There were no members of the public present.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Staff Liaison, Trevor Parkes at 6:59 pm. He then introduced Councillor McKie to the group and informed the membership they needed to elect a chair person for the evenings meeting.

Motion was made by Joy Palmeter, seconded by Lorne Argyle that Pete Hartman assume the responsibility of chairperson for the evenings meeting. Pete Hartman accepted the nomination, was elected chair, unanimously, and took over the meeting.

II. LATE ITEMS

No late items.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Moved by Lorne Argyle, seconded by Joy Palmeter that the agenda be adopted as circulated.
The Motion CARRIED.
IV. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

(1) Minutes of the Regular Meeting, of December 20, 2011 were not available at the meeting. Trevor Parkes explained that Marie Letham was away for several weeks and will prepare the December minutes on her return. The minutes should be available for the February meeting.

V. BUSINESS FROM MINUTES

No minutes available.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

(1) DEVELOPMENT PERMIT
521 – 529 Comerford Street
[Lot 266, Suburban Lot 40, Esquimalt District, Plan 2854]
[Lot 267, Suburban Lot 40, Esquimalt District, Plan 2854]

Trevor Parkes advised the Commission members that this proposal was for a Development Permit including variances for siting and parking. The application is similar to the one presented to the commission in September 2011. He introduced Leonard Cole, Urban Core Ventures, owner, and Des Bazett of Vic Davies Architect Ltd.

Des Bazett proceeded to describe the proposal. He talked about the fit of the project with the neighbourhood; mentioning the existing 4 story building to the north, on Esquimalt Road, and the Official Community Plan (OCP) designation for the area to the south, allowing for up to 4 storey's.

Mr. Bazett then went on to describe the layout and features of the building; including the commercial unit, the secure parking area, how there would be a majority of bachelor units between 330 ft² and 410 ft², with several 1 and 2 bedroom units between 440 – 565 ft². All units would have a full kitchen, bathroom and an in-suite laundry. He commented that Leonard Cole has done a similar type of development in the City of Victoria.

He spoke of the buildings 9 accessible units, the front door would have an automatic door opener and how the elevator would proceed to the roof, allowing full accessibility to the 1000 ft² roof top patio. He stated that some units will have private terrace areas and all units will have access to storage lockers and bike storage.

Des Bazett also outlined the landscape plan for the members and stated they would work with the municipal parks and engineering departments to enhance the boulevard, and were suggesting a short term space for the front of the building. He described the finishes, colours and materials proposed for use on the building. He indicated that the building would be constructed to meet “Built Green” silver standard and a consultant would be hired. He described the project as a part of the “new green lifestyle”; that it would appeal to people with fewer
possessions, including no car.

Mr. Bazett spoke about the parking variances being requested. That they were proposing 23 spaces, at a ratio of .65 spaces per unit, including 1 disabled and 1 commercial space. He indicated there would be power supplied in some spaces for electric vehicles and 3 month bus passes would be supplied to new purchasers. He reasoned the limited parking was justified by the location, the ease of access to community facilities and public transit.

Leonard Cole, Owner told the members the ratio for parking had increased from the last proposal from a ratio of .43 to .65 spaces per unit. He believed Council to be very positive toward the project as they waived the 6 month restriction on submitting as new application. He also stated the bylaw allows a ratio of .5 spaces per unit in senior’s apartment developments.

**APC Questions:**

Lorne Argyle asked if the parking spaces would be for sale. Leonard Cole explained that they would be sold, allowing them to keep the price point down on the units. Mr. Argyle asked about the storage for motor scooters. Dez Bazett stated they would have space and electrical plugs in the storage areas on each floor, and that the elevator would be large enough, as the BC Building Code requires elevators to be large enough to hold a stretcher. Lorne Argyle also made an inquiry if the developer thought the building would be non-smoking, with no barbeques allowed on the balconies. Mr. Cole said he thought that would be possible.

Joy Palmeter asked about the strata titling and would Mr. Cole keep a percent of the units for rental. Leonard Cole explained that the units would be for sale and will be rentable by the owners, and that he intends to keep some units but how many will be determined by the market. Joy Palmeter then expressed a concern about the parking numbers and the fact young tenants will have friends with cars and there is already a tight parking situation in the area. Mr. Cole stated that Boulevard Transportation Group now supports the parking numbers, though the report is not available yet. Joy Palmeter expressed concern about setting a precedent with these low parking numbers. Mr. Cole mentioned that each project is evaluated separately and on its own merits.

Wes Nelson asked about the demographics of Mr. Coles Fort Street building. Mr Cole described it as a diverse group with many single women and 75-80% owner occupied.

**APC Discussion:**

Lorne Argyle stated he was in favour and thought the building was a step in the right direction.

Pete Hartman stated he was not in favour of the project. At the Council meetings he attended the public was not supportive of the project. There is a lack of
street parking in the area and that a variance for any more than 1 or 2 stalls, was unacceptable.

Amy Higginbotham asked Trevor Parkes about the parking proposed for the Esquimalt Village Plan (EVP). Trevor Parkes explained that the EVP is designed to meet the current zoning requirements for parking which is 1.3 spaces per unit for residential and the spaces would be almost exclusively underground. Mr. Parkes also stated that with the scale of the subject proposal there would be practical difficulties with placing the parking underground. Amy Higginbotham asked is there are any other developments in Esquimalt that have had such large variances for parking. Trevor Parkes stated that to his knowledge there were not, and that the Skyline project at 924 Esquimalt Road has a ratio of 1.15 spaces per unit.

Amy Higginbotham indicated she felt the applicant was asking Esquimalt to conduct an experiment where they would have little recourse if this turns out badly, because the units will be individually owned. She expressed a responsibility to think about the area as a whole and a need to encourage business and to not put added stress on the parking availability in the area.

Wes Nelson indicated he also had reservations about the parking variance, that there would be little control over who buys into the building and that it was overly optimistic to think that many of the buildings residents will not require parking. He also expressed concern with the impact the lack of parking will have on the economic development in the area.

Joy Palmeter stated there is no room for overflow parking in the area.

Pete Hartman expressed concern there is no way for the municipality to control who owns the units and whether they require parking.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Moved by Amy Higginbotham, seconded by Joy Palmeter, that the Esquimalt Advisory Planning Commission (APC) resolves that the application for a Development Permit limiting the form and character of development to that shown on architectural plans provided by Vic Davies Architect stamped “Received January 10, 2012”, and sited as detailed on the survey plan prepared by Powell and Associates, BC Land Surveyors, stamped “Received December 2, 2011”, and including the following relaxations to Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050 and Parking Bylaw, 1992, No. 2011, for the proposed development located at Lot 266, Suburban Lot 40, Esquimalt District, Plan 2854 and Lot 267, Suburban Lot 40, Esquimalt District, Plan 2854 [521-529 Comerford Street], be forwarded to Council with a recommendation of denial.

The motion **CARRIED: 4 In favour, 1 Opposed**

**Zoning Bylaw, 1992, No. 2050, Section 24 (1) – Visibility at Intersections**

— an exemption from the requirement that there shall be no obstruction to the line of vision by Buildings, Structures or vegetation between the heights of 1 metre and 3 metres above the established grade of streets within and area
bounded by the centre lines of intersecting streets and a line joining a point on each of the centre lines 25 metres from their intersection.

**Parking Bylaw No. 2011, Section 11(1) – Visitor Parking** – a reduction in the required number of dedicated visitor parking spaces from 1 of every 4 to 1 of every 8 [i.e. from a total of 12 visitor spaces to 6 visitor spaces]

**Parking Bylaw No. 2011, Section 13(1)(a)(v) – Number Of Off-Street Parking Spaces** – a reduction in the required number of parking spaces from 1.3 spaces per dwelling unit to 0.64 spaces per dwelling unit [i.e. from a total of 45 spaces to 22 spaces].

VII. **PLANNER’S STATUS REPORT**

Trevor Parkes, presented the following status report on recent applications.

**Status of Recent Applications:**

**880-D Esquimalt Road:** [DP for Commercial Renovation] COTW moved that the application be forwarded to Council with a recommendation of approval subject to Development Permit No. 18/2011 being presented to Council for consideration. Development Permit No. 18/2011 will be presented at the January 23, 2012 Special Meeting of Council.

**1054 Colville Road:** [DP for Two Family Residence] At the regular meeting held November 14, 2011 COTW moved that the application be forwarded to Council with a recommendation of approval, subject to staff completing appropriate notification and returning the Development Permit to Council for consideration. The Development Permit was approved by Council on December 12, 2011.

**856/858 Esquimalt Road:** [Rezoning and Development Permit] COTW supported staff recommendation that the application be forwarded to Council with a recommendation of approval, subject to preparation of amending bylaw, appropriate notification, and a public hearing being held. Staff presented the amending bylaw for 1st and 2nd reading at the regular meeting of Council on August 15, 2011. Council considered the amending bylaw and directed staff to schedule a Public Hearing, send notification, and advertise as required. The application has been placed in abeyance at the request of the applicant pending conclusion of negotiations with the neighbouring property owner relating to traffic issues.

The applicant was unable to successfully negotiate a resolution to outstanding traffic issues. Accordingly, modifications to the proposed site layout and landscaping were required. The updated amending bylaw accommodating these changes was presented to Council October 17, 2011. First and 2nd reading was given to the bylaw and staff were directed to schedule a Public Hearing, send notification, and advertise as required.

The Public Hearing occurred November 7, 2011. The amending bylaw was given 3rd reading and staff were directed not to return the amending bylaw and development permit to Council prior to the applicant entering into a legal
agreement to ensure that the developer assumes responsibility for the costs for the off-site works on Esquimalt Road and lost infrastructure on Esquimalt Road. Staff are working with the applicant to resolve this issue and return the application to Council.

**616 Lampson Street:** [Rezoning and DP for 1 new SFD] COTW supported staff recommendation that the application be forwarded to Council with a recommendation of approval subject to preparation of amending bylaws, completion of appropriate notification, and a Public Hearing being held. Staff presented the amending bylaw for 1st and 2nd reading at the regular meeting of Council on January 16, 2012. Council directed staff to schedule a Public Hearing, send notification and prepare a Development Permit for consideration.

APC Questions:

Chair Hartman asked Trevor Parkes about the municipality's role in civil matters between neighbours, relative to rezoning applications. Trevor Parkes explained that the municipality has very little role except that if one owner is asking the municipality for something then there may be an opportunity to facilitate an agreement.

Chair Hartman also asked about the quality of some applications versus others. Trevor Parkes explained that some applications are done by professional developers others by home owners, and that staff attempts to work with all applicants to achieve an acceptable level of presentation.

**VIII. COUNCIL LIAISON**

Councillor Bob Mckie conveyed that he was looking forward to attending the APC meetings, was there to listen and he could take the members comments back to Council.

**IX. NEW BUSINESS**

No new business.

**X. NEXT REGULAR MEETING**

Tuesday, February 21, 2011

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

On motion the meeting adjourned at 7:54 pm.