From: John Hall Sent: July 2, 2019 3:06:27 PM

To: Michael Angrove; nag@quadravillagecc.com

Cc: JM; Kathryn Gillis; Laurence Coogan

Subject: RE: 2920 Prior Street CALUC Letter

Dear Michael Angrove:

Re: Community Meeting for 2920 Prior Street

Community Meeting Details

Date: 30 May 2019

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

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

Attendance: 33, primarily nearby neighbours

Meeting Chair: John Hall Note taker: Gillian Hillidge

Proposed Development Details

Peter Johannsknecht – Architect/Cascadia Architects
Rich Humpheries – owner and developer
Handout – Small Lot House (City of Victoria document) and the proponent's architectural drawings

Table showing Existing R1-B zone, Proposed Small Lot Zone and Remainder Lot

| | R1-B zone | Existing Lot | Small Lot (R1-S2 | Rem L-shaped |
|-------------|-----------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
| | | | Zone) | Lot |
| Lot - Sq Ft | (min) | 9450 | 3552 | |
| House | | 750 | 1770 | |
| Garage | | | 677 | |
| Parking | | Rear yard | Front yard | Front yard |

Rick, with assistance from Peter, gave local context of the current 9450 sq ft lot, current structures, relative site topographical changes, several architectural views of the proposed house, studies of exterior shading a view impacts on the northerly property. Rick indicated that he had discussed previous drafts of his plans with the adjacent neighbours.

The new house has a pitch style roof, with three small North side windows (bathroom & staircase windows) to minimize privacy impacts to the North. The new house would have one parking spot between the house and Prior Street. Current boulevard fir tree is to be retained as per an Arborist report.

Dis**c**uss**io**n

The Following issues were raised by neighbours.

Increase i**n** density

Several neighbours were opposed to the increase in population, expressed as potentially going from 2 current bedrooms to 8, and as one legal accommodation to 3. Sense that impacts of use, noise and parking would increase.

Lot shape and zoning

The existing smaller lots in the neighbourhood appear to be cut in approximately two equal long-narrow lots with the required street frontage. This is the more consistent form of small lots in the neighborhood.

Concern was raised over the L-shape of the proposed lot that would retain the existing house and garage. This lot allows the existing garage used as a dwelling to remain on a single lot.

Building design and view/shading impacts

The shading study demonstrated increased shading of the adjacent house and its deck to the north. The effect of decreasing light inside the neighbouring house was expected to be significant. The loss of view from the Northern deck was moderate, however the interior view would be substantially impacted. Views from inside or the Northern neighbour will become the wall of the proposed house. Those neighbours expressed significant concerns about impacts in their quality of life.

In terms of overall design changes that could mitigate viewscape and shading impacts, less impactful roof shape (lower) and having the house shifted closer to the curb and farther south was discussed so as to reduce shade and view impacts on the northerly lot. As well consideration for reducing the overall height lower, such as sinking the basement deeper or doing without the basement accommodation level (bedroom and bathroom).

Garage as Garden Suite

Rick would like to retain the garage and have it legally recognized as a garden suite. While the proposed lot size and garage size are at odds with the garden suite policy, there was a reference to exceptions for existing structures. A comment was made in favour of two accommodations (houses) in total, one on each small lot, rather than a third accommodation garden suite. It appeared that no parking was planned for the proposed garden suite legalization.

Parking

In general parking was a concern based on the increased in density of residents (please see that section above). There was some confusion as to the reason to place the parking in front of the proposed new house. Rick pointed out a recent change by the City of Victoria.

Lands**capi**ng

While landscaping discussions focused mostly on the retention of the boulevard fir tree, which was apparently recently trimmed rather badly, consideration for both northern and southern neighbors were expressed. The northern neighbor was concerned about privacy, view and shading impacts of vegetation proposed along the north lot line. The southern neighbors noted that the plans included trees along the southern border of the panhandle when they had explicitly requested that no planting occur there.

Covenants

There had been discussion about various covenants with the northern and southern neighbors. In general the purpose was to retain green space and prevent and further deterioration of view and increased shading by limiting what future development might be possible. Neighbors had not seen any draft covenant language so we unable to comment fully on proposals, though in general rick described two covenants: a) protecting the Northern neighbor's view (and to limit shading) by restricting what could be done behind (West) of the proposed new house via a covenant in favour of that neighbor, and b) a covenant restricting development on the pan handled lot to retain green space and views in favour of all of the North, new lot and South lots. There was concern that the covenant on the panhandle lot did not fully address any possible future changes in the area and height of the garage and the location and size of any future replacement house.

Overall Sentiment

There was a general concern about densification in general and the impacts on the neighborhood and opposition to the proposal. Overall the sense was that going from one to three legal accommodations was out of step with the neighborhood, that a simple division of the lot was more in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. The view and shading impacts were of key concern to the southern and northern neighbors. Draft covenant language had not been shared so comments were general at this stage.

John Hall CALUC Chair Hillside Quadra Neighbouthood Action Committee.

Cc: Hillside Quadra NAC, rick Humpheries