



Community Meeting Feedback Form

This form is intended to help establish a more standardized approach to recording feedback from the Community Meeting. The CALUC may either complete this form and submit it to the City or ensure that the same content is reflected in a letter provided in lieu of this form.

Location of proposed development (address):

1905 Lee Ave.

COMMUNITY MEETING DETAILS

Date: June 18, 2019

Location of Meeting (address): Victoria Collage of Art – 1625 Bank St.

Meeting facilitated by South Jubilee Neighbourhood Association CALUC.

Approximate total number of people in attendance: 24

Meeting Chair (please name): Ben Ziegler

Note Taker (please name): Kevin Ziegler

CALUC Chair or designate signature:

Ben Ziegler

Date:

June 26, 2019

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DETAILS

Applicant represented by:

Owner: Maria Weeks and Joseph Calenda (Molto Bene Enterprises)

The applicant explained that this proposal is to change the zoning and/or Official Community Plan for the subject property to accommodate the following proposal:

Rezone the lot and house to provide for a second small lot and house at 1905 Lee Avenue. To subdivide the existing lot at 1905 Lee Avenue into 2 special zoned small lots: 1) existing house to be a lot of 262 m² meeting small lot zone requirement of 260 m²; 2) new lot of 235 m² requiring special zoning with new house to be built.

Community Questions and Answers:

- Q: New house design appears to have a self-contained second suite? A: Designed suite is for extended family.
- Q: How does this proposal meet the small lot zoning guidelines? A: It doesn't. New house is proposed as a single-family house that happens to have 2 kitchens / living spaces etc. Call it what you want.

- Q: In reference to the new lot and proposed house, is it duplex? A: No, it's not a duplex, it would be a basement suite.
- Q: Are you seeking a variance? A: Not applying for variance, asking for site specific zoning; however, asking for variances is another potential approach.
- Q: Why isn't variance information on the map? A: Variances required are in the (detailed) table (part of meeting notice).
- Q: Floor ratio larger than allowed in small lot? A: It's consistent with small lot zone. Basement is not included in gross floor space.
- Q: There appears to be a discrepancy between the information re: FSR on the mailed out information and the information you are providing here; why? A: I (developer) made a mistake and included the basement square footage in the mailed out information. It does not need including since it is a basement, not a storey.
- Q: What would happen to the 3 large protected trees? A: The one closest to the street would be saved; the middle one would be removed; the one at the back of the lot removed.
- Q: Is the tree at the back of the lot on applicant's lot or shared with neighbouring lot? A: Would need to confirm where the tree is.
- Q: Are the existing trees shown to scale on the plan? A: No.
- Q: Are you sure that the protected tree that you stated will remain is possible to save? A: Haven't looked at it in detail.
- Q: Arborist was on site, right? A: Yes, but a tree impact report for sub-division has not been prepared.
- Q: Provision to replace loss of mature trees on property (due to parliament of Canada's climate emergency)? A: Won't be planting any new trees.
- Q: Style of existing home at 1905? A: Raised bungalow
- Q: In reference to developer's statement that the existing house would have the non-conforming deck removed and the house renovated: Are there revised plans (for existing 1905 house)? A: Plans not available at this time, deck will be removed, and Juliet balcony will be added.
- Q: In reference to the front streetscape drawing #2, is the picture to scale? A: Yes
- Q: In reference to the front streetscape drawing #1, is this drawing to scale? A: No. It has been manipulated to fit the page.
- Q: Will the dimensions be put on street profile? A: No
- Q: How much higher than the house to the right? A: New house is 7.5m in height.
- Q: Curious why the existing residence does not present an option to a family of four (with an incomplete basement)? What's wrong with the existing house? A: Was built in 1906, hazardous to do renovation. Alternative is to tear down and propose a duplex.
- Q: Will the exterior entrance staircase to the basement on the east side of the new house meet setback requirements re: the east property line? A: Stairway will be built to code.
- Q: In reference to the RS-1 small lot zoning and the variances being requested by developer especially regarding rear yard set-backs for each house, how does this proposal meet RS-1 zoning requirements? A: It doesn't. That's why I'm requesting a specialized small lot zoning.

Community Comments (including positive, negative, and neutral):

Key Areas of Concern (Summary)

- Visual plans and drawings: issues of proportionality, scope, misrepresentation, consistency, level of detail
- Trust: issues of trust re: development purpose, proposed zoning, building occupancy, site usage, (future) actual vs. proposed design
- Impact on adjacent neighbours: shadow, shade, minimal setback
- Premature, on developer part, to bring their proposal to a community meeting?; Q & A left many unanswered questions and concerns; there were no positive (community) comments to the developer's proposal.

Comments

- New lot is smaller than allowed by current small lot zoning.
- Multiple slides presented seem inaccurate (e.g. houses, properties, and trees were not accurately drawn to scale).
- Need better representation of proposed development in context to other houses/properties on the street. Include a site plan that includes adjacent properties and panoramic street profile.
- Protected trees are not shown to scale – an arborist should be consulted to provide clarity on tree retention questions.
- Where does the existing house deck fit into the landscape plan? Deck not shown in landscape plan. Landscape plan and street profile don't seem to line up.
- Lack of backyard setbacks on both houses especially the proposed new house which would have a backyard setback of only 1.3m (4.27 ft) placing a 7.48m (24.54 ft) high blank wall only 4 ft away along the neighbour to the north's entire back yard. Existing house would have a backyard of 2.03m (6.66 ft).
- Loss of value / pleasure for adjacent property (north) due to shadow and wall along the back.
- Regarding planned basement suite in new house, concern that this will become a secondary suite in the house. Small lot zoning does not allow for a secondary suite. Can you covenant the property to prevent rental to non-family member?
- Rear yard setback does not meet zoning and has an extreme negative impact on neighbours to the north. Noted loss of enjoyment of yard for property to the north. Concern over shading's impact to fruit trees in adjacent property on Lee.
- Parking for the existing house said to be in the "garage" and onsite. There does not appear to be a functioning garage nor an area indicated on the site for parking.
- Minimal out-door living space (proposed).
- Worried about this development setting a precedent in the neighbourhood (re: small lot size and minimal setbacks).
- Hard to provide informed feedback, if data and visuals are lacking (i.e., still too many unanswered questions).
- It may have been premature to bring this proposal to a CALUC community meeting.
- All community members in attendance asked questions and/or had comments.
- There were no positive community feedback comments.
- Community members appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposal.

CALUC Chair or designate signature: Ben Ziegler Date: June 26, 2019