

February 15, 2016

Mayor and Council
City of Victoria

Subject;

1120, 1124, and 1128 Burdett Ave. rezoning form R3-AM-1 and R1B to Site Specific Zoning

Description;

The current zoning is R3-AM-1 and R1B and the proponent is requesting to combine the properties into one. Currently on the property are three existing houses, which are to be replaced with one four-story apartment building with 36 units.

In response to the Community Meeting Notification (CMN) the proponents for the above address met with Fairfield Gonzales Planning and Zoning Committee and members of the community. To make a presentation to all and answer any questions and receive comments from those present.

Members of the CALUC Committee present: Wayne Hollohan (Chair), Maureen Connolly, Ted Relph, Clair Jackson, Jim Masterton, Ken Roueche, Robin Jones.

Twenty-eight members of the community attended.

Wayne Hollohan opened the meeting by explaining the CALUC process, the procedures of the meeting, and ways in which community members would be able to have further input at meetings of the Planning and Land Use Committee of the City.

Developer's Presentation

Karl Robertson (KR) provided a comprehensive account of the proposal, which is to replace three existing houses with a four-story apartment building with 36 units.

He suggested that the rezoning is for this proposal is consistent with City's vision as indicated in the OCP. It is a project within 200 m of the urban core that increases density; scores very high in terms of walkability and cyclability. It provides one parking space per unit plus three visitor parking spaces and ample secure bike storage. It fits with the existing four story apartment buildings that are on three sides it, has generous landscaping, promotes alternative forms of travel, and contributes to the streetscape with walkout apartments at grade. The building will aim to achieve a Built Green standard. He provided a thorough description of the project with slides of the site plan, elevators and rendering suggesting the materials that might be used.

Questions from the CALUC committee

Wayne Hollohan opened the meeting to questions, beginning with members of the CALUC committee. (CCM)

CCM do not see why this can't fit within some form of an existing zone when we have hundreds to choose from.

CCM expressed about the height of the building and the difference between peaks and the roof; and asked whether a shadow study has been done.

KR explained that the peaks are a design feature to provide visual interest at the cornice line, and that most of the roof is at the height stated. A shadow study has been completed.

CCM asked whether a concession in parking requirements was being requested and whether a parking analysis has been done.

KR replied that a reduction in parking requirements is being requested, and indicated that no parking analysis has been done, but undertook to complete one.

CCM asked if the mature tree in front of the project will have to be removed.

KR replied that it will be removed.

CCM asked for a clarification of the FSR of 1.86 (The Chair clarified the meaning of FSR in response to a question from the audience)

CCM replied that current zoning allows an FSR up to 1.6, but that an FSR of up to 2.0 is indicated under the OCP.

CCM asked whether design improvement could be made to the ground floor in order to make the units look more like townhouses, and to soften the massing of the proposed apartment building.

KR replied that this should be possible.

Questions and Comments from the Floor (identified by the address of the person asking. Most questions were from different people, but these are apartments so they have the same address)

1151 Burdett: This rezoning proposal is asking for reduced setbacks and increased density. Is this asking for too much? Why not townhouses rather than a blocky façade? KR replied that the setback from Burdett was established to match that of the apartment building at 1149 Rockland, next door, and the rear setback also matches adjacent buildings, but the design is still at an early stage and the developer is seeking feedback.

1150 Rockland: This proposal completely blocks off the back of their building. It feels as though 1150 Rockland is being stuffed in the nose. KR replied that there will be a new garden at the back of the proposed building that will provide a view for the residents of 1150 Rockland.

1153 Burdett (also owns another house on Burdett): This proposal asks for increased density and height, and reduced setbacks and parking. What amenities will be provided for the community to offset these? The developer has considered

making a community contribution such as to help with the homeless in Victoria, but is open to other suggestions. Also the new fire hydrant will provide add security for nearby houses that are currently a long way from a hydrant.

1153 Burdett: Why not ask for rezoning for R3-AM1, without the variances to setbacks and other adjustments, which would be a simpler solution? KR replied that this would lead to a four story building.

1149 Rockland: The artist's rendering looks like a 5 story not a 4 story building, and has a building at 3 or 2 stories been considered? KR replied that the decorative peak on the cornice line makes the building look taller in the rendering. This is a detail that can be reconsidered.

1115 Rockland: Has the developer looked at another apartment on Burdett that is smaller scale? This seems like too much building for the site, and will cause shadow problems.

1115 Burdett: The developer should be looking at 2 or 3 stories, which would be more in keeping with the street.

1131 Burdett: Where will people park? He only has street parking and this building only has 3 visitor parking spaces.

1115 Rockland: She will lose sunshine, privacy and her view of the Olympic Mountains.

650 Linden Ave: Asked about landscaping and the possibility of replacing mature trees that will be removed with other large trees rather than ornamentals. KR replied that the underground parking means that soil depth would not be sufficient for large trees, but that they intend to use the largest planters.

1115 Rockland: will there be any blasting? KR replied that what is known of subsurface materials suggests that blasting won't be needed, but they won't know until full geophysical tests have been done.

1115 Rockland: Wondered if there has been any consideration of the character of the block, and whether the design could be made more compatible with the rest of the block.

1153 Burdett: A townhouse or row housing development would be more compatible with the rest of the street, and in his experience could also be economical and fulfill the housing needs of the City.

Wayne Hollohan
Chair FG- CALUC