynn

From: [redacted]
Sent: March 5, 2022 10:26 AM
To: [Mayor and Council](#)
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: 880 Fleming Street development proposal

To Mayor and Council

Research is showing time spent in nature and parks can boost our general well being. With the removal of so many mature forests on the south island it makes retaining the Fleming Forest at 880 Fleming Street most important. When 874 Fleming Street is complete the new residents will take more pleasure in a forest than a building. As a resident who has lived on Fleming Street since 1962, I know that our small street is not suitable for dense living as the street is a cul de sac and parking is horrible with the old Lions Lodge. With the increase in the lion's lodge capacity from 72 to 134 units, the parking will be even worse on our street and the access for emergency vehicles will be difficult if not impossible. Please do not make our neighborhood unlivable.

Also I went on the Save Fleming Forest page and noticed that the developer is not making any of the 2 or 3 bedroom apartments low income housing and it is only the one bedroom apartments that will be low income or 10% below market rate. To my way of thinking that means that families will be left out and they are the hardest hit in this high housing cost market. It should not be allowed!

Thank you for your consideration

Dorlynn (Lynn) West
851 Fleming Street
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Kim Maddin

Subject: FW: Fleming Street development issues

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: <u>March 7, 2022</u> For Information <u>__CAO__Mayor/Council</u> Other <u>Late Item</u> Referred to: <u>Deb H</u> For <u>__Action__Response__Report</u> For Agenda <u>X Council __COTW __IC</u>
--

From: Joanne Winstanley [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 9:07 AM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Fleming Street development issues

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning,

I am a resident of Esquimalt and am writing to express my opposition to the proposed sale and development of 880 Fleming Street.

The site includes one of the few stands of old trees between the Gorge waterway and highrock park -- an essential piece of what little natural greenspace remain in the neighbourhood, and should at least be preserved (at best, it should be zoned as park land) for the enjoyment and well-being of all residents and local wildlife.

Thank you,

Joanne Winstanley

Kim Maddin

Subject: FW: No to developing 880 Fleming Street

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7 , 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

> On Mar 6, 2022, at 9:26 AM, Dawn Massey wrote:

>

> CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

>

>

> Dear Mayor and Councillors,

> I am writing as a citizen of Esquimalt to voice my opposition to the removal of a wetlands/forest to accommodate the development at 880 Fleming. Climate change requires the preservation of this natural habitat.

> Sincerely,

> Dawn Massey

>

> . 

Meagan Brame

Councillor


Township of Esquimalt | Council

Tel: 1-250-414-7100 | www.esquimalt.ca

For the latest on the Township's response to COVID-19, please visit esquimalt.ca/covid19

March 6, 2022

Mayor and Council
Township of Esquimalt
1229 Esquimalt ~~BOR~~ Rd. BC.
V9A 3P1



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

Re: OCP Amendment Application and Rezoning Application for 880 Fleming Street

My name is Ross Griffin and I live at 939 Craigflower Rd at the SE corner of Craigflower and Lampson. My property lies close to the western edge of the proposed development at 880 Fleming St.

At the outset, I would like to say that I support the need for more "affordable" housing in our community and elsewhere in Greater Victoria, however I do not support this particular development at 880 Fleming St.

I have four major concerns with the proposed development and so I am asking that you turn down all parts of the proposed Amendments to the Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2018, no. 2922 as well as the proposed Amendments to the Zoning Bylaw 1992 No. 2050.

Concern 1. **The proposed development is far out of proportion to the surrounding properties on the north, west and south side of the development, which are predominantly single family residential units of 1 or 1.5 stories.** The proposed 5-story 45 residential unit development will completely change the character of our neighbourhood. The proposed development is too high, it is too dense and it will completely remove a living "urban forest" from our neighbourhood, something I would note that many other Victoria area municipalities are trying to retain rather than clear-cut. Its design, while modern, does not fit with the design of other structures in our neighbourhood.

The houses in our neighbourhood are mainly well taken care of, are basically owner occupied, and have somewhat heritage aspects.

Concern 2. **The existing urban forest will be lost.** The development proposal is so large that according to the consulting arborists, it would require the removal of all 65 bylaw protected trees on the subject property plus 5 trees on the proposed Fleming Street access road, plus a further 5 trees on neighbouring properties. This is unacceptable. A smaller footprint is needed.

On visiting the site, I counted approximately 30 trees of significance. They are mainly fir, probably 100 years old and about 80 to 100 feet high. There are also several arbutus trees plus a couple of garry oak trees (which I believe are classified as endangered). These trees are home to an abundance of wildlife - crows, ravens, hawks, and several great horned owls (which may also be protected). Bald eagles frequently land in the trees although they do not likely nest there. In addition there are approximately 1000 small birds, including hummingbirds that nest there over winter. As well, numerous black squirrels, grey squirrels, raccoons, rodents, snakes and other critters inhabit this urban forest.

While the landscaping plan shows a number of shrubs and plants around the edges of the development, the existing urban forest will be lost. I understand that the developer will be contributing approximately \$80,000 to the Township's tree replacement fund and that some of that funding may be used to plant up to 20 trees on the Fleming Street access at the southern edge of the development. Those 20 trees may be appropriate landscaping for Fleming Street


but they cannot come near to compensating for the loss of a mature forest and wildlife habitat provided by the existing trees on this site.

Concern 3. **Our privacy will be negatively affected.** The proponent should be asked to retain trees along the perimeter of this development in order to ensure reasonable privacy of neighbouring properties, or alternatively reduce the height of the proposal to 3 stories (similar to the height of the vacant building on 874 Fleming). At least some effort should be made to minimize the project's impacts on neighbouring lots.

Concern 4. **Water Problems.** The site is soaking wet, even on dry days. The removal of trees will only extend the problem. It was so wet at the lower end of the property on March 2, 2022 that I would have needed hip-waders to access the property. It seems like there is an underground river that goes down to the high tide level at the south end of the property (by the athletic field at Lampson Park). Due to the water problems and the depth of clay underneath the top soil, the ground will continually shift. As an example I have a 6 ft wide gate on my property that I have to adjust over an inch between summer and winter for it to work properly and my property is quite dry, not at all like the proposed site. This is to give you an example of soil movement in the area.

Given the above-noted concerns I do not support the development proposal as currently described. Thank you for the opportunity to express my views.

Submitted by:



Ross Griffin
939 Craigflower Rd
Esquimalt

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Submission for public meeting re:880 Fleming St.- Environmental objections
Attachments: petitionoct31.pdf

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: James nadeau [REDACTED]

Sent: March-06-22 12:14 PM

To: Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>; Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>

Subject: Fw: Submission for public meeting re:880 Fleming St.- Environmental objections

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We have previously submitted a petition of most of the homeowners in the area requesting that this proposal doesn't pass and the lot in question is zoned as park and added to Lampson Feild. We would like to request that the petition be included as a submission for the public meeting. It is attached to this e-mail as well. The hard copy has already been delivered to corporate services. We understand that the city is trying to increase affordable housing by offering up this lot and from the perspective of a zoning map it looks reasonable. The reality is that this lot is in an awkward area and the use of the remainder of a right of way to access it is questionable at best. There is a reason that this lot has survived intact this long. However, because of this we now have a small forested area that has over 70 bylaw protected trees, some over 100 years old. We believe that removing this small forest will severely impact the wildlife in the area. The local bird population fled to this area during the heat dome last summer and they rely heavily upon this small forest. We have requested species surveys and environmental impact studies. In the meantime, we have been advised to do a "bio-blitz" to informally record the animals that we have seen in the area. Here is what we have found:

- Eagles use the tree tops, sometimes as many as 5. I'm not sure if there are nests in the area, but it is a possibility.
- Owls - there are at least 2 owl nests in the area, barred owls and we believe there may be a great horned owl nest higher up.
- there are hundreds of smaller birds such as House finches, swallows, sparrows, Toueys, bush tits, humming birds (rufous and annas), pine siskins, etc.
- Hawks - there are 3-5 hawks in the area. two different kinds. we are not sure exactly what species, but are trying to identify them using a bird manual.
- There are bats in the area. (all 9 species of bat in BC are considered threatened).
- There is some type of tree frog in the area, we can hear them but we can't see them.
- We believe that there are also wandering salamanders in the area (blue listed).

The value of trees.

I don't believe that I should have to market the value of a small forested area like this in the 21st century, but if that is what is required: First, carbon capture, after the lights at Tillicum and Craigflower the road dips and then the cars accelerate up the hill, having a carbon capture in this area is invaluable. Because of the removal of the small stand of trees in front of the lot to facilitate the hammerhead and road extension (which is already having issues fitting into the areas demarcated by the city), this project will now require the removal of approximately 100 mature trees. These trees also provide another service which I am convinced is not being considered at all: water management.

Water management.

If the updates to drainage in the area do not include the projected amount of water that is being managed by 100 trees, it will be inadequate. The fact is that with climate change we will see the appearance of more "atmospheric rivers" and an overwhelming of storm drains, sewage lines, etc. The Gorge Vale is some of the lowest laying land in the area and, as you are aware, water flows downhill. As development and density increase and natural catchment is destroyed, this will become an ever-increasing issue. I strongly believe that removing this small forest will be an environmental catastrophe, both in water displacement and wildlife eradication. Does anyone even know how much water is currently being absorbed by this small forested area? It must be quite a bit as it is surely the reason that there are so many trees in such a small area.

We have submitted, with our petition, some ideas about how to use the space as park and a commitment of our association to pursue grants and funding for our ideas. We have looked into it and funding is available for both of the following park proposals and we have people that could start writing grant proposals immediately.

A) A park with a protected area for birds and other wildlife in the back and an area for people up front. This would involve some artistic fencing in the back third of the park with information boards, lighting, seating, and clearing of the lower areas for accessibility and esthetic appeal, but maintaining the upper three-tiered tree canopy as a bird sanctuary/wildlife protected area.

b) If the first goal (zoning as park) can be achieved. We could look at a more ambitious proposal of acquiring grants from other levels of government for a partial daylighting of Chan Creek, which flows underground through the area. We believe that we could acquire funding to aid with any civic engineering that would be needed to support this project. As the area grows and densifies, natural water catchment would be a much preferable solution for dealing with overflow than overwhelmed storm and sewage lines and expensive sump systems. This area is constantly dealing with these issues. The amount of time spent on the pump station on Lamson street alone is considerable. Imagine how much worse this is going to get. I strongly believe that we could use this area in a way that would be cost effective to the city, improve drainage, would not interfere with any future development in the area and would actually support further density. I understand that this is a big ask. However, once the area becomes park/protected area this proposal could be looked at, but is not a necessary component of zoning the area park and there is no more effective water management system than a forested area.

I am convinced that this is a gem, a time capsule from the last century. It should be preserved and cultivated into a park that the city and our neighbourhood could be very proud of. Please consider this option seriously. This isn't just a vacant lot, as it is sometimes being treated. We have a chance to do something wonderful here and council should support our efforts do it.

Thank you,

James Nadeau
854 Fleming St

We, the undersigned residents of Esquimalt, have signed this petition in support of Esquimalt Council refusing the zoning application to develop the lot known as 880 Fleming St and are formally requesting to have the lot zoned as part of the park at Lampson Field.

- Date Oct 20 / 2021 Name James Nabeau E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 21 / 2021 Name Tara Harper E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 20 / 2021 Name James Scottfield E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date OCT 21 / 2021 Name KEVIN SMITTEN E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct. 21 / 2021 Name Lynn West E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 21 / 2021 Name Hamish Murray E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 21 / 2021 Name Susan Ellis E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 21 / 2021 Name Daniel Wilkes E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 23 / 21 Name Diane R. Olexy E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 23 / 21 Name Mark Ollerton E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]
- Date Oct 23 / 21 Name SIGNEY ROBINSON E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]

We, the undersigned residents of Esquimalt, have signed this petition in support of Esquimalt Council refusing the zoning application to develop the lot known as 880 Fleming St and are formally requesting to have the lot zoned as part of the park at Lampson Field.

Date	Oct 21 2021	Name	M HACKWELL	E-mail		Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct 21 2021	Name	[REDACTED]	E-mail	880 Fleming St.	Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct 21 2021	Name	Jim KELLY	E-mail	867 FLEMING ST	Phone		Signature	
Date	✓	Name	Kim Heffler	E-mail		Phone	✓	Signature	
Date	Oct 22/21	Name	SHUDUNIA LA BOUCAN	E-mail	850 FLEMING ST	Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct 23/21	Name	Fynn Owen La Boucan	E-mail	850 Fleming St.	Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct 23/21	Name	JON LABILLAIS	E-mail		Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct 23/21	Name	Patrick Keith	E-mail		Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct 24/21	Name	Melanie Reid	E-mail		Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct 23/21	Name	SHARON PEDERSEN	E-mail		Phone		Signature	
Date	Oct-23/21	Name	Tina Neale	E-mail		Phone		Signature	

We, the undersigned residents of Esquimalt, have signed this petition in support of Esquimalt Council refusing the zoning application to develop the lot known as 880 Fleming St and are formally requesting to have the lot zoned as part of the park at Lampson Field.

Date Oct 23 Name JOHN AASEN E-mail [REDACTED] Phone [REDACTED] Signature [REDACTED]

Date Oct 30 Name ALAN BARWIN E-mail [REDACTED] Phone [REDACTED] Signature [REDACTED]

Date Oct 30 Name LOUISE OWEN E-mail [REDACTED] Phone [REDACTED] Signature [REDACTED]

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

We, the undersigned residents of Esquimalt, have signed this petition in support of Esquimalt Council refusing the zoning application to develop the lot known as 880 Fleming St and are formally requesting to have the lot zoned as part of the park at Lampson Field.

Date Oct 23 Name Sean Quinn E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]

Date Oct 23 Name Ross Griffin E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]

Date Oct 23 Name Valer Goulet E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]

Date Oct 23 Name DAVID ASTON E-mail [redacted] Phone [redacted] Signature [redacted]

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

We, the undersigned residents of Esquimalt, have signed this petition in support of Esquimalt Council refusing the zoning application to develop the lot known as 880 Fleming St and are formally requesting to have the lot zoned as part of the park at Lampson Field.

Date OCT 22 Name MURRAY SCOTT E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date OCT 22 Name KIM DEANE E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date OCT 22 Name Darrell Deane E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date OCT 22 Name BRENT ATKINSON E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date OCT 22 Name KEITH McINTOSH E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date 22 OCT Name M. TOALICZAK E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date 22 OCT Name MONA BROWN E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date 22 oct Name David Parker E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date 22 OCT Name Eric Hirston E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date OCT-23 Name MARLENE LAZENBEEK E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Date _____ Name _____ E-mail _____ Phone _____ Signature _____

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Submission for public meeting re: 880 Fleming Street- Developer's failure to meet the concerns of the neighbourhood

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: James nadeau [REDACTED]

Sent: March-06-22 12:12 PM

To: Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>; Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>

Subject: Submission for public meeting re: 880 Fleming Street- Developer's failure to meet the concerns of the neighbourhood

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

1. **Access** We have submitted overall issues that we have with accessing the lot separately. I will keep my comments here about access specific to this proposal. The city could allow access from the remainder of the right of way on the west side, but refuses to do so, citing changes to the park or altering the parameters of the baseball diamond as obstacles. These obstacles will present on the Fleming St side as well, but are not considered as serious, when they support alternate access.
- 2.
3. **Parking study** - The parking study is unrealistic and according to the report, there is no historical data to confirm that its results will be accurate. If this was a vacant lot with more than one access point, it might be suitable to use as an experiment to test the accuracy of these predictions. However, with all of our valid concerns about density and access, this doesn't seem like the appropriate location to see if this will be the case. I question the results of this study as they seem unrealistic and overly optimistic. It is my experience that people that rent, do own cars. There are many young couples that I work with who would have probably been entering the housing market based on their dual income situations, but are now renting and in many cases both will own a car. If a young single parent can get into affordable housing, they will most likely need a car and because of the controls on rent they might be able to afford one. The point I'm trying to make is that the overall demographic of renters has been drastically changing and this is not being taken into account in either the parking or traffic study. Also, the study treats this like it is a stand alone project, which it most definitely is not.
- 4.
3. **Traffic Study** - My concerns with the traffic study are the same as with the parking study. It is all theoretical and the most densely populated Cul de sac in the region is no place to have a test run of these theories. Also, neither of these studies takes into account the 16 detached houses and 140 units of the development next door. This isn't a stand-alone project and any realistic study would address those issues. Also, the reliance on e-bikes and shared vehicles, though commendable, isn't realistic and also has no actual historical data to draw from. This particular situation is not the appropriate

place to field test overly optimistic theories. The fact is that e-bikes will probably not be used by people with children, elderly people, and people with disabilities. They will also not be a realistic option for the winter months. Also, How many bikes will the developer replace as they go missing. If the user is liable for the e-bike when they use it, the rampant bike thefts in this town (over 1000 in the last 18 months) might make people think twice about accepting this expensive responsibility. Also, The fact that there are no sidewalks poses major problems. People literally walk up and down the middle of the street. The land inside the curbs slope toward the road and it doesn't make walking off the road easy and makes it impossible for people with strollers, walkers, scooters, etc.

4. **Communication/Engagement** - This has been very disappointing. I reached out to the developer with many questions that were left unanswered. I requested that if I was going to attend his meeting that he should have someone there who can answer some engineering questions and that we would like to see some optional proposals (the housing society was able to meet these requests). I also explained the issues that the neighbourhood is having with this development and developing the lot in general. He said that he received my email and that he was looking forward to seeing me. I went to the open house and none of the requests had even been considered. He just wanted to have his slide show, the exact same as the one that he tried to present in August that was deemed unsatisfactory. As I was asking questions I would be interrupted. I was accused of being a Nimby person (and I won't reiterate why we find this so insulting). There is no engagement here, just presentation. His only concern seemed to be having me sign his sheet, which I refused to do. I found him rude and dismissive. I understand that this is stressful for him, we are feeling stress as well, but there is no reason to engage in rude and unprofessional behaviour. As he was ignoring or refusing all of my request for information or dialogue, I choose to leave the centre if all I was going to receive was disingenuous communication that he could state was adequate engagement. In short, engagement with the community has been inadequate and appears to be viewed as an almost unnecessary inconvenience. The support letters from local business that the developer submitted address the environmental concerns regarding urban sprawl, but say nothing about weighing the clear cutting of the lot against the need for affordable housing. This leads me to believe that they are not fully aware of the actual environmental costs of this proposed development or they would have mentioned it in the letter.

Thank you,

James Nadeau
854 Fleming St.

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Submission for public meeting re: 880 Fleming ST - Objections to accessing the lot from Fleming St.
Attachments: hammerhead 880 Fleming St.pdf

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: James nadeau [REDACTED]

Sent: March-06-22 12:09 PM

To: Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>; Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>

Subject: Fw: Submission for public meeting re: 880 Fleming ST - Objections to accessing the lot from Fleming St.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The residents of Fleming St and the members of the East Esquimalt Community Association object to using the remainder of right of way "66ft" to acquire a Fleming St address and extend our single access road for the following reasons:

- 1) It is our contention that right of way "66ft" had been essentially decommissioned through the years. The reality is that more than 50% of the road was running through a baseball diamond and on the other end was a Cul de sac with an easement to a parking lot and a four-story building with three trees planted in front of what was the right of way. I understand that this looks reasonable on a zoning map, but not so much in reality. The changing cadastral landscape argument has been used in regards to accessing the lot from Lampson, we are making the same argument in regards to accessing the lot from Fleming(or even accessing the lot at all). Right of way "66ft" is not Fleming Street and should never have been used to acquire a Fleming St address. The fact is that the name of the right of way was its length. So, you could argue that altering its length, as with the baseball park being placed over it, could technically decommission the entire right of way.
- 2) If this was an acceptable way to utilize the remainder of a right of way, then we should have been notified of the changes to our roadway by mail or a rezoning sign at the entrance of Fleming St. This would have alerted us and would have been a better time to engage with the community about using the lot. When a house is purchased on Fleming street, the first thing that the Realtor mentions is the right of way. If it is deemed important enough that it needs to be brought up when you purchase a home, then it should be important enough to be notified if it is being decommissioned or altered. It is our contention that making all these changes to the nature of our roadways without notification or consultation was unacceptable. This doesn't seem like an open process and appears designed to keep us out of the loop. Also, the roadway demarcations are on the rezoning sign for 874 Fleming St. (This caused confusion), but they are not mentioned in the proposal. So, if these changes regarding the nature of our roadway(s) were made in either of these ways, it is completely inappropriate. Clearly, the planning around extending our road and using the remains of a decommissioned right of way to access Lot "A" has been going on for the last 3 or 4 years. Therefore, there is no excuse for not consulting with or notifying us and it creates the appearance that we were intentionally kept out of the process until we were zoned into a corner, so to speak. However, even with the demarcations, the land below is currently zoned p2 and we see no reason that that should change.

3) It currently looks as though the access road/easement & hammerhead will already have to exceed the boundaries laid out by the city. So, yet more land will have to be removed from the park to reach this, which at this point should be considered inaccessible, lot. That means the small stand of trees in front of the lot will have to be removed as well. So, to access this area, a small Forest of 70 trees and a small stand of approximately 30 trees will be removed, Over 100 mature trees. We will present environmental objections separately. I have attached an image showing that the roadway/hammerhead exceeds the boundaries of the existing demarcations. It seems to us that having to build this monstrosity of a turnaround in the middle of the park so that this one site can be serviced should be enough of a reason to put a halt to this.

Fleming Street will already be, by far, the most densely populated Cul de sac in Esquimalt with the new building at 874. We are not a "nimby" neighbourhood. We are bearing our share; we have supported a major affordable housing project, but should not be made to bear it all. As far as we can tell this is the only lot offered by the city for affordable housing, which also doesn't seem right. These are the problems and arguments we'd like to present in regards to accessing Lot A via Fleming St. We will submit input regarding our other concerns separately.

Thank you,

James Nadeau
854 Fleming St.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26

Deborah Liske

From: James nadeau [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-22 10:45 AM
To: Mayor and Council; Corporate Services
Subject: Submission for public meeting re:880 Fleming St. - Process Objections

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Please verify you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

Hello,

Throughout this proposal we have encountered process issues which we would like to address and have them added to the public record.

There was no consultation/notification with Fleming St residents when:

- the right of way was being decommissioned and zoned P2.
- when an application was submitted in 2018 to give Lot A a Fleming St address.
- when the right of way was being changed from a connecting road to Lampson to a closed road attached to Fleming St.

These would have been great opportunities to start a pre-application consultation process with the neighbourhood.

Looking into the above concerns, we required historical documents from municipal Archives:

- The minutes and documents regarding the original zoning of the Lion's Lodge.
- The unaltered zoning map 38082.
- The minutes and documents regarding the park rezoning 4 years ago where, we believe, the right of way was decommissioned and added to the park.
- The minutes and documents regarding when the trees were given by-law protection and any information about the push to have the area declared a bird sanctuary in the 1990's.

We believe that access to this information will help our argument. We have been told that, because of flooding late last year, that we cannot currently access these records. I requested that second reading not happen until two weeks after we received these documents. This request was ignored and second reading took place. I made the same request that public meeting shouldn't happen until at least two weeks after receipt of these records. Once again, this request has been ignored, I am still unable to acquire public records and the meeting takes place later tonight.

Advising the public about the meeting:

- The mailout only included the west side of Fleming St. Though this might be all that is required in the inclusion zone, it didn't sit well with Fleming St residents who had written to Council and were engaged in the process. What's more, some residents on Colville, outside of the inclusion zone, did receive the notice.
- The apartment building 2 doors from the site was excluded from the mailout. They are clearly within the 100-metre zone and this excludes approx. 120 or more people, that live in the direct community, being properly notified about the public meeting.
- The proposal sign only being posted in front of the lot that currently has no sidewalk or road access. We asked for it to be put on Lampson St or at the entrance to Fleming St. Both of these requests were refused.
- The sign wasn't updated to inform the public about the meeting as of four days before the meeting. I had to inform corporate services about this oversight.
- the accelerated pace of the readings and meetings have hindered our ability to reach out to the public with our message. We have done what we can , but are just beginning to scratch the surface of a lot of public support for preserving this lot.
-

Please recognize that these are serious objections. We will continue to engage with the process, but we want to make sure these concerns are on the public record.

Thank you,

Esquimalt East Community Association

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: 880 Fleming St

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: Alan Barwin [REDACTED]
Sent: March-06-22 12:51 PM
To: Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>; Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: 880 Fleming St

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Desjardins and Council,

Fleming Forest must be preserved as a natural urban ecosystem.

Over the past six months, I have familiarized myself with the plans for developing "880 Fleming Street," participated in community meetings and have yet to see long term value for affordable housing or for our climate from cutting down a woodlot and advancing this project.

We are in a Climate Crisis, as our Township, province and nation recognize. We saw record temperatures, flooding, forest fires, health issues in the past year, due to the effects of climate change. As our council you have the power and the responsibility to do everything possible to mitigate climate change. That includes protecting existing natural environments to be carbon sinks and refuges for threatened wildlife. The positive effects of natural spaces on human mental and physical health is also well documented in medical and psychological research. After the year we've had, you need to do everything to slow climate change and support the wellness of Esquimalt residents.

I am absolutely in favour of affordable housing, especially in my part of Esquimalt. I have three daughters in their 20s who struggle to find a place to live with a reasonable monthly rent. The proposed development will only provide 14 affordable housing units and only for a limited time. Our housing crisis will continue, and it is ridiculous to provide so few spaces for so short a time period. The proposed project is a revenue project for the developer with limited value in addressing our housing crisis. As a council, work instead with the province and federal government to create truly long-term affordable housing. Identify previously developed land with actual access to main roads. Absolutely support affordable housing, but not at the expense of a vibrant ecosystem.

As I have communicated previously, no development proposals should ever have been sought by Esquimalt for an existing forest. The process was backwards and should have begun with community consultation on zoning, before ever considering potential developments. You have heard loud and clear from Esquimalt residents (as opposed to the letters of support submitted by friends and allies of the developer) that Fleming Forest should remain undeveloped. It is time to do the right thing and rezone Lot 1, Section 10 Esquimalt District Plan EPP78715 as parkland in perpetuity, for our community and our climate.

Sincerely,

Alan Barwin
891 Lampson Street

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: 880 Fleming St.

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: Tara Harper [REDACTED]
Sent: March-06-22 6:42 PM
To: Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@esquimalt.ca>; Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: 880 Fleming St.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

This letter is concerning the proposed rezoning of 880 Fleming St.

When the Lion's Lodge put in an application to double their capacity of affordable housing to 137 rental units we did not oppose the development. While we had concerns about additional noise, traffic, safety and density, we understand the dire need for affordable housing. However, we are opposed to the rezoning of 880 Fleming St. to multi-family residential.

The community asset now being called 880 Fleming St is actually Fleming Forest...a treasured forest and wetland which our children grew up playing in.

When Council made the decision to declare a climate emergency in 2019 we applauded. We simply can't understand how you can reconcile this resolution with wanting to cut down a mature forest in the township just three years later. Forests help cut greenhouse gas emissions, sequester carbon, provide habitat for wildlife and mitigate the impact of flooding. **Forests are the best chance we have of withstanding climate change.**

Fleming forest has 77 by-law protected trees – including several healthy arbutus trees which are a species at risk. We need mature forests like this for our collective future...not just a few additional trees to be planted by a development tree levy here and there.

We love to see Council encourage developers to incorporate more sustainable transportation options such as e-bikes and car share but the reality is people will still likely use their own cars for essential errands. We own e-bikes ourselves but the epidemic levels of bike theft in the CRD prevents us from using them for anything more than recreational purposes.

Allocating just 24 residential parking spaces for a 45-unit building remains grossly inadequate. Esquimalt Parking Bylaw for this class of building requires the developer provide 59 resident/visitor parking spaces. They are providing less than half of the required parking based on the township's own requirements.

As far as safety goes, please understand that Fleming St. is a small, quiet residential street with no sidewalks. It is heavily used by teenagers walking to the local high school, children playing in Lampson Little League Park and pickle ball and tennis players accessing the courts on Colville. Many, many pedestrians use Fleming St. as a connection to the bus stop on Craigflower. Consider the impact additional traffic from 182 new households (137 + the proposed 45) plus construction vehicles will have on a street with no sidewalks!

As tax payers, we have a hard time understanding how Council can even consider selling a community owned forest to a developer for approximately \$1 million. With current real estate values this land is estimated to be worth more than double that. It is, without a doubt, invaluable as a forest for our future.

Please vote to defeat the motion to rezone 880 Fleming St and preserve Fleming Forest.

Thank you,

Tara Harper and Jean-Paul Restoule
849 Fleming St.
Esquimalt, BC V9A 5V3

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: 880 Fleming

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: S Greenaway [REDACTED]
Sent: March-06-22 7:56 PM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: 880 Fleming

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello;

I live on Lampson Street and I think it would be a mistake to cut the trees at 880 Fleming and develop that natural space. Once gone, it will be gone forever. To destroy one community just to build a different one seems short-sighted and fails to value the current community - in this case, a natural one filled with trees and wildlife (herons, eagles, etc). Wouldn't it be better to have Esquimalt known for its parks instead of apartment buildings?

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to express my views on this issue.

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Hearing for the development at 880 Fleming st

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Late Item</u>
Referred to:	<u>Deb H</u>
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: charnjit sidhu [redacted]
Sent: March-06-22 8:06 PM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: Hearing for the development at 880 Fleming st

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is charnjit sidhu I live at 1569 Brodick cres Victoria bc although I do not live in Esquimalt. But I support any affordable housing project in the Greater Victoria. There is a shortage through out greater Victoria. This is affordable housing project at 880 Fleming st . so I give my full support council should give full consideration
Thank you
Charnjit sidhu
[redacted]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Comments for 880 Fleming project application

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: alvin menold [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-22 2:54 AM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: Comments for 880 Fleming project application

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Alvin Menold and live at 888 Lampson.

As I look out from my from my living room window I have so very much enjoyed the large, tall stand of beautiful trees swaying in the wind. These solidly extend at the rear of the properties across the street from my house all the way down Lampson.

It would be awesome to not cut these down with any new future proposed structure to be built on this 880 Fleming lot.

Thank You for your time to read this feedback.

Deborah Liske

From: Kevin Smitten [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-22 10:28 AM
To: Mayor and Council; Corporate Services
Subject: 880 Fleming St - Opposition to rezoning to develop the urban forest

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I have been a resident of Fleming Street for the past 15 years. I am totally opposed to the rezoning of this piece of land unless it is to bring it into the park. I understand we are in a housing crisis and rental units are desperately needed, but this is not the way we should be going about it. Once this intact natural forest is gone there is no going back, planting numerous boulevard trees will never be able to replace this small ecosystem. The fact that this piece of urban forest still stands 100% intact directly next to a park to me is a sign it should be brought into the park and not developed. This forest also provides a green buffer between the baseball field and soon to be under construction Lions Lodge rebuild which is nearly doubling the number of units that the current building has. Allowing this development will totally change the landscape for the worse from a natural area and merely adding to the "concrete jungle".

People may want to call me a nimby but the fact is I supported the Lions Lodge redevelopment (going from 77 units to 134) as I know how much the region needs subsidized housing units, not the "affordable" units that are proposed by this developer. The units are still going to be going for close to market rates which right now are insane and even discounted will be out of reach for many being impacted by the housing crisis. The people that live here need help, not more units they can't afford to rent! I feel that on top of the disaster that would be cutting down this small urban forest, the deal for the land is a terrible deal for the taxpayers of Esquimalt. Sale price of \$1,000,000 on a piece of land that was assessed last summer in July at \$2,890,000 and is likely worth quite a bit more given what real estate values have done over the last year. It is a very bad deal on a piece of land that never should have been considered for development!

Also I noticed that when the developer had the traffic counts done on our street it was after the lions lodge had been vacated and during a pandemic when most of us are working from home and not travelling as we would normally do, thus underestimating the number of trips on this road.

I hope that council can see that this is a bad deal for the taxpayers, a huge blow to the area's current residents and is not actually accomplishing the goal of providing truly affordable housing. I know a few families being priced out of the area due to rent increases in the market and these units would be out of their range as well.

Please vote no on this rezoning, save the forest and find previously developed land to build truly affordable (i.e. subsidized housing) for those who need it and qualify by proof of income.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope you do the right thing and vote no on this rezoning.

Kind Regards,

Kevin Smitten
844 Fleming St

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

Deborah Liske

From: jag mangat [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-22 11:27 AM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: Support

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT
RECEIVED: _____ March 7, 2022
For Information __CAO __Mayor/Council
Other _____ Late Item
Referred to: Deb H
For __Action __Response __Report
For Agenda X Council __COTW __IC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Please verify you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning,

Hope all is well. I am in support of this 880 Fleming street project as it will help with the housing crisis in Victoria as it can provide more housing with Victoria at a more affordable rent per month.

I live in Gordon Head and all throughout Victoria BC people cannot find homes to live in.

Thanks
Jag

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Deborah Liske

From: Gurmit Bal [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-22 9:34 AM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: [SPAM] Zoning 880Fleming St

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: _____ March 7, 2022 For Information __CAO__Mayor/Council Other _____ Late Item Referred to: Deb H For __Action__Response__Report For Agenda <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council __COTW__IC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing this in support of the above named project I strongly recommend that we need many many more rental housing in this area . I am running a rental building in the downtown area and the there is always line up for applications to rent from all kind of people looking and begging for rental space .Therefore I strongly support this project to go through..

Thanks
Gurmeet Bal
[REDACTED]

Deborah Liske

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: Affordable Housing Development

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Late Item</u>
Referred to:	<u>Deb H</u>
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

From: RAVI CHAHAL
Sent: March-07-22 3:38 PM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: RE: Affordable Housing Development Hello,

My letter is for 880 Fleming Street

Thank you
Ravinder Chahal

-----Original Message-----

From: RAVI CHAHAL
Sent: March-07-22 2:06 PM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: Affordable Housing Development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in support of an affordable housing development in the Core. We are all well aware of the housing shortage in Victoria especially affordable housing. This monumental crises has been in the forefront of news media for a significant period of time with British Columbians as well as politicians bemoaning the lack of solutions and funding. This housing development would be an asset to the community of Esquimalt where I lived for over a decade before getting married. The developers have come up with a solution to assist the crisis without the help of government funding or financing but with their own private funding. It is sad and frustrating that I must write a letter in support of this project for a public hearing on this topic.

Thank you
Ravinder Chahal
956 Gade Road

Deborah Liske

From: Emanuela Bocancea
Sent: March-07-22 3:15 PM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: 880 Fleming Street - Request to participate at the public hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I live and work about 1.5 km away from the proposed development at 880 Fleming Street and I would like to participate in the public hearing. I am very concerned about the environmental impact of urban sprawl and suburbanization caused by the proliferation of single-family homes and vehicle ownership in my neighbourhood. I'm also worried about the lack of availability and affordability of housing within the greater Victoria area.

I strongly support this sensitive infill development project at Fleming Street because it:

- increases urban density in an environmentally sustainable way
- will attract non-vehicle-owning residents through the offset of car parking/ownership through a variety of unique, creative, and environmentally-friendly alternatives (e-bikes, car-sharing program), and this will diminish the overall number of cars
- provides high-quality and truly affordable housing options for the neighborhood

I would like the opportunity to have 1-2 mins to express my support for this project at the hearing.

Thank you!
Emanuela

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC



CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

Municipal Hall, 1229 Esquimalt Road, Esquimalt, B.C. V9A 3P1
Telephone (250) 414-7100 Fax (250) 414-7111

DATE: March 7, 2022

MEMO TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Ian Irvine, Director of Financial Services

SUBJECT: Correction to 2022 Local Grant Worksheet

It has come to my attention that one figure on the Local Grant Worksheet attached to Staff Report No. FIN-22-002 was incorrectly recorded. This amount pertains to the 2022 request from the Esquimalt Community Arts Hub which should have read \$15,000 rather than \$10,000 as was included. The amended schedule reflects the corrected amount while the amounts in the "2022 Committee" column remain unchanged as they accurately reflect the Committee's recommendations.

The Local Grant Committee members reviewed all submitted materials prior to finalizing their recommendations. These materials included supporting documentation for the Esquimalt Community Arts Hub's request of \$10,000 to stage a mural festival and \$5,000 for an urban arts tour. However, as a tool intended to assist with their recommendations, staff also provided each Committee member with a worksheet which included the inaccurate amount.

The current recommendations are consistent with the Council Policy which allows for the Local Grant Committee to allocate up to 90% of the budgeted amount. Should Council wish to approve amounts other than those recommended, additional funds are available within the 2022 local grant account.

Respectfully submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ian Irvine".

Ian Irvine
Director of Financial Services

Corporation of the Township of Esquimalt 2022 Local Grant Applications					
Organization	2019	2020	2021	2022	2022
	Payments	Payments	Payments	Requests	Committee
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Established Events					
Buccaneer Days	24,000	20,000	-	35,000	25,000
Esquimalt Farmers Market Society	20,000	16,000	20,000	30,000	24,000
Victoria Nikkei Society	1,500	1,500	1,500	C/F	
Celebration of Lights	5,000	2,500	5,000	5,000	5,000
Ribfest	10,000	-	10,000	10,000	10,000
Township Community Arts Council	24,000	-	15,000	15,000	15,000
Esquimalt Lantern Festival	-	-	-	-	
	84,500	40,000	51,500	95,000	79,000
Esquimalt-Based Organizations					
Victoria Rainbow Kitchen Society	5,000	-	7,500	10,000	7,500
Macaulay Elementary School PAC	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Gorge Waterway Action Society	1,000	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000
Esquimalt Community Arts Hub	-	-	13,500	15,000	10,000
Michael Dunahee Keep the Hope Alive	900	750	-	-	
Victoria Tool Library	1,000	-	-	-	
World Fisheries Trust	650	650	-	-	
Rockheights Middle School	4,150	-	-	-	
Esquimalt Community Garden Society	0	-	-	-	
Societe Radio Communautaire Victoria	-	-	-	-	
Esquimalt Youth Coalition	-	2,041	-	-	
Creatively United for the Planet	-	7,500	-	-	
Ministry of Casual Living	-	-	-	-	
Lifecycles Project Society	-	-	-	-	
Esquimalt Secondary School (Council Policy No. FIN-19)					
Clive Kelly Award [cost of keeper trophy & engraving]	50	50	50	50	50
1912 - 2012 Esquimalt Centennial Art Scholarship	250	250	250	250	250
Library Book Gift	150	150	150	150	150
Musical Instruments	600	600	600	600	600
Student Travel Costs - Athletic Programs	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750
Terry Fox Scholarship	500	500	500	500	500
Township of Esquimalt Scholarship (Industrial Education)	500	500	500	500	500
L'École Victor Brodeur (Council Policy No. FIN-21)					
Township of Esquimalt Athletic Awards	500	500	500	500	500
1912 - 2012 Esquimalt Centennial Art Scholarship	250	250	250	250	250
Team Funding - Athletics	1,750	-	1,750	1,750	1,750
	30,000	27,491	39,300	44,300	36,800
Other Organizations					
Capital Bike Society	1,500	1,500	1,500	2,500	2,500
NEED2 Crisis and Information Line	1,000	1,000	1,200	1,200	1,200
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Victoria Capital Region	2,000	2,000	2,000	3,000	3,000
Vancouver Island South Film & Media Commission	3,000	3,000	3,000	5,000	3,000
Just Love Animals Society	-	-	-	10,000	0
Fateh Care	-	-	-	15,000	0
Leadership Victoria	-	-	-	2,500	0
Green Teams of Canada	6,000	6,000	6,000	15,000	6,000
Victoria Sexual Assault Centre	-	3,000	-	5,000	3,000
FED Farm	-	-	-	5,000	0
55 Plus BC Games (Pre-approved in 2018)	-	-	-	5,000	5,000
Victoria Jazz Society	-	-	34,978	-	
City of Victoria	500	500	-	-	
Victoria Literacy Connection	1,000	-	-	-	
Greater Victoria Volunteer Society	1,000	-	-	-	
	16,000	17,000	48,678	69,200	23,700
Total	130,500	84,491	139,478	208,500	139,500
Maximum Allocation - per Council Policy					139,500

Deborah Liske

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: In support of Development application at 1075 Tillicum

From: Gabrielle Doiron [REDACTED]
Sent: March-04-22 9:27 AM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: RE: In support of Development application at 1075 Tillicum

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 4 , 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am in full support of the proposed development application at 1075 Tillicum and I encourage the Mayor and Council to send this project to public hearing.

This is a great location to add new housing in the community and we are in need of more housing options here in Esquimalt.

This application also encourages homeowners to reduce their environmental impact by giving up cars, which I believe is in line with your new transportation plan.

The neighborhood Pub was a gathering place for the community. I know that many of the community members around the Tillicum road area were sad when it closed and are hoping that it will be replaced with another pub or similar type venue where people can gather and socialize. There is a lack of restaurants or pubs to solicit in this area and Esquimalt is in need of more of these types of businesses. With the beautiful event center opening across the street in Gorge Park, it would be a nice compliment to a neighborhood that is becoming a more attractive place to live by creating more housing and improving the quality of living in Esquimalt.

In addition to this, **I would implore you to please consider a crosswalk on Tillicum between Craigflower and Gorge.** There are .8 kilometers between pedestrian crossing points. Every day I see people running across the street in heavy traffic and speeding cars. I know people would make the argument that it will slow down traffic, but there is an issue with speeding on Tillicum and it is only a matter of time until someone runs across the road and gets hit by a car (especially elderly people who live in the area). With more commercial space being added to this area, it would be in the best interest of the council to safeguard its community and add a crosswalk in this area so they can safely access amenities in their community.

The proposed development at the old pub has my support and it deserves the Mayor and Council's as well.

I hope to see this application approved.

Thank you,

Gabrielle Doiron and James Martens

(Owners, 9-1060 Tillicum Rd)

Deborah Liske

From: Erin Willis [REDACTED]
Sent: March-04-22 10:57 AM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: [SPAM] 1075 Tillicum Development

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT
RECEIVED: March 4 , 2022
For Information __CAO __Mayor/Council
Other Late Item
Referred to: Deb H
For __Action __Response __Report
For Agenda X Council __COTW __IC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I am writing in support of the development at 1075 Tillicum from Abstract that is having its first reading before council on the 7th.

I live in View Royal at Craigflower and Admirals and frequently use the amenities in the immediate area of the development especially the Gorge View park.

The addition of 100 homes close to shops, transit infrastructure and green space will be a much welcome addition to the area especially considering the housing crisis.

I understand that the developer is looking for a parking variance but will be providing ample bike storage, BC Transit passes for homes with no parking, and modo car share e-vehicle and membership for all homes. Additionally they are proposing a \$100K CAC towards active transportation improvements along Tillicum. Considering mode shift is a key objective to the CleanBC plan and that both Saanich and Victoria are planning a AAA bike lane along the gorge this is the perfect place to reduce car dependency.

Thank you for your time,
Erin Willis

Deborah Liske

From: Jeanette Kelly [REDACTED]
Sent: March-04-22 12:49 PM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: 1075 Tillicum Rd Abstract Developments

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: _____ March 4 , 2022 For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council Other _____ <u>Late Item</u> Referred to: _____ <u>Deb H</u> For __ Action __ Response __ Report For Agenda <u>X</u> Council __ COTW __ IC
--

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mayor & Council,

My husband and I are homeowners at 1060 Tillicum Rd. We have participated in the Zoom info meeting hosted by Abstract Developments, received follow-up mailers and have spoken directly to Adam Cooper of Abstract Developments. After hearing about the design, target buyer and amenities the development will bring to our community, we are very excited to see this project go forward. Esquimalt is a neighbourhood with so much to offer 1st time buyers, families or people looking to downsize or simplify their lives. We have ample green spaces, playgrounds and recreation opportunities. Why not open our space to affordable, safe and environmentally conscious housing? We feel confident development all along the Tillicum corridor will see business and employment opportunities, increased usage of transit and rejuvenation of the Tillicum Shopping Centre. It would be great to have a neighbourhood gathering place such as a coffeeshop or small pub where friends and neighbours can walk over, socialize and best of all :shop local!

Thank you for the opportunity to express our support of our "hometown".

Jeanette & Lorne Kelly

--

Jeanette Kelly

Deborah Liske

From: Ryan Cole
Sent: March-04-22 9:05 PM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: 1075 tillicum

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: March 7, 2022 For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council Other <u>Late Item</u> Referred to: <u>Deb H</u> For __ Action __ Response __ Report For Agenda <u>X</u> Council __ COTW __ IC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have tried to email the council but have not gotten any confirmation it was received.

I am writing about the 1075 Tillicum development application.

My name is Ryan Cole, I live at 311 Uganda ave. I have been an Esquimalt resident for 10 years.

I have attended all the meetings that Abstract has had for community input.

This development is not something I wish to see happen. I support housing developments, but this one is too high for this area. Abstract was inferring to residents that it had to be 6 storeys because of the OCP. It only has to be UP TO 6 storeys. This lot is the highest point in the neighborhood and building up 6 storeys is going to dominate the area. My privacy in my backyard will be gone. I will have balconies looking directly into my house.

Since Abstract presented their shadow study, one resident sold their house and left Esquimalt. I have always felt Esquimalt cared about residents, and for the first time I don't feel that.

I think this should be capped at 4 storeys, like every other development in the area. The trees line the area at 4 stories and it would fit in at that height.

Increased traffic is a concern, privacy, shadows, parking. All of these things are going to hinder my current situation. It's easy to vote Yes to this if you don't live here. We need the council to stick up for us, the people who live right here.

I met with the Mayor and walked her on the site to show her that the drawings do not paint the whole picture. In fact, they do not show any of the houses who will be impacted.

I urge you to cap this height at 4 stories, just like the property next to it.
We need you.

Deborah Liske

From: Justin Temmel [REDACTED]
Sent: March-04-22 10:17 PM
To: Corporate Services
Cc: Jennifer Horsfall
Subject: 1075 Tillicum Road

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: <u>March 7, 2022</u> For Information <input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council Other <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Late Item</u> Referred to: <u>Deb H</u> For <input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report For Agenda <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC
--

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Please verify you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Council,

We are the homeowners at 1051 Tillicum Road, immediately next door to the late Gorge Point Pub. We are positioned to be some of the most affected by the extensive construction work and resulting high density building right next door. While we obviously aren't thrilled to be in this situation, we think it's important for you to know that we do still support the project for several reasons.

We understand that there is a severe shortage of available housing in this city, and we are thankful that we managed to get into the housing market ourselves. Few of our peers have been as lucky as we have in that regard, and these condos will open up more much-needed housing opportunities for them and other residents of Victoria.

Given the current housing crisis, we feel that no-one who has managed to buy a single family home outside of suburbs, ourselves included, should stand in the way of a project that increases home density this close to the downtown core. We are a city surrounded by water and mountains and cannot keep expecting those working in Victoria to commute and live continually farther from their workplaces. It is unsustainable for our time, money, and fuel to be wasted commuting back and forth each day. Higher density from multi-story buildings and townhouses, especially on busy streets like Tillicum, is a big part of the solution.

Abstract has been great to deal with, and they have put an impressive amount of effort into keeping peace with those of us that will have to live next door. They've demonstrated a high willingness to minimize the impact their construction will have on the rest of us, and try to leave the area better than they found it. For example, when we expressed concern that the balconies on the side closest to our property would loom over our backyard, Abstract adjusted their drawings to step back the 5th and 6th floors away from our property line and made strong efforts to ensure that our privacy hedge would be kept intact. Other neighbours had expressed concerns about lack of greenspace, and so the design was adjusted to include extensive landscaping along the roadside of their sidewalk, making that part of Tillicum safer and more enjoyable for pedestrians. They have also gone above and beyond to demonstrate how their design will not throw shade over the surrounding single family homes unless the sun was already low in the sky.

Finally, the design of the building includes private and communal outdoor spaces and beautiful architecture, all of which will promote mental health and community for these new residents and green spaces for birds, bees, and small animal life. This space has been thoughtfully designed and will be an asset to those living there as well as the neighbourhood. It's not a pub, but it is something else that we desperately need-- housing.

We encourage you to support this application and advance it to public hearing.

Thank you,

Justin Temmel, Jennifer Horsfall

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: 1075 Tillicum

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: _____ March 7 , 2022 For Information __ CAO __ Mayor/Council Other _____ Late Item Referred to: Deb H For __ Action __ Response __ Report For Agenda X Council __ COTW __ IC

-----Original Message-----

From: Sak Johl [REDACTED]
Sent: March-06-22 4:15 PM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: 1075 Tillicum

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Esquimalt Mayor and council

My name is Sak Johl.I recently had an opportunity to work with the mayor,council and the planning department of Esquimalt,to build 5 Townhomes at 1052 Tillicum.

The area surrounding Gorge Park is the gateway to Esquimalt from Sannich.Recently,the area has not only been updated with my development of 5 new townhomes,but now an older duplex is been replaced with 5 new townhomes @1048 Tillicum.

The former Gorge Pointe Pub area is now been considered as mixed use residential.I support the idea of additional housing for this area.Abstract's reputation of quality design will enhance the modernization of the Gorge Park Area. The one recommendation would be a pedestrian crossing at the corner of Tillicum Rd. and McNaughton Ave.

Sak Johl

Sent from my iPhone

Kim Maddin

From: Corporate Services
Subject: FW: For Council Meeting March 7th. 1075 Tillicum Rd. Gorge Pub redevelopment.

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT RECEIVED: _____ March 7, 2022 For Information __CAO __Mayor/Council Other _____ <u>Late Item</u> Referred to: <u>Deb H</u> For __Action __Response __Report For Agenda <u>X</u> Council __COTW __IC
--

From: Ron Pettapiece [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-22 7:36 AM
To: Corporate Services <Corporate.Services@esquimalt.ca>
Subject: For Council Meeting March 7th. 1075 Tillicum Rd. Gorge Pub redevelopment.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council
RE: 1075 Tillicum

I was contacted by Adam Cooper, Director of Community Planning and Development, from Abstract Developments. He saw that I had been a participant at the initial community consultation session. In his email he mentioned that he was trying to build support for Abstract's proposal to build a 6 story . His exact words were "see if it's possible to earn your support". I then had a phone conversation with Adam late last week.

Unfortunately I cannot support the proposal as it stands for several reasons"

1. Adam did nothing to allay my fears about the **blasting of rock** required to put in the underground parking. I recently sold my family property at 607 Beach Dr about 1 block away from the abstract development in the 600 block of Beach Drive in Oak Bay. The blasting continued for many months and caused damage to nearby homes, including my own. Adam mentioned that he did not think the blasting would cause significant disruption to neighbours and I seriously doubt this, considering that the building site appears to be perched on rock.
2. **Maintaining some sort of historic pub or eating facility/destintion**, ideally on the top floor so that many people could enjoy the wonderful view. Adam mentioned that there would be 1300 SqFt. available on the street level that could be used by a retailer; hopefully a food outlet.
3. Keeping a **reasonable building height**. Six stories is proposed. Adam assured me that the shadow created by a 6 story building would not create a shadow for the dwellers of the adjacent condominium structure. This seems unlikely considering the angle that the sun sets in the West. I live in the neighbourhood and the sun falls directly on line with where the building will be positioned. So there will definitely be an impact on the dwellers of the South side of the condo building.
4. **Pedestrian traffic** caused by a new condo building across from Gorge Park. I realize that the issue of traffic crossing and road safety are a municipal, rather than an Abstract Development issue. Adam mentioned that \$100K will be given to help with traffic, beautification issues. I have seen many close call accidents where pedestrians have tried to get across the road with their children and pets to get into the Gorge Park. This will only increase with more residents and with no food facility in the newly built public building in the park. So some solution to this (eg. overpass, pedestrian crossing at the park entry etc.) will need to be worked into the roadways plan.

Ron Pettapiece
1190 Rhoda Lane

Deborah Liske

From: Fred Billingham [REDACTED]
Sent: March-07-22 1:11 PM
To: Corporate Services
Subject: Rezoning of 1075 Tillicum Road- File 22-065

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Township of Esquimalt Network. Please verify you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT	
RECEIVED:	March 7, 2022
For Information	<input type="checkbox"/> CAO <input type="checkbox"/> Mayor/Council
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Late Item
Referred to:	<input type="checkbox"/> Deb H
For	<input type="checkbox"/> Action <input type="checkbox"/> Response <input type="checkbox"/> Report
For Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Council <input type="checkbox"/> COTW <input type="checkbox"/> IC

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows
Hi,

I would like to submit a comment in regard to the proposed rezoning of 1075 Tillicum Road, the site of the former Gorge Point Pub. I am supportive of the plan to rezone this land for multi-family development, as I am aware of the necessity to increase density in both Esquimalt and across the CRD to create a more sustainable region. As I see it, the more people living this side of the Island Highway, the fewer cars driving in and out from the Westshore every day, and the more opportunities for people to live car free, relying on transit and cycling.

In conjunction with this however, I believe it is very important to ensure that commercial activity is retained on the ground floor, be that in the form of a licensed premises like a pub/restaurant or a café. Pubs and cafe's are really important elements for community building, providing spaces for neighbours to meet up and mix. For instance, on my last visit to The Gorge Point Pub before it closed, I met a neighbour from 2 doors away who I had never met before and found we had a mutual friend in common! In this area over the past couple of years we have lost Gorge-ous Coffee, and Il Greco is due for a rebuild/development (albeit both of these are in Saanich) as well as the closure of the Gorge Point. I love how walkable Esquimalt is, but you have to retain places like pubs and cafe's to make there be somewhere to walk to.

I'm not sure if it is possible to zone for a specific commercial use? If not, would it be possible to add a clause or covenant to the rezoning approval that a proportion of the ground floor of the site be dedicated to commercial space, with a specification that the use has to have the capacity to promote social/community mixing?

I hope this is possible. We have lived in Esquimalt for nearly 4 years, and really love it here. My wife was saying only a couple of days ago how much more we would have struggled with COVID and lockdowns without being able to go on daily walks through the trees or down to the ocean, and I'm really looking forward to the upcoming implementation of the Active Transportation Plan. It's a great neighbourhood and community, and a new pub or similar in this location would really help keep it that way!

Thanks so much for your time,
Fred Billingham
1027 Colville Road