

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Annette Hansen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** December 7, 2018 3:14 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Development Variance Permit Application No. 00209

To the Mayor and Council, City of Victoria,

With respect to Development Variation Permit Application No. 00209, I wish the following considerations to be noted:

1. The Technical Memo prepared by Bunt and Co. (Parking Review Summary) does not specify whether the property owner charges a monthly fee for parking on the premises. If they do, I would suggest the demand for parking is higher than indicated. This building does not cater to wealthy residents and \$25/mth+ is a barrier to parking lot use. This is the situation in my building which is adjacent to 1300 Yates. However, if the building does not charge for parking stalls and has experienced declining need for resident parking, then Hooray! Maybe the residents can pull up the unneeded blacktop and put in garden plots.
2. My main objection is to the proposed elimination of guest parking. It will result in additional pressure on street parking. Bunt and Co.'s assessment made it sound like the city offers 1300 Yates seven free spots. But after 6pm every day, visitors to my building - which has zero guest parking - routinely search 10 minutes for a spot, and often find it 3 to 5 blocks away. This is NOT a rare occurrence. It is the norm. I've had friends suggest that I visit them because it's too frustrating to find street parking around my place. If my guests never find a spot in front of 1300 Yates, I don't see how guests of 1300 Yates will find spots.
3. As a full time commuter cyclist, I can attest that the addition of four cycle stalls is likely inadequate for residents although perhaps useful for guests. Please bear in mind that most buildings - with good reason - do not allow bicycles inside units or on balconies. Unless the building possesses a large (30+ stall) indoor bike lock up, four additional cycle stalls is hilarious. Residents won't use them overnight - not if they want to find their bike in the morning.

The proposal to add one more unit atop the building has little impact on me and I wouldn't consider it my business to object although as a minor point in passing the rooftop amenity referred to is likely the building's common room. My building has one (and an exercise room) and it's awesome - definitely a feature that attracts and keeps better tenants. The addition of one rental unit to Victoria's dire rental market may be marginally beneficial to the larger community, but it is probably not beneficial to the community within 1300 Yates. Common space is where community happens. The original 1966 owners understood that. Once converted for revenue, it will never be reclaimed for its original purpose.

The proposal to eliminate off-street guest parking does impact me, and greatly so. Until the time when more residents are enlightened and/or fortunate enough to be able to use alternate transportation, this request for a variance permit is bad for my neighbourhood.

Yours truly,  
Annette Hansen  
207 - 1340 Harrison Street.  
Please do not release my email address/phone number to the public.