# CITY OF <br> VICTORIA 

## Committee of the Whole Report

For the Meeting of July 27, 2017

$$
\text { To: Committee of the Whole Date: July 20, } 2017
$$

From: Jonathan Tinney, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development

Subject: Development Variance Permit No. 00194 for 121 Menzies Street

## RECOMMENDATION

That Council, after giving notice and allowing an opportunity for public comment at a meeting of Council and after the Public Hearing for Rezoning Application No. 00508, if it is approved, consider the following motion:
"That Council authorize the issuance of Development Variance Permit Application No. 00194 for 121 Menzies Street in accordance with:

1. Plans date stamped May 25, 2017.
2. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
a) decrease the dwelling unit floor area (minimum) from $33.00 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to $28.98 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
b) decrease the number of parking stalls from eight to one
c) locate the parking in the front yard
d) locate accessory buildings in the side yard
e) increase total site coverage from $40 \%$ to $42.30 \%$
f) increase the height of one accessory building from 3.50 m to 4.41 m
g) decrease the rear setback of an accessory building from 0.60 m to 0.50 m
h) decrease the side setback of accessory buildings from 0.60 m to 0.40 m
i) decrease the separation space between an accessory building and a principle building from 2.40 m to 1.0 m
j) increase the rear yard site coverage for an accessory building from $25.00 \%$ to 29.80\%
3. The Development Permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution."

## LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In accordance with Section 498 of the Local Government Act, Council may issue a Development Variance Permit that varies a Zoning Regulation Bylaw provided the permit does not vary the use or density of land from that specified in the Zoning Regulation Bylaw.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present Council with information, analysis and recommendations for a Development Permit Application for the property located at 121 Menzies Street. The proposal is to rezone from the R1-B Zone, Single Family Dwelling District, to a site specific zone in order to permit a 10 dwelling unit House Conversion at this location. There is a concurrent Rezoning Application, as well as a Heritage Designation Application, that are presented in separate reports.

The variances are related to decreasing the unit size required in a conversion, reducing the parking requirements and reducing requirements related to siting and height of accessory buildings. The variances are supportable because they are the result of existing conditions and do not appear to substantially impact the adjacent properties.

## BACKGROUND

## Description of Proposal

This proposal is to rezone from the R1-B Zone, Single Family Dwelling District, to site specific zone to allow a House Conversion with 10 dwelling units. The proposed variances are related to:

- decreasing the dwelling unit floor area
- decreasing the number of parking stalls
- changing the parking location
- increasing total site coverage
- increasing the floor area of an accessory building
- increasing the height of an accessory building
- decreasing the setbacks of an accessory building
- altering the permitted location of an accessory
- decreasing the separation space required between a principle building and an accessory building
- increasing the rear yard site coverage associated with an accessory building.


## Sustainability Features

As indicated in the applicant's letter dated April 21, 2017, the following sustainability features are associated with this application:

- rainwater collection
- recycling and composting
- vegetable gardens
- high efficiency appliances with low water flow.


## Active Transportation Impacts

The application proposes bike racks which support active transportation.

## Public Realm Improvements

No public realm improvements are proposed in association with this Development Permit Application; however, the applicant is willing to provide a 1.78 m Statutory Right-of-Way along Menzies Street.

## Accessibility Impact Statement

The British Columbia Building Code regulates accessibility as it pertains to buildings.

## Tree Preservation Bylaw and Urban Forest Master Plan

There are no Tree Preservation Bylaw impacts with this application.

## Existing Site Development and Development Potential

The site is presently illegally developed as 11 dwelling units (with individual bathrooms), two housekeeping units (with a shared bathroom), and one garden suite. The site was approved for seven housekeeping units, but was subsequently modified without securing the necessary City permits.

Under the current R-2 Zone, the regulations in the R1-B Zone, Single Family Dwelling District, would apply due to the size of the lot. The property could be developed as a single-family dwelling with a secondary suite or garden suite.

## Relevant History

The existing building is approved for seven housekeeping units. At some point in the past, the building was renovated to accommodate 11 self-contained dwelling units (each with a separate bathroom), two housekeeping units, and the accessory building was converted into a dwelling unit totalling 14 dwelling units on the site.

## Community Consultation

Consistent with the Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) Procedures for Processing Rezoning and Variances Applications, the applicant has consulted the James Bay CALUC at a Community Meeting held on October 12, 2016. A letter dated October 21, 2016 is attached to this report.

This application proposes variances; therefore, in accordance with the City's Land Use Procedures Bylaw, it requires notice, sign posting and a meeting of Council to consider the variances.

## ANALYSIS

## Regulatory Considerations

The following table shows the variances that would be required to facilitate this development in conjunction with the concurrent Rezoning Application. This approach, rather than building these unique attributes into a new zoning bylaw, is recommended so these less stringent requirements are not entrenched in the zoning bylaw, running with the land even if the existing building is lost at some future date. Similarly, legal non-conforming conditions, such as height and setbacks will remain as legal non-conforming conditions so that again, if the building was ever destroyed, future development would need to conform to the zoning regulation bylaws of the day.

| Zoning Criteria | Proposal | Zone Standard |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Principle Building - Conversion |  |  |
| Dwelling Unit Floor Area (m²) - minimum | 28.98 | 33.00 |
| Parking - minimum | 1 | 8 |
| Parking - location | Front Yard | Behind Front Yard |
| Site Coverage (total) (\%) - maximum | 42.30 | 40 |
| Accessory Buildings- Schedule F |  |  |
| Location | Side and Rear Yard | Rear yard |
| Height (m) - maximum | 4.41 | 3.50 |
| Setbacks (m) - minimum: | 0.50 | 0.60 |
| Rear |  |  |
| Side |  |  |
| Separation space from principal building | 0.40 | 0.60 |
| Rear yard site coverage (\%) - maximum | 29.80 | 25.00 |

The height, number of storeys, setback and site coverage variances are supportable because they are existing and do not seem to have a substantial impact on the adjacent properties. The applicant has supplied a Parking Study (attached) to justify the parking variance and is providing 10 bicycle parking spaces to help with the shortfall.

## CONCLUSIONS

This Development Variance Permit Application to permit a 10 dwelling unit house conversion would not substantially impact adjacent properties. The parking variance is supported by a Parking Study and mitigated by 10 bicycle parking stalls. Staff recommend that Council consider supporting this application.

## ALTERNATE MOTION

That Council decline Development Variance Permit Application No. 00194 for the property located at 121 Menzies Street.

Respectfully submitted,


Rob Bateman
Senior Process Planner Development Services Division


Report accepted and recommended by the City Manager:


Date:


## List of Attachments:

- Attachment A: Subject Map
- Attachment B: Aerial Map
- Attachment C: Plans date stamped May 25, 2017
- Attachment D: Letter from applicant to Mayor and Council dated April 21, 2017
- Attachment E: Community Association Land Use Committee Comments dated October 21, 2016
- Attachment F: Parking Review dated January 22, 2016.
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## Window Schedule

| 20-60\% - 1 | 40-400-8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 26.500-2 | 40.500. 9 |
| 26.56\% 3 | 60.30 -10 |
| 30.36\% - 4 | 60.400 - 11 |
| 36-36\% 5 | $60.500 \cdot 12$ |
| $36.56 \div$ - 6 | 20-400-13 |
| 40.360-7 | 26.300 -14 |

Door Schedule (Rating)
$24^{\prime \prime}$ sta. $\widehat{1}$ 24"Fire 10 Hour- (1)
28"std- 2 28"Fire 1.0 Hour- (2)
30" stat- 3 30" Fire 1.0 Hour- (3)
32" std-4 32 " Fre 1.0 Hour- 4
$34^{\prime \prime}$ stal - 5 34" Fire 1.0 Hour - 5
$36^{\prime \prime}$ sta - $36^{\prime \prime}$ Fire 1.0 Hour - 6

## General Construction Notes

1) Building contractor is to Verify all dimensions on site before proceeding
) Measurements on site take precedence over scaling off drawings
) All concrete is to be a minimum $20 \mathrm{mpa}(3000 \mathrm{psi}) @ 28$ days
2) All lintels in load bearing walls to be a minimum $2 @ 2 \times 10$ SPF unless otherwise
noted.
3) All plates on concrete to be rot treated $\&$ or be separation isolated upon installation.
4) Flush framed members shall be anchored using joist hangers.
5) Flash all unprotected openings and changes in materials on exterior walls.
) All grades shown are approximate only.
6) All construction to comply with Local, BC and National Building codes as applicable.
7) All materials specified are subject to local availability
8) Roof Trusses and Manufactured floor members shall be designed by authorized engineer, who shall ensure that lintels, beams and posts over load bearing points are designed to withstand appropriate loads imposed upon them.
9) Design snow loads $=35 \mathrm{psf}$ (not to be exceeded)
10) All structural framing lumber shall be 汼 $1 \& 2$ SPF or better unless noted
therwise.
11) Do not use Fingerjoint (FJ) studs under beams, lintels or girders.
12) Lot Survey has been completed and construction is to be contained and maintained within dimensions of observed building envelope.

| Suite Data Information Table |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floor / Suite \# | \% 2 | m2 | Configuration |
| Bsmint 48 | 237.08 | 22.03 | Bachelor w/ Bath |
| Bsmnt \#9 | 548.70 | 50.98 | 1 Bedroom w/ 2 bath Full Kjchen \& Dining "Caretaker" |
| Bsmnt\#\#11 | 159.15 | 14.79 | Bachelor w/ Bath \& Kitchenette |
| Main FFr \#1 | 256.67 | 23.85 | Bachelor w/ Bath \& Kitchen w/ Stg Loft |
| Main Flr\#3 | 348.49 | 32.38 | 1 Bedroom w/ Bath and Kitchen |
| Main Fir \#10 | 544.34 | 50.57 | 2 Bedroom w/ Bath and Kitchen w/ Stg Loft |
| 2nd Floor \#4 | 377.87 | 35.10 | 1 Bedroom w/ Bath and Kitchen w/ Stg Loft - 2 Levels |
| 2nd Floor \#5 | 409.24 | 38.02 | 1 Bedroom w/ Bath and Kitchen w/ Stg Loft |
| 2nd Floor \$6 | 261.29 | 24.27 | Bachelor w/ Bath and Kitchen w/ Stg Loft |
| 2nd Floor \#7 | 775.99 | 72.09 | 1 Bedroom w/ 2 bath and Kitchen w/Stg Loft - 2 Levels |
| Bsmnt Office | 254.88 | 23.68 | Caretaker/ Owner Office space |
| Totals | 4598.29 | 427.21 | Mixed Usage Units |
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| Project Information Data Table |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Zone Existing | R-2 (DP16) |
| Proposed Zone | New Zone - Site Specific |
| Site Area | ${ }^{*} 5028.80 \mathrm{sf}(467.19 \mathrm{~m} 2)$ |
| Total Floor Area | ${ }^{*} 5625.95 \mathrm{sf}(522.67 \mathrm{~m} 2)$ |
| Commercial Floor Area | NA |
| Floor Space Ratio | ${ }^{*} 1.12$ |
| Site Coverage \% | 42.3 |
| Open Site Space \% | ${ }^{*} 44$ |
| Height of Building | $39 '-11 \frac{3 \pi}{4}(12.19 \mathrm{~m})$ |
| Number of Storeys | 4 |
| Parking Stalls on Site \# | 1 |
| Bicycle Parking | ${ }^{2} 10$ |


| Building Setbacks |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Front Yard | $24^{\prime}-33^{\frac{I^{\prime \prime}}{}}(7.40 \mathrm{~m})$ |
| Rear Yard | $12^{\prime}-99^{\prime \prime}(3.90 \mathrm{~m})$ |
| Side Yard (North) | $11^{\prime}-98^{\prime \prime \prime}(3.59 \mathrm{~m})$ |
| Side Yard (South) | $9^{\prime}-2 \frac{2}{\prime \prime}^{\prime \prime}(2.80 \mathrm{~m})$ |
| Combined Side Yards | $20^{\prime}-11 \frac{5}{8}^{\prime \prime}(6.39 \mathrm{~m})$ |


| Residential Units Details |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total Number of Units | ${ }^{*} 10$ Mixed Usage |
| Unit Type | $* 1$ Bdrm / 2 Bdrm / Bachelor |
| Ground Orientated Units | 3 |
| Min Unit Floor Area | *159.15 sf (4.79 m2) |
| Residential Floor Area | Refer to Suite Data Table - DWG C2 |


A) Proposed Bike Parking - STG Area
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Second Floor $=4$ Suites (w/ baths)
Attic Floor = Upper level of existing 2 suites from Second floor (4 \& 7)
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City of Victoria
April 21, 2017
Sustainable and Community Development
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

## RE: Rezoning application for 121 Menzies Street: Lot 27, Section 11, Beckley Farm, Victoria City, Plan 753

The proposal is to rezone the above noted residential property from the current R-2 (two family dwelling district) zone to one that would permit and accommodate 10 self-contained suites with a Floor Space Ratio of 1.19.

In 1992, the owner of the property was issued a Building Permit to renovate the property so as to accommodate 7 light housing keeping units with shared bathrooms. At the time the Building Permit was issued the R-2 zoning still applied to the property.

Subsequent to the issuance of the Building Permit, which was followed by an Occupancy Permit in 1993, the owner did further renovations that increased the number of suites to 14 from 7. Eight of the suites are bachelor suites with baths; 3 are one-bedroom suites with baths (one of which is designated as a caretaker suite); 2 are light housekeeping suites with shared bath; and one is a one-bedroom Garden Suite created though the conversion of an existing exterior garage, for a total of 14 suites. All of the suites, with the exception of the caretaker suite, are rented.

The current development provides much needed all-inclusive affordable rental housing with utilities and internet provided. The unfortunate aspect of this development was that it was undertaken in contravention of the City's Zoning Bylaw (the property is still zoned as R-2 two family dwelling district) and fifty percent of the work was done without permits, inspections and approvals. To try and resolve the situation the applicant retained a team of professionals to fully determine how much of the work complies with the BC Building Code.

John Ivison and Associates Limited was retained as part of the consulting team to assess all aspects of past construction and liaise with City staff. The consultant has subsequently determined that the work done is largely in conformance with the Code with only minor remedial work required. Consequently, fire and life safety/protection is not an issue.

The revised proposal is to reduce the number of suites within the principal building from 13 to 10. All the suites will be all inclusive and self-contained with their own bathrooms. The current Garden Suite will be decommissioned by removing the kitchen and bathroom fixtures. The building will then be converted to an accessory use, likely storage space.

One of the suites will be designated as a caretaker suite while a former suite will be converted to an office for use by the caretaker/owner. The caretaker suite and accompanying office will provide on-site supervision of the tenants and their activities, helping to mitigate any concerns neighbors may have regarding noise and unwanted behavior.

The building, built in 1907, fits in well with existing development on this block of Menzies, particularly its neighbors on the east side of the street which are of a similar age and architecture. The grounds are well landscaped with raised garden beds. The lack of large trees and hedges in the front yard provides unobstructed views of the building and its heritage facade.

The proposed Floor Space Ratio of 1.19 is only slightly higher than that of the two and three storey multi-dwelling buildings across the street in the R3-2 zone, which permits a maximum FSR of 1.0. Although the main subject building was raised as part of the Building Permit issued in 1992, the building's original footprint has not changed.

The existing and proposed development conforms to most of the goals, objectives, policies and guidelines contained in the City's current land use legislation including the Official Community Plan (2008) and the James Bay Neighborhood Plan (1993).

The proposed rezoning adheres to the vision outlined in the City's Official Community Plan for the community of James Bay, specifically the creation of a densely populated mixed-use neighborhood with a Large Urban Village (21.15.1). Compliance with strategic directions include: maintaining a variety of housing types and tenures for a range of age groups and incomes (21.16.1); maintaining an interesting diversity of land uses, housing types and character areas (21.16.3); and enabling the adaptation and renewal of the existing housing stock (21.16.4).

The property is designated Traditional Residential in the OCP and the proposal complies with many of the designation's guidelines. These include house conversions and ground oriented buildings as allowable uses, houses oriented to face the street with variable front and rear yards, on street parking and individual driveways, and density up to an FSR of approximately 1:1. As a house conversion in Development Permit Area 16 (General Form and Character) of the OCP, the proposal is exempt from the requirement of a Development Permit.

The subject property is in close proximity to James Bay Village where development is guided by the Large Urban Village Development Permit Area (DPA 5). James Bay Village is a mixed-use area made up of buildings of a variety of ages, types and forms accommodating commercial and community services, medium to high density housing, and a park. The existing and proposed development of the subject property is a natural complement to the Village.

The proposal adheres to the vision laid out in the James Bay Neighborhood Plan, which includes the preservation of existing community amenities that are of "special historical or community
importance, including existing housing stock and streetscapes", and the provision of "appropriate and affordable housing that meets the needs of a rich diversity of residents". The proposal also conforms to the goals and objectives listed under the Housing section of the Plan, including: providing a range of housing opportunities; supporting initiatives that house the elderly, disadvantaged and needy; and retention of significant buildings in the neighborhood.

The proposal offers social benefits to the James Bay community and the City by providing affordable housing in a city with an affordable housing shortage. The proposal fits in well with the intentions of the City's recently approved new Housing Strategy including: the reduction of parking requirements; the removal of minimum dwelling unit size regulations in multi-dwelling residential zones; and zoning that encourages a variety of housing forms including house conversion opportunities. The owner has agreed to keep the suites as rental accommodation in perpetuity should the rezoning be approved.

The property contributes to the neighborhood's unique character, sense of place and human scale, and is recognized by the City as having significant heritage value. The City's Heritage Planners held a meeting with James Bay residents in May of last year to go over a list of James Bay properties they'd like to have designated for their heritage value, which includes the subject property. The property's owner attended the meeting as well as a meeting at City Hall with the Heritage Planners. As a result of these meetings the owner has agreed to have the property designated as a heritage property if the rezoning is approved.

The property, with a number of suites and windows facing the street and no large trees blocking views to the street, provides excellent "eyes on the street" in keeping with CPTED policy. Previous incidents of members of the public using the building's front porch for illegal activities have been resolved with the enclosure of the porch. The provision of a live-in caretaker/building supervisor will provide additional security

With only one parking space on the property there is technically a deficiency of 7 parking spaces based on the proposed 10 dwelling units. In January of last year, the owner retained the services of a transportation consultant to conduct a parking review of the property. The study, done with the current 14 suites, concluded that the few vehicles associated with the building are comfortably accommodated with the existing on street parking and one on-site parking space. There's been only one complaint from neighbours regarding parking, and that was 20 years ago. Turnover of suites has been extremely low and prospective tenants are made aware of the lack of on-site parking.

The property is conducive to a car free lifestyle. The property's location, next to James Bay Village, has a walk score of 84 meaning it is in a very walkable location close to commercial, community and government services as well as amenities such as parks. There is good access to transit with the \#3 Beacon Hill/Gonzales route on Menzies Street, in front of the subject property, providing quick access to downtown. The area, with its flat terrain, is good for cycling. The proposal includes storage for 10 bicycles in a secure location accessible to tenants. Cycling and pedestrian infrastructure improvements are planned for Menzies Street and will require a widening of the road right of way. These improvements, and the widened road right of way, have been considered and can be accommodated.

The building has a number of sustainability features. Rainwater from the eaves is collected via drain pipes into a series of rain barrels around the building, keeping rainwater from entering the storm sewers and providing water to the property's landscaping. Recycling and composting is provided for with a well-designed collection system. The collected compost is used to fertilize the property's raised garden beds. Vegetables grown in the gardens are for the use of tenants and neighbours. The suites include high efficiency appliances with low water flow, features which will be retained should the rezoning be approved.

In summary:

- The current development of the property, with 14 dwelling units, has been in place for over 20 years;
- A consultant has determined that the work undertaken, while in contravention of City bylaws, is largely in compliance with the BC Building Code and is safe for occupancy;
- The number of suites will be reduced from 14 to 10 , including the decommissioning of the Garden Suite and converting it to an accessory use, likely storage space, to bring the proposal more in line with existing municipal policies;
- A caretaker's suite and adjacent office will provide ongoing security as well as maintenance of the building;
- The proposal contributes and conforms to most of the goals, objectives and policies contained in the OCP and James Bay Neighbourhood Plan as well as the City's new Housing Strategy;
- The property is in a very walkable location with good cycling and transit access, and parking has not been a problem;
- The current development contains a number of sustainability features that will be retained;
- The rezoning will ensure the preservation of a valuable heritage asset and streetscape by having the property heritage designated if the rezoning is successful;
- The property will continue to provide much needed affordable all-inclusive housing through a housing agreement with the City that will ensure the suites on site are rental in perpetuity.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.
Yours Sincerely;

Harold Stanley M. Env. Design
Community Planning Consultant
Harold Stanley Consulting

## Mayor \& Council, City of Victoria

## Re: CALUC Community Meeting - 121 Menzies St

The community meeting to consider the proposal at 121 Menzies was held on October $12^{\text {th }}$ ( 46 attendees). Attached please find an excerpt of the General Meeting minutes regarding the proposal.

A proposal for this property was presented at the April 8, 2015 JBNA meeting. The letter from that meeting is appended. The R-2 building was renovated in 1992 and subsequently given an occupancy permit for seven LHK suites. The owner soon thereafter completed additional renovations, added five others. The current proposal is for 11 units.

All but one meeting participant expressed strong negative responses to the proposal. The question and response period was quite extensive with further explanation and additional similar comments to the further points raised. The minutes capture some of these comments.

The one positive comment suggested that the units would be "affordable" and therefore the proposal should be supported.

The negative responses focused on the disrespect for the process and the precedent the proposal would set. This train of thought was expressed a few times, more so after the proponent said there are others in the neighbourhood who have done the same thing, meaning created suites beyond permissive zoning.

For your consideration,

## Cc: Harold Stanley <br> CoV Planning

## EXCERPT from JBNA October $12^{\text {th }}, 2016$ Minutes

JAMES BAY NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION
MINUTES - General Meeting October $12^{\text {th }}$, 2016-46 present

## 7. CALUC: $\mathbf{1 2 1}$ Menzies

Harold Stanley, Planning Consultant, Charles Miller, Engineering Technologist, Duncan Valley Designs John Ivison, John Ivison \& Associates

Marg Gardiner reported on the Development Review Committee (DRC) pre-meetings: On July $4^{\text {th }}$ and September $12^{\text {th }}$ JBNA Committee members, Tim VanAlstine, Wayne Shillington, and Marg Gardiner met with the proponents. Trevor Moat was at the July meeting and Tim Sommer at the September Meeting.
A proposal for this property was presented at the April 8, 2015 JBNA meeting. The letter from that meeting will be appended to the letter from this meeting as the issues remain. The R-2 building was renovated in 1992 and subsequently given an occupancy permit for seven LHK suites. The owner soon thereafter completed additional renovations, added five more suites in the building and then converted a garage to stand-alone accommodation. With changes, there were $130 r 14$ rental suites. The added suites were constructed without City permits or approval.
Since that time, the proponent has had consultations with the City and reworked the interior configuration and is now proposing 11 units.
At the pre-meetings, the items suggested to be contentious remained:

1) the precedent it might set and the message to other landowners who could make similar unapproved renovations or that this would set a precedent for the level of density and type of renovation permitted in the community.
2) the parking shortfall which further frustrates residents who are searching for parking near 5-corners and especially Thrifty Foods.

Community Meeting presentation:
John Ivison . . building constructed in 1906 was originally single family R-2 zoning. Owner G Osborne purchased in 1992. 1992 restoration started; house raised, windows/doors replaced, painting, roof and gutters. Interior changes 7 light housekeeping suites, 7 kitchenettes, 4 common washrooms. Additional work took place which increased units to 14 , this was done without permit. Only 1 parking space. The current proposal has no plans to provide additional parking based on parking study. Has a secured area for bikes.

## Questions/comments:

Q/A opportunity given to those proposal live within 100m of 121 Menzies, followed by invitation to any resident. (addresses not captured for all speakers)
C: resident - the approval of zoning for 7 units should never have been exceeded
C: Lewis St resident - take offensive when you state there are other buildings which have suites greater than permitted and only reason you are here is that it was "just the one found out". This insults those who follow the system and create suites legitimately.

Q: Lewis St - want 11 suites, an office, garden suite are they included in the 11 A: Yes

Q: What is rent range and suite size range
A: range of rent $\$ 330$ and $\$ 1000$ monthly. Currently 250 sqft, with reduction from 14 to 11 suites range will be 287 to 780 sqft
C - takes great exception to how this has been presented. Defies all zoning requirements. Crams in units.

Q: How many tenants currently in residence
A: 7
C: 17 yr resident, appreciates issue of affordability, worth supporting. 11 units not to be sneered at.

C: Don't support it -flies in face of by-laws, permits, what's the point of other community members following rezoning regulations if people flaunt regulations. Sets a bad precedent. Has had 24 yrs of revenue from the illegal suites. Restore back to original 7 suites. Proponent is trying to pull on heart-strings to rationalise his circumvention of bylaws. Others have followed the rules, and it cost them a lot.

Q: What are alternatives.
A: will have to restore back to original 7 units.
C: 1992 entitled to 7 suites - compromise 11 suites - need to go back to 7 suites. Currently occupied by 7 renters. No one would be displaced.
Q: if reduced to 7 suites won't be as affordable?
A: Yes, would have to revert back to light-housekeeping suites no individual bathrooms would be shared. That is the term of the covenant which was entered into - if proposal does not succeed then must revert.

# James Bay Neighbourhood Association 

## 234 Menzies St <br> Victoria, B.C. <br> V8V 2G7

www.jbna.org

April 20th 2015
Mayor and Council
\#1 Centennial Sq.
Victoria BC
Re: Development Re-zoning: 121 Menzies from 7 to 13 units

Mayor and Council:
A proposal related to an application to re-zone a multi-unit building located at 121 Menzies Street was presented at the April 8, 2015 meeting of the James Bay Neighbourhood Association (JBNA). Approximately 80 people attended the meeting.

The presentation focussed on the fact that the building had been renovated in 1992 and subsequently given an occupancy permit for seven suites. The owner soon thereafter completed additional renovations, added five more suites in the building and converted a garage to stand-alone accommodation, bringing the total to thirteen rental suites. The owner acknowledges that the six added suites were constructed without City permits or approval. The owner now is requesting that the building "stays AS IS and modify the zoning to reflect the structure."

Re-zoning proposals frequently elicit strong reactions from residents in the immediate vicinity. This particular proposal brought forth comments from people who live in many different parts of James Bay.

In summary, there were those who thought that the there is a need for small, affordable rental accommodation. Others stated that the exterior of the building and the lot were well-maintained and in keeping with the heritage look of James Bay and still others were not concerned about there being only a single parking space for the thirteen units. On the other hand, there were those who questioned whether all construction had been done to code and whether all suites were safe for tenants.

Some speakers were frustrated that they had met City standards, incurred permit costs and paid increased property taxes after renovating their property while this landlord had not. There were those who were concerned that approval of this application would be seen as either condoning the owner's actions and thus send a signal that other landowners could make similar unapproved renovations or that this would set a precedent for the level of density and type of renovation permitted in the community.
I have included below the minutes of our April $8^{\text {th }}$ Neighbourhood Association meeting that relate to this rezoning application and a letter I received from a resident who could not attend this meeting.

Yours truly,


CALUC Chair, JBNA

## JBNA CALUC - 121 Menzies

## April $8^{\text {th }}$ Meeting minutes

Development Re-zoning: 121 Menzies from 7 to 13 units
Charles Miller, Duncan Valley Designs, presenter
Richard Skene, Architectural Securities Inc, Gordon Osborne, Owner
John Ivision, Structural Eng Alex Apotoli, P. Eng
A multi-unit apt since 1992, density from 7 units to 13. Building build in 1906, single family R2 zoning, owed by Mr. Osborne since 1992. Currently zoned for 7 suites, was over the current R2 zoning but City rezoned to permit 7 LHK suites in 1992. Renovated the house and raised 2 ft . for legal basement. Extensive restoration of exterior and interior in 1992. Likely 7 units in place when inspected. However, additional suites constructed around same time: Unauthorized construction.

Now requesting modified zoning for 12 suite and 1 garden suite, with 4 additional suite in basement, 1 addition al suite on main floor, and the garden suite - garage conversion.
Only 1 parking spot for building - garden suite tenant has this spot. 2 other people in apt who own cars of 13 suites. Building has secure bike location.

## Q/A:

Q - Superior St resident who is also a landlord - questions regarding permits, was plumping done with professionals, electricians etc.
A - Yes for original 7 suites, not conforming for additional suites that's why requesting rezoning. Had over-built (pipes etc) in 1992 so plumbing conformed to code.
Q - Superior Cont'd - As a landlord, one of the houses I manage has a larger footprint than the whole Menzies property and would not consider 13 units for it. This proposal is not supportable.

C - Pilot St resident - l've gone through the rezoning process, followed what was required. You are asking the community to support the rezoning. For 22 years you have benefited from 5 illegal suites and you're asking for forgiveness because you are now making it right. This is not acceptable, the building should be reverted back to the 7 suites that were allowed by the city in 1992. These actions are not acceptable.

C - Simcoe resident - support affordable housing, states tenants are safe
C - Montreal St resident - do I as a single dwelling owner get to do this? Not likely. You've done this before - this is not supportable.
C - San Jose resident - walks past building, likes it, collecting of rain water, clean, no garbage, building a good citizen for street.
Q - Menzie St resident - going through process today are you up to today's standards? You state you can't meet, are you asking for relax of requirements?
A - Want to present an alternate process for today's standards
Q - Kingston St - if city doesn't approve request does the building revert back to 7 units?
A - Reserves right to answer at this time - wants to bring back into standards.
C - You might be a good landlord and your tenants might be good; but the zoning stays with the building and this is too much for this site.

C - Residents may be good citizens, that's all laudable, but 22 years of benefit by the owner, don't know that the owner has been a good citizen.
A - Not here to condone Mr Osborne's conduct, states he was heavily fined by hydro, here trying to rectify situations

Q - What was the original parking requirement for the 7 units?
A - 7 units required 3 parking stalls, currently only 1 parking stall for the
Q - Parking requirement in 1992 was 3 - was garage used as a garage
A - Garage was used as a garage prior to conversion in 1992.
C - So from the beginning you never intended to comply with parking. The garden unit should revert to parking as additional parking is needed..

C - Resident - St James St project was turned down due to parking, I don't believe that a stall is always needed for every resident; but more is needed than being proposed. With the St James proposal the City insisted on a car share requirement, if the City unwisely proceeds with this proposal, there should be a requirement for a couple of car shares spots right there. C - Have major concern for this application as will open floodgates, can't support this.

C - Why is it not possible to consider something less than 13 units?
A - Want to legalize those existing since 1992
$Q$ - Is there egress for all existing suites?
A - All suites have egress
C - Wrong approach taken, my concern what happens when property is sold, what if the next owner isn't as responsible as the current?
A - Can't answer at this time until know what city will do?
C - The rezoning application should be looked at as though the property was Greenfield. If that were the case, what would be permitted.

Q - What about water, plumbing?
A - Already up to code for 13 suites since 1992.
C - For the 7 units was there an occupancy inspection?
A - Yes, all plumbing was roughed in in 1992, and electrical but due to finances the 6 extras suites weren't done.
A - Was approved for occupancy in 1992.
C - Very concerned about the precedence this will set and subsequent owners, put city and this community in a very difficult situation.
Q - Was building up to code in 1992?
A - Yes
Q - What have you done since then? Current codes
A - Met and have gone beyond what is required as of 2012, need to find out from city what can and can't be relaxed.

Q - Are they up to 2012 codes?
A - Have just touched surface of 2012 codes and are reviewing with city.
C - Medana St res - until a week ago didn't know how many people lived in building - support.

## Letter from resident on Medana St.

To: Tom Coyle,
I oppose the rezoning of this property to allow 12 units plus a Garden Suite even though this use has been illegally in place for some years. The zoning does not allow this and the fact the property has had so many units for so long does not make it right. The neighbouring house to the north also contains more units than the zoning allows. Parking problems spill over onto neighbouring streets as there is not enough parking on Menzies Street. Thirteen units is excessive for a zoning meant for two units, but permitted to have seven. The small size of the multiple units contributes to more neighbourhood/tenant turnover which affects the character of the neighbourhood.
Even though this is to be a site specific bylaw, a precedent will be set. I am unable to attend the Community Meeting due to a schedule conflict.
\#201, 791 Goldstream Ave
Victoria, BC V9B 2X5
T 250.388.9877
F 250.388.9879
wattconsultinggroup.com blvdgroup.ca

Tinney \& Associates
January 222016
568 Victoria Avenue
Our File: 1933
Victoria BC V8S 4M6
Attn: Roger Tinney
RE: 121 Menzies Street Parking Review
Boulevard Transportation, a division of Watt Consulting Group was retained by Tinney \& Associates to undertake a parking review for the residential building at 121 Menzies Street in the City of Victoria. This high level review provides an informed professional opinion regarding parking supply and demand.

### 1.0 EXISTING BUILDING

The site is located at 121 Menzies Street in the City of Victoria. See Map 1. The site was converted into seven light house-keeping units approximately 20 years ago, and has since changed unit types and configuration which requires a rezoning process.

There are a total of 14 units with a mix of bachelor, studio, and one-bedroom units, and range from 134 sq.ft. to 484 sq.ft. Two of the units share a bathroom, the rest are self contained.

There is one off-street parking space and 12 bicycle parking spaces.

### 2.0 PARKING REQUIREMENT

The site is located in the R-2 Zone: Two Family Dwelling District which requires parking per the City of Victoria's Zoning Bylaw, "Schedule C". See Table 1. Total required parking for the site is 18 spaces.

TABLE 1. PARKING REQUIREMENT

| Unit Type | \# of <br> Units | Parking Requirement | Applied to the Site |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Light House |  |  |  |  |
| Keeping Units | 2 | Buildings converted to <br> housekeeping units | 1 space for the first unit <br> +0.5 space for every <br> unit over 1 | 1.5 |
| Bachelor / One- <br> Bedroom Units | 12 | Multiple Dwellings located in <br> zones other than R3-1 and <br> R3-2 | 1.3 spaces / unit | 16 |

MAP 1. SUBJECT SITE


### 3.0 RESIDENT PARKING DEMAND

## Existing Site

The site has an existing vehicle ownership of 5 vehicles ${ }^{1}$, a demand rate of 0.36 vehicles per unit. The parking space on site is currently being utilized by visitors or maintenance vehicles; residents currently park on-street. Residents regularly utilize bike parking and it is typically seen at high occupancy.

## Representative Sites

Resident parking demand has been estimated based on vehicle ownership information obtained from previous studies. Sites shown in Table 2 are located on the periphery of downtown and are market rental apartments which are expected to exhibit similar parking demand to the subject site. Average vehicle ownership among sites is 0.37 vehicles per unit and ranges from 0.19 vehicles per unit to 0.56 vehicles per unit. The average vehicle ownership rate applied to the subject site suggests residents will own five vehicles; supporting the existing parking demand.

[^0]TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF VEHICLE OWNERSHIP AT REPRESENTATIVE SITES ${ }^{2}$

| Location | Units | Owned Vehicles | Demand Rate <br> (vehicles/unit) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1118 Balmoral Road | 24 | 10 | 0.42 |
| 1635 Cook Street | 70 | 26 | 0.37 |
| 2549 Dowler Place | 16 | 9 | 0.56 |
| 1110 Queens Avenue | 16 | 3 | 0.19 |
| 2136 Ridge Road | 32 | 12 | 0.38 |
| 1039 View Street | 160 | 32 | 0.20 |
| 1147 View Street | 22 | 10 | 0.45 |
| 2523 Wark Street | 16 | 8 | 0.50 |
| 1158 Yates Street | 18 | 4 | 0.22 |
|  |  |  | Average |

The subject site consists of small units. The sites surveyed were typical rental apartment sites, but not necessarily small units. Smaller units tend to exhibit lower parking demand because of the fewer number of occupants and/or lower income residents.

### 4.0 VISITOR PARKING DEMAND

Visitor parking demand rates have been demonstrated in the range of $0.05-0.07$ vehicles per unit for multi-family residential ${ }^{3}$. Using a conservative estimate of 0.1 vehicles per unit, visitor parking demand is expected to be 1 vehicle.

### 5.0 ON-STREET PARKING CONDITIONS

On-street parking utilization was observed in the area surrounding the site, including Menzies Street, Niagara Street and Simcoe Street. See Map 2. Observations were conducted over two periods to understand on-street parking conditions during weekday PM and weekend daytime; when resident demand is highest.

Residents of the site currently park on-street and it is assumed were accounted for in observations. The likeliest location residents seek parking is Menzies Street adjacent the site in the residential parking only area, which was seen at $88 \%$ occupancy with three spaces unoccupied. Total parking was observed at $70 \%$ occupancy with 24 spaces unoccupied. Parking that is available to residents was observed at $72 \%$ occupancy with 21 spaces unoccupied. Generally, parking is available within a oneblock radius of the site.

[^1]TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF ON-STREET PARKING CONDITIONS


MAP 2. SUMMARY OF ON-STREET PARKING SUPPLY AND RESTRICTIONS


GREAT!
transportation solutions for communities

### 6.0 SUMMARY

Site parking demand is six vehicles (five resident and one visitor) and is not accommodated on site. Site demand is already incorporated into on-street parking demand; suggesting that on-street parking supplies accommodate demand. There is no expected additional parking demand associated with the site.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you have comments or questions.
Sincerely,

## BOULEVARD TRANSPORTATION

a division of Watt Consulting Group
per,


Daniel Casey, MCIP, RPP, M.Plan
Senior Transportation Planner


Mari Bosomworth, BA Junior Transportation Planner


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Information obtained on January 82015 from building landlord

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Data was obtained from ICBC as of September 30, 2013
    ${ }^{3}$ Based on observations of visitor parking demand conducted in 2015 for two studies of multi-family residential sites (one adjacent downtown Victoria, the other in Langford) and findings from the 2012 Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study (Table 31, pg50) available at:
    www.metrovancouver.org/services/regionalplanning/PlanningPublications/Apartment Parking Study TechnicalReport.pdf

