

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

6 January 2019

Dear Michael Angrove:

Re: Community Meeting for 1302 Finlayson Avenue Rezoning

Community Meeting Details

Date: 28 November 2018

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

Meeting facilitators: Hillside Quadra Neighbourhood Action Committee (NAC): 3 members

Attendance: 5: 4 in 100m notification distance, 1 outside notification area;

Meeting Chair: Jon Munn, NAC

Note taker: Deborah McCarron, NAC

Proposed Development Details

Proponent: Adrian Brett of Adrain Brett and Associates

Owner: Paul Fisher

Proposal: Rezone from R1-B Single Family Dwelling District to R1-S2 Restricted Small Lot (Two Storey) District and a new zone to fit the nonconforming situation; and vary the R1-S2 6.0m front and rear yard building set backs from to 2.0m and 3.4m respectively.

The proponent presented the proposal and answered questions. Currently, 1302 Finlayson is the site of a commercial building with residential on the upper floor. The current owner operates the English Carpenter furniture business.

The proponents would like to rezone their land to new zones with lot size minimums which would permit a subdivision to create two small lots. The adjacent table provided by the proponent summarizes the lot and building dimensions if the proposal is successful.

No table was presented to show how the existing uses and building do not conform with the existing zone or how the

	Proposed Lot A 3105 Highview (metric)	Existing Lot B 1302 Finlayson (metric)
Existing Zone	R1-B	R1-B
Proposed Zone	R1-S2	NEW
Lot Area	260.50	283.40
Lot Frontage on Street	16.99	18.70
Site Coverage	38.41%	47.99%
FSR	0.60	0.75
Open Site Space	52.10%	45.37%
Site Coverage	100.07	135.99
Floor Area 1+2	157.13	211.26
Main	83.96	104.25
Upper	73.17	107.01
Basement	82.41	
Floor Area all Floors	239.54	211.26
Commercial Floor Area	N/A	86.64
Residential Floor Area	239.54	124.62
Number of Dwelling Units	1	1
Parking Stalls	1	1
Number of Storeys	2	2
Height	7.30	7.42
Average Grade	36.80	37.60
Peak Height	44.88	46.29
Eave Height	43.31	43.74
Front yard	2.00	0.43
Rear yard	3.43	2.72
North Side Yard	2.40	3.00
South Side Yard	3.00	0.51
Combined Side Yard	5.40	3.51

existing situation and zone differ from the proposal. Although a development permit and the related guidelines normally are required for intensive residential development, details of conformity were only discussed briefly.

The proponent briefly described that the existing commercial use on the lot does not conform to the R1-B zone and the siting of the building does not conform to the yard distance requirements of the zone because the existing situation largely existed prior to the adoption of the zoning bylaw. There was no summary of what changes to the property were made over the years and how the nonconforming situation was addressed with or without city permits.

It was noted at the meeting that the proposal requests a new zone to accommodate the unusual nonconforming situation of the commercial use with lot line setbacks close to 0.5m. The city has the option to ask that any building be brought into conformity with the existing R1-B. The variances required for the existing building to be in conformity with the R1-S2 zone were not discussed.

The road edge adjacent to the lot is largely gravel with no drainage or transport related improvements. The proponent noted that the city usually requires adjacent road improvements when there is a subdivision or rezoning. This would likely be a curb and gutter to direct rain water for drainage and a sidewalk for safe pedestrian travel. The proponent is requesting to construct a planted ditch to absorb rain water, or bioswale instead of the regular improvements. This is a subdivision related detail, so the decision would be made by the Engineering Department.

The proponent said that what the city Official Community Plan (OCP) wants in urban areas is traditional residential housing. They feel the proposal meets development permit area objectives and it is sensitive infill. He suggested that the city wants contact sensitive new developments to support future population growth. They also want retention of existing local businesses in the community such as the existing business.

As part of the proposal the owner will be making the spindle work copied from the 1880s design to be placed on the façade overlooking the park to match the 1914 character of the original house. The proponent said the wraparound porch facing north and west will enhanced the ability for surveillance or ‘eyes on the park,’ and this is a good way to make the park more secure. Also, there are no changes to be made to the existing house. There will be minor grade differences between the new house on Highview and the existing house on Finlayson Street.

Discussion

A number of issues were discussed. It was noted that the adjacent owner and/or resident neighbour to the east would be most affected by the proposal and no representative for that neighbour was present.

Use and Density

Three of four of the neighbours said they are “absolutely are for this”, and it is “sensible development.” One of three, suggested it feels the new building would encroaching on the park and he is losing his view of the park although he didn’t think this would be an issue for zoning.

A resident asked what the height of the new house’s basement would be and if it is underground and being designed as a liveable space. Adrian responded that basement suites are not permitted under small lot zoning. Adrian feels this rule is about to be changed. The neighbour objects to any basement suite.

Transportation/ Parking

Many meeting participants stated that they like more space for on-street parking. A couple of people said that pedestrians walking to and from the park would be o.k. without a sidewalk.

Additional parking demand from the proposal was briefly discussed but no clear conclusion was reached. Three neighbours liked the way people could park now, although only one off-street parking space per unit may not be adequate. The proponent did not address this issue clearly.

Traffic/Street Improvements

There was some discussion of how a bioswale would be designed with driveways and parking.

An 18-year resident two doors down on Finlayson said the sidewalk would end at the property line by the park if a conventional curb and gutter were done. She is against this. She likes the additional parking on the shoulder that can be kept if it’s placed in gravel. On another project across the street this was an issue and the neighbours collected 16 signatures to keep the soft gravel shoulder. She thinks they could get more signatures if needed.

Affordability

A minor mention was made regarding affordability. The proponent said this is a small market-oriented proposal, but the existing residential unit on top of the commercial unit could be more affordable.

Design – Building Form and Character

Those attending agreed that the attention to detail from the 1880s design to be placed on the façade overlooking the park was a good idea.

The neighbours also asked about the siding and the use of color. They commented that they did not like the latest improvement across the street and the existing green colour of the building could be changed. The owner responded that he’s tending toward dark blue and plans to keep the original character.

One suggestion asked that a colour and materials board be presented to show the possibilities. This is an issue for the development permit, but there is no public notice at that stage.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposal seen as acceptable by the small number of attendees.

Jon Munn
CALUC Co-Chair
Hillside Quadra Neighbourhood Action Committee

cc. Hillside Quadra NAC, Adrian Brett