

By email to: Michael Angrove,
Planner
City of Victoria
mangrove@victoria.ca

18 May, 2019

Dear Michael Angrove:

Re: Community Meeting for 2740/2742 Fifth Street Rezoning

Community Meeting Details

Date: 04 April 2019

Location of meeting: Quadra Village Community Centre, 901 Kings Avenue

Meeting facilitators: Hillside Quadra Neighbourhood Action Committee (NAC): 2 members

Owners/ Agents: 2

Attendance: 5: 5 in 100m notification distance and received letters

Meeting Chair: Jon Munn, NAC, CALUC Chair

Note taker: Gillian Hillidge, NAC

Context

The surrounding properties have a mix of residential uses. The R-2 zone is common on both sides of Fifth Street north of the commercial properties at Hillside Avenue to Topaz Avenue. The immediate adjacent zones to the subject property are R-2 to the north and east on Fifth Street, the unique R2-38 zone to the south on Fifth Street and the R3-2 Multiple Dwelling District zone to the east on Quadra Street.

The property zoned R3-2 on Quadra Street contains a multi-storey apartment building, although the zone does permit a variety of residential and institutional uses.

The R2-38 zone was developed specifically for 2736-2738 Fifth Street. This property provides an excellent transition in density and character from the more active and intensive commercial and multi-unit residential uses to the south and west. Although the development accommodates several dwellings, the character combines arts and crafts/ early 20th century residential elements and the street face of a single dwelling with matching dwellings and parking behind.

Proposed Development Details

Owners/ Proponents: Aneesa Blake and Reed Cassidy

Proposal: Rezone from R-2 Two Family Dwelling District to R2-38 Fifth Duplex District

The proponent presented the proposal. Currently, the subject property is the site of a duplex where the design was largely based on high efficiency energy performance and a modern aesthetic. The proposal emphasizes the addition of a new dwelling at the rear of the property which increases the density requiring a new zone. The new building will match the new existing duplex with a low pitch roof, a rectangular profile, vertical natural wooden siding with black accents below the roof overhang and for all window and door openings.

Strata ownership is proposed for the three dwellings. The proponents will own the three units. They currently live in one unit and rent one, and they plan to rent the third unit at market rates. A rental covenant, based on City policy will be in place. The number of years was unclear.

The existing paved driveway will be used and there will be paved parking for three vehicles. A new fence is proposed to lessen sound block car lights. Parking is also proposed in front of the duplex on permeable surface which allows grass to grow through it.

The proponent gave a lot of detail regarding the energy performance calculations for the building and how this limits the size and number of windows and doors. The high efficiency included water heat recapture. As with the existing duplex the house will have features to make it Net Zero ready, which means solar cells can be added to generate electricity which could be fed back into the electric grid. These features could make the dwellings consume an average of zero electricity over a year.

In addition to the new zone, the proponents are requesting a smaller rear yard setback from the required 3m to 1.2m. A small height variance is also requested. A shadow study was presented to show little to minimum effect on the adjacent properties to the north.

Although a development permit and the related guidelines normally are required for more intensive residential development, details of conformity were only discussed briefly. The Proponent noted that they meet the intent of Official Community Plan (OCP) policies.

Discussion

A number of issues were discussed. It was noted that the adjacent owner and/or resident neighbours to the north would be most affected by the proposal. These residents from 2750-2754 Fifth asked several questions about the how the third dwelling would affect them.

Proposed 2740, 2742, 2744 Fifth (metric)		
Existing Zone		B-2
Proposed Zone		B2-3B
Lot Area		752.50
Lot Frontage on Street		18.29
Site Coverage		30.06%
FSR		0.56
Open Site Space		53.64%
Site Coverage		226.20
Floor Area		418.77
Total Floor Area	2744 Fifth	137.06
	Proposed Main	66.41
	Proposed Upper	71.45
	Proposed Basement	N/A
Total Floor Area	2742 Fifth	142.32
	Existing Main	68.33
	Existing Upper	73.99
	Existing Basement	N/A
Total Floor Area	2740 Fifth	138.59
	Existing Main	66.60
	Existing Upper	71.99
	Existing Basement	N/A
Floor Area all Floors		418.77
Commercial Floor Area		N/A
Residential Floor Area		418.77
Number of Dwelling Units		3
Parking Stalls		3
Number of Storeys		2
Height	2744 Fifth	6.75
	Average Grade	14.64
	Proposed Peak Height	21.72
	Proposed Curve Height	21.06
Height	2742/2740 Fifth	7.01
	Average Grade	15.52
	Peak Height	22.64
	Curve Height	22.41
Front yard		7.35
Rear yard		1.20
North Side Yard		3.53
South Side Yard		3.14
Combined Side Yard		6.67

Use and Density

Most of the questions centred on how the new dwelling would affect neighbours, the effect of increased density. There was some mention of the previous house which was demolished, as there were many nuisance issues before that are a relief to be rid of.

Neighbours expressed concerns about increased activity, such as more cars along the property line where there is a narrow setback to the older house with a lower level suite. The shadow study did help satisfy some concerns about a new building blocking the sunshine now enjoyed by neighbours. Adjacent lower level apartment dwellers might be affected the most, but none were represented at the meeting.

Privacy issues were also raised. Few windows proposed overlook adjacent properties. One comment from the adjacent apartment dweller was made regarding seeing into the proposed dwelling from above. The proponent said they could install opaque glass in some windows.

Transportation/ Parking

The most problematic issue was how the proposal addressed on-site parking. Only three spaces for three dwellings accommodated at the rear was seen as inadequate. There was some discussion of a parking space proposed in front of the duplex. Some concern was raised regarding how front yard parking would affect the neighbourhood character if it became common. The fact that the proposed front parking would be behind a fence, was limited to one space and could blend with the landscape if grass grew through the space was considered a design benefit. It was noted that the City requires front building parking to have planted trellis or hedges.

Affordability

A minor mention was made regarding affordability. The proponent said this is a small market-oriented proposal.

Design – Building Form and Character

Neighbours present though the energy objectives of the owners were laudable. The issue of the modern design and how it fit with the neighbourhood was not a big concern, but reference was made to how the property at 2736-38 Fifth fit very well with the neighbourhood character.

Not much reference was made to applicable guidelines and how the proposal would be reviewed under Development Permit Area No. 16, i.e. (a) Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (1981), (b) Design Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial Development (2012), and (c) Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010), stated in the Official Community Plan.

There was some discussion of the new fence and how it could help address issues of the northern neighbour. It would block car lights, but also sun light.

Conclusion

The proposal made some nearby residents uncomfortable with the space the infill dwelling would take and increased activity from more people and cars. The OCP indicates that Development Permit Area 16 uses guidelines to *support a sensitive transition to traditional neighbourhood development*, and more discussion of how these guidelines apply to this site would have been useful to determine if a better fit could be achieved.

There was not an overwhelming level of support and no firm objections. Attendees liked many of the ideas proposed, but those living closest thought the proponent was asking for too much.

Jon Munn
CALUC Co-Chair
Hillside Quadra Neighbourhood Action Committee

cc. Hillside Quadra NAC, Reed Cassidy