

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT

LATE AGENDA ITEMS COUNCIL

Monday February 22nd, 2021 @ 7:00 pm Esquimalt Council Chambers

- (1) **PERTAINING** to Item No. 6 (5): **STAFF REPORTS** Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit Bylaw Amendments, Staff Report No. DEV-21-003
 - Email from Sean MacUisdin, The Island Scrivener, dated February 21, 2021, Re: Bylaws and Projects
 - Email from Rozlynne Mitchell, dated February 21, 2021, Re: DADU's
- (2) PERTAINING to Item No. 6 (6): STAFF REPORTS Development Variance Permit 1151 Esquimalt Road (Archie Browning Sports Centre signage), Staff Report No.: DEV-21-009
 - Email from Sandra Slobodian, dated February 22, 2021, Re: Bright sign near Esquimalt Road entrance to Archie Browning
 - Email from Meagan Klaassen, dated February 22, 2021, Re: Archie Browning sign
- (3) **PERTAINING** to Item No. 7 (2): **COMMUNICATIONS** Email from Nancy Shakelford, Assistant Professor, School of Environmental Studies, University of Victoria, dated February 4, 2021, Re: Support for the UN's Decade on Ecosystem Restoration
 - Email from Lynn Amaral, dated February 20, 2021, Re: Comment/Response

From:

Laurie Hurst

Sent:

February-22-21 10:11 AM

To:

Kim Maddin

Subject:

FW: Bylaws and Projects

For mail log, thanks.

Laurie Hurst, CPA, CGA Chief Administrative Officer

Tel: 1-250-414-7133

For the latest on the Township's response to COVID-19, please visit

esquimalt.ca/covid19

From: Barb Desjardins <Barbara.Desjardins@esquimalt.ca>

Sent: February-21-21 6:23 PM

To: Laurie Hurst < laurie.hurst@esquimalt.ca>

Subject: Fwd: Bylaws and Projects

Public input on agenda items

Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

Barbara Desjardins

Mayor, Township of Esquimalt Lekwungen Territory Tel: 1-250-883-1944 Begin forwarded message:

From: Sean MacUisdin

Date: February 21, 2021 at 5:19:09 PM PST

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

Subject: Bylaws and Projects

Good day, Mayor and Council.

I'm dropping a line on a couple of issues that I have some concerns about; the Garden Suite bylaw and the proposed design for the Emergency Services building.

Garden Suite Bylaw.

Though I am happy to see the proposed bylaw amendment finally submitted, I do have concerns with some of the content.

"A Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit may not be located on any Parcel with a Secondary Suite."

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT
For Information:

CAO Mayor/Council

Blair/Scott/Bill

RECEIVED: FEB 2 2 2021

Referred: Lacked
For Action For Response COTW
For Report Council Agenda IC

My interpretation of this may be at fault, however, I read this as to state that a SFR that already has a secondary suite may not have a Garden Suite. I'm concerned about this restriction as it seems to be an unnecessary throttle on a housing measure that will likely already have limited buy in because of the other measure that must be met before one takes into account cost (say \$60,000 or more for a 300 square foot suite). I do not believe that this bylaw will result in a dearth of garden suites within the municipality, so a restriction such as this only serves to further reduce the number of those that may be considering this option. Speaking anecdotally from the perspective of my neighborhood, there are many properties with adequate room for a 300-400 square foot garden suit that already have suites. They would then be disqualified.

If the point of this bylaw is to increase infill housing and density, then I would suggest we make it easier for SFR owners to achieve this rather than putting up restrictions. Although I am unsure of what prompted this, I would suspect it is parking. Parking is indeed an issue in the municipality, but as it seems that developers have been able to download parking onto municipal streets, as have legal and illegal suites, and for that matter, SFR's with multiple vehicles, why we have drawn a line in the sand over this is puzzling.

Please reconsider this and perhaps treat the ongoing issue of on-street parking as a separate issue.

"Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit must not have a Basement or any habitable space below or above the First Storey."

I believe I understand the reticence of having a multi story garden suite in a SFR backyard, I would suggest that this statement is a bit sweeping, especially when one considers the inclusion of a loft in order to decrease the overall footprint. A restriction on loft height would ensure that suites were not imposing edifices while at the same time, allowing flexibility in design that would also maximise a smaller footprint. As noted by the APC:

"That the Advisory Planning Commission recommends to Council the proposed regulations and guidelines for the legalization of Detached Accessory Dwelling Units in the Township of Esquimalt be approved with the following consideration be given to changing the height to 1.5 storeys to accommodate interior" lofts.

"The Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be provided with a bicycle storage area, onsite, screened from the view of pedestrians on the street."

I assume 'area' does not mean building, however, I'm also not sure what 'area' entails.

Emergency Services Building

I noted the proposed design of the new Emergency Services building lacked anything but the emergency services, which I must admit, surprised me greatly. I recall during feedback sessions and with conversations with council members that the proposed building could have residential and community space above it (I remember this as there were discussions about TCAC having access to community space). The design appears to have neither, which I believe is a great opportunity lost. It is my understanding that in order for the the municipality to pair with BC housing for affordable housing options, we need municipal land, of which there is little that is not park space. This therefore seemed like an ideal spot for residential housing, community space, and quite franklly, some additional commercial frontage as the building displaced three stores. Beyond this, building a two story building amongst a collection of six plus story buildings that are being built with the message of densificatuion and building up (and with some of those projects being rather unpopular) seems pretty tone deaf. I

would hope that a significant rethink of this building be considered to include residential, community, and commercial space.

Parks and Rec LED Sign Board

Finally, though I understand the desire and utility for an LED sign for Parks and Rec and for its messaging opportunities, I must admit that placing it at one of the most dangerous stretches of road in Esquimalt for cyclists and pedestrians causes me concern. The road in front of the plaza is notorious for cyclists being hit by inattentive and distracted drivers — me being one of them — and adding a large LED sign will likely only add to that. If this sign goes forward, please coinsider the installation of mitigating devices or signage as suggested by the Greater Victoria Cycling Coalition.

Thank you for the consideration.

Sean Pól MacÚisdin

Independently Published Author



Website - Author Sean MacUisdin

		CORPORATIO	IN OF THE TOWNSHIP OF	ESQUIMALT	
From:	Rozlynne Mitchell	For Informati	on:		
Sent:	February-21-21 6:26 PM	CAO	Mayor/Council		
To:	Corporate Services; Laurie Hurst; Bill Brown; Tricia deMacedo				
Subject:	Feb 22nd Council Agenda Item re DADU's	RECEIVED:	FEB 2 2 2021		
February 21, 2021		Referred:	Rachel		
Township of Esquimalt	Mayor and Council, Laurie Hurst, Bill Brown, Trici		For Response Council Agenda	Corw	

Dear Mayor and Council:

Re: Feb 22nd Agenda Item "DADU Bylaw Amendments - Staff Report No. DEV-21-003"

My letter is in support of Staff's newest recommendations for Bylaw Amendments regarding Detached Accessory Dwelling Units ("DADU's"). I believe it to be a thoughtful and sensitive approach to the implementation of DADU's, in part regarding on-site parking, owner occupation and building height and design requirements.

I was disappointed that the process would not include a mechanism for neighbour input, or at least neighbour notification, in order to provide an opportunity for input on privacy issues and also so that it would not be a surprise when construction started on a house just over one's backyard fence.

I also wish to address three of the considerations put forth by the Advisory Planning Commission re the proposed regulations and guidelines:

#1 - Suggestion that no parking spaces be required "as they take up too much green space".

I am not sure how realistic it is to think that we will get away from using cars in the future. If parking is not required, people will still have cars and will be parking on the street. Not requiring parking while increasing density will only add to our already congested roadways. Many of the streets in my area are full of parked cars, in part from secondary suites with no onsite parking. Staff's current recommended approach provides some flexibility while hopefully addressing additional street congestion.

#2 — Suggestion that there be no requirement for the DADU or the principle residence be owner-occupied "as there are no major issues with homes that have rented suites and are not owner-occupied".

Absentee landlord rentals can be a big problem for a neighbourhood. A number of other municipalities have gone with requiring owner occupation as it helps to alleviate fears that neighbours have about some strictly rental properties. It can also help with some of the quality and privacy design choices that are made in the building of DADU's as the owners will be living on the property as well. The intention of DADU's is to provide the community with a mechanism for gentle densification and increased (hopefully affordable) rental opportunities within what are currently single family zoned neighbourhoods; where home owners have a means to age-in-place; where rental revenue can provide a mortgage helper making home ownership more affordable for more people; and, to provide dwellings for family members as they grow and want to stay in their community. Owner occupation supports this intent and inspires confidence in the neighbourhood that

DADU's will blend into the existing neighbourhood and not bring a lot of additional concerns. This is not always the case with strictly revenue generation investments.

#3 – Suggestion that there be consideration given to changing the height to "1.5 storeys to accommodate interior lofts".

I believe this could be considered in some areas. For example there are very large lots in some designated areas, such as parts of Saxe Point, where this might make sense. But some areas, for example in some areas proposed for West Bay where the lots are small, any dwelling that is put in next door will <u>not</u> be unassuming. A one storey dwelling could be made to blend in but a one and a half storey building could impact neighbours on all sides significantly. I suggest that for those larger properties where it makes sense to do so, that consideration be given for some height variances while limiting smaller properties to one storey.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Rozlynne Mitchell

Archie Browning

Kim Maddin

From: Sent: To: Subject:	Corporate Services February-22-21 10:55 AM Kim Maddin FW: Bright sign near Esquimalt Road entrance to Archie Browning		
Importance:	High	CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT For Information: CAO Mayor/Council	
Mail Log Please.		RECEIVED: FEB 2 2 2021	
Corporate Services General Delivery Email		Referred: Kache For Action For Response COTW Council Agenda IC	

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

From: Sandy

Sent: February-22-21 10:35 AM

To: Corporate Services < Corporate. Services@esquimalt.ca>

Subject: Bright sign near Esquimalt Road entrance to Archie Browning

Dear Mayor and Council

If this is part of other measures to make pedestrians more visible and thereby safer then it is welcome. However, bright distracting signage at that particular spot would potentially lead to even more pedestrian accidents. Not to mention light pollution. It is possible that it is part of a bigger plan which includes new curbs, painted walkways, better traffic lights. However, if not then I would question this as an addition to that particular spot.

Sandra Slobodian 1143 Bewdley Ave, Victoria, BC V9A 5N2

From:

Laurie Hurst

Sent:

February-22-21 11:07 AM

To:

Kim Maddin

Subject:

FW: Archie Browning sign

For mail log, thanks.

Laurie Hurst, CPA, CGA Chief Administrative Officer

Tel: 1-250-414-7133

For the latest on the Township's response to COVID-19, please visit

esquimalt.ca/covid19

From: Barb Desjardins < Barbara. Desjardins@esquimalt.ca>

Sent: February-22-21 10:58 AM

To: Laurie Hurst < laurie.hurst@esquimalt.ca>

Subject: Fwd: Archie Browning sign

Sorry about the last one, I realized it was sent to staff, this is another for public input tonight

Sent from my iPad

Barbara Desjardins

Mayor, Township of Esquimalt Lekwungen Territory Tel: 1-250-883-1944 Begin forwarded message:

From: Meagan Klaassen

Date: February 22, 2021 at 10:51:30 AM PST

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

Subject: Archie Browning sign

Re: Council meeting February 22, Agenda item 6: Staff Reports #6

Dear Mayor and Council:

I would like to express my concern with the proposed Archie Browning sign at the entrance to Esquimalt Plaza. There are frequent regular social media reports from citizens about near-misses and actual collisions between motor vehicle drivers turning into the plaza and people walking on the sidewalk and riding in the bike lane. There are five (!) uncontrolled entry/exits at the plaza, and drivers are turning without due care and attention, especially at the entrance to the arena/McDonalds drive-through where the new sign is to be placed. A digital screen with constantly changing messages and advertisements is yet another powerful eye-catching distraction. I am not opposed to a new sign, however until the current road design problem is fixed I am worried this sign will cause even more close calls and injuries or even a fatality. If there was a single traffic-light controlled plaza/arena entrance (plus the plaza delivery exit and arena/McDonalds drive-through exit) the sign would be much less concerning.

Thanks for your time,

Meagan Klaassen 1217 Lyall St Esquimalt

From: Sent: To: Subject:	Lynn <ellamay@shaw.ca> February-20-21 5:01 PM Corporate Services Comment/Response to 7.2</ellamay@shaw.ca>	For Information: CAO CAO RECEIVED: FEE 2 2 2021
Dear Council,		Referred: Rackel For Action For Response COTW
Thanks for your service t	to our great community!	For Report Council Agenda IC

I would like to echo and support communication 7.2! I would also like to encourage us to have a bylaw prohibiting invasive species (especially english ivy).

It would also be fantastic if a few times a year the town could offer a way to dispose of the ivy refuse for private properties.

It would also be fantastic if their could be a way to link private properties of all sorts with workers/volunteers willing to remove invasive species.

I would also be willing to help facilitate any of this if need be.

Thanks again,

Lynn Amaral