

Report of Meeting of Fairfield Gonzales

Community Association Land use Committee

Re: variance application for 331 & 337 St. Charles Street – DVP No. 00204

Meeting date: June 7, 2018 at Fairfield Gonzales Place, at 630PM

About 15-20 people in addition to the Committee were present

Meeting Chair: David Biltek

This report is not meant to be a verbatim recording of the meeting, but rather a summary of the discussions that reflects what the community said at the meeting

As was stressed at the meeting the FGCA CALUC does not approve or deny any applications for re zoning or variance applications.

Community sentiment:

1. The neighbourhood values ample front and back yards, and the proximity, particularly here where the subject property is adjacent to Hollywood Park
2. Parking. By adding two dwelling units there will undoubtedly be increased street parking. The neighbourhood already struggles at many times of the year, especially during baseball season with increased parking on neighbourhood streets; along with a small day care in a house on Earle can cause parking and traffic issues.
3. Sewer problems. The neighbourhood reports that every Monday there is a City truck at the corner of Earle and St Charles that pumps out sewer lines. The City has not made clear if there would be any impact on this situation by adding two more dwelling units.
4. The immediate neighbour to the East was concerned about the proximity of the new house to be built on lot B. the neighbouring house to the east of the proposed new house has 13 windows on the west side and the

occupant, Mr. Insha Khan is concerned there will be significant loss of light and privacy

5. There did not appear to be any valid reason for the variances, which were out of character with the existing lots and side yards

Developer comments

1. His intention is to have three dwelling units where there are now two. The existing two houses are perfectly functional, and he see no reason to bring those down and replace them. He said he could do that: tear down the two houses and subdivide the land and build three houses in their place, but it seems a waste to do so.
2. The new lot is planned to have a long driveway and would have sufficient room for two cars to park on the driveway.
3. The house was designed to limit intrusion into the neighbour's house to the east. The windows on the east side of the new house are few and high and should not decrease privacy for the east side neighbour.
4. The developer pointed out that the variances were largely a result of the City's request for additional road allowance along St Charles, a request of two plus meters. This then triggered a further conflict with determining which was the to be the FRONT, BACK and SIDES. Under City size/shape rules, the new "front " of the existing lot at the corner of St Charles and Earle would be what is now a side yard, and as a result the south side yard would become the new BACK yard.

Possible solutions:

The meeting was asked what if anything might be done to resolve some of the concerns

The developer suggested they might be able to adjust the shape of the house, making it longer and narrower, which would increase the side yard with the neighbour to the east. He will consider that possibility

He also said they could conduct a shadow study to show what impact there might be on the adjacent houses.

The developer will also share addresses of some other projects he has completed so the neighbours can view the sort of work he has done.

There was support for the peaked roof of the house, which is in keeping with existing character.

The City should explain:

- 1. Why the need the additional road allowance, and**
- 2. What if any will be the in impact on sewer lines of the new house**

There was considerable concern about the lack of notice for this variance.

The developer said he wished he had spoken to the neighbours prior to developing plans.

There was also a question as to why neighbours were not advised of this application, and it was suggested that perhaps the City should require this in the future.

It was also suggested that the neighbourhood association could send notices. It was pointed out that the FGCA does not have the resources to deliver notices to specific locations but would consider putting variance applications into their e-newsletters. This would be received by some people, given the circulation of approximately 1400, but would not entirely solve the lack of notice. The CALUC will consider doing this

The meeting adjourned at 8PM with a thank you from Mr. Khan