

Alicia Ferguson

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: Rezoning of 672 Niagara St - Feedback for Council

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

From: Janice Matthews
Sent: September 4, 2018 11:25 AM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: Rezoning of 672 Niagara St - Feedback for Council

To Mayor and Council
From Brian and Janice Matthews, residents and owners of 642 Niagara St.
Regarding proposed changes to 672 Niagara St. specifically variances to parking regulations

There is already a problem on the 600 block of Niagara Street caused by the number of cars illegally parked in residential parking zones. Staff and visitors to the Residential Care facilities at 657 and 685 Niagara, residents of the transition house at 647 Niagara, and residents of an apartment building at 660 Niagara are often forced to park in residential parking zones because their own facilities have not provided enough parking for them. Add to this the people who park on Niagara St to visit Beacon Hill Park. The overflow into residential parking extends west onto both sides of Niagara Street and around the corner onto St Andrews Street. Residents who are legitimately entitled to use residential parking are often unable to find a parking spot near their house.

The new development at 672 Niagara will exacerbate this problem, and reducing the number of required parking stalls will certainly not help. The residents of this 4-unit development will likely have more than 4 vehicles (in a perfect world they would walk or ride bikes but we're not there yet!). There will not be enough space for them to park legally on the street.

We urge you to refuse the request to reduce the number of parking stalls.

Thank you,
Brian and Janice Matthews
642 Niagara St.

Alicia Ferguson

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: 672 Niagara St.

From: Ruth McAllister
Sent: September 1, 2018 12:48 PM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: 672 Niagara St.

My mother, Sarah Lovell, is a resident at 685 Niagara St (Douglas House Apartments), which is directly across the street from 672 Niagara St.

She is 100 years old and unable to contact you herself, but wished me to express her concern about the increased congestion on Niagara St. that this higher density would cause, especially with less parking available on site for these new residents. It is very difficult already for friends and family visiting Douglas House to find any parking available in the neighbourhood. Between recently increased residential-parking-only and all-day parking around Douglas House, which is taken up by people working downtown and therefore unavailable to others, there are often no parking options for friends and family, who may travel some distance to visit.

If this project proceeds despite these concerns, please try and ensure that there are 2 hour parking options in front of Douglas House, rather than the current mix of residential and all-day parking.

September 3, 2018

Proposed Changes to 672 Niagara Street

Some of us at 685 Niagara are very concerned about the proposed development at 672 Niagara. The reductions in setbacks that are requested seem problematic, especially if they will result in the loss of one or more trees, but the request to reduce the number of parking stalls seems especially hard to justify. As a seniors' retirement home of about 100 residents, our building has many more visitors than a typical apartment complex and no visitors' parking. In addition, many members of staff have to drive to work and need to find parking. Next door, Trillium Douglas Care has about 25 residents, many with family members visiting daily, staff needing to park, and no parking lot.

Parking in the area is often very difficult to find, with visitors often having to park across Douglas Street by Beacon Hill Park, then jay walk over to Niagara, since there is no crosswalk. We very much hope that City Hall will eventually provide a crosswalk, but in the meantime the congestion caused by people parking on Niagara, the buses and others trying to make their way down the street and turning onto or off of Douglas, and the temptation for people to park on the Beacon Hill side of Douglas and then take their chances crossing to Niagara, often make for a very dangerous situation.

We hope that Council will not accept this proposal because of the apparent necessity to decrease the setbacks. If it is accepted, we request that, at the very least, there be no reduction in the number of parking stalls.

Your sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alison Prentice".

Alison Prentice

Apt 214, 685 Niagara Street
Victoria, BC
V8V 4X4

Pamela Martin

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: September 4, 2018 6:15 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Re:Proposal at 672 Niagara

Re: Proposal at 672 Niagara;

It was my understanding this area was zoned R2 Duplex. Certainly this proposed building will not meet that definition for housing and or density. Further some years ago I purchased 646 Niagara St, when we wanted to sell this property and enlarge the our own lot 190 St Andrews St, we were told that the minimum lot size at this time was 5,000sq ft. we were denied the variance which we applied for and forced to surrender some property. 672 Niagara does not meet this criteria we were subject to.

As far as parking goes there is limited parking at 672 Niagara, there had been a garage at the back of the property at the junction of Thetis and Violet lanes which was been demolished and no use made of the pad if indeed there was one. There is of course the frontage on the Niagara side which might fit 2 cars if it was free of other cars. This means that infarct there is no parking readily available for 672 Niagara tenants, the current occupants are parking on the properties grass from Thetis lane. Apparently there has been word among some of our neighbours that those that are proposing this development have been told that they can park on St Andrews St! That is not viable as this street is zone residential and according to the city by-laws 672 residents do not qualify for parking on this street and will be subjected to ticketing as we and some of our neighbours would ensure that the by-law be enforced.

In short I am opposed to this jamming of apartments or housing developments on such small properties to serve some developers profits.

At 86 years of age and suffering to physical disability, I will not be able to attend the council meeting. I request that this email stand as my voice against this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thomas Kent Anthony

Retired member Victoria Police Department

Sent for my father

Mitch Anthony

I also live at 109 St Andrews St and am opposed to this proposal.

Pamela Martin

From: Joan Tuttle [REDACTED]
Sent: September 5, 2018 2:04 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Proposal at 672 Niagara

To Whom It May Concern

I am not able to attend the Public meeting September 6. However, I would like to express my strong disapproval of taking this small pie shaped lot for Four housing units.

I remember having a conversation with Chris Coleman several years ago about this very lot. At that time a developer wanted to buy the lane to allow for enough building to ensure a large profit. Counsellor Coleman helped stop that.

There is no provision for parking in this proposal.

Clearly, this request is about profit for the developer, not housing. Using the property for a house and suite, as is being built on a larger lot on the corner of Niagara and Government would be more appropriate. James Bay is a very beautiful and unique neighbourhood and we need to insure that it continues to be.

Sincerely,

Joan Tuttle

120 St. Andrews St.

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Martin

From: Ray Hoff [REDACTED]
Sent: September 5, 2018 1:25 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: September 6, 2018 Hearing Property "A"

Sirs and Madams:

We would like to object to the rezoning of the property adjoining Thetis Lane and Niagara Street into a separate zoning area. This is bad urban planning and will change the character of the R3-2 zoning area from which it is being cut.

Changing the existing house on that property to be multifamily is one thing and is consistent with other properties in James Bay but giving a piece of property its own zoning area is, frankly, blockbusting and will quickly be used by others in that R3-2 area to change the character of the neighbourhood.

We live at 188 Douglas and look down on Thetis Lane. The C1 zone across the street from us (Beacon Hill Drive In) has a long history and makes sense with the proximity to the park. Moving multistory dwellings onto lots where they need variances from the zoning regulations in R3-2 is bad public policy and will obviously force people in that building to encroach on their neighbours and take up additional street parking.

We oppose the change.

Raymond and Bonnie Hoff
520 - 188 Douglas Street
Victoria, BC V8V 2P1
Cell: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]