Alan Andrew 1966 Fairfield Road Victoria, BC February 6, 2018

Public Hearing on Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No 1142) No. 18-026 (R1G waterfront).

## **Dear Councilors and Planning Staff,**

R1G waterfront zoning rules require updating and I support council and city staff in this effort. This is an excellent opportunity to align R1G waterfront zoning with the environmental and development goals of the city.

However, the rules as proposed are not logical. Nearly half of existing properties in the zone, including 10 of 16 abutting Gonzales beach, are not compliant with the rules as proposed (see appendix on following page for a detailed list).

If the intent is to preserve to environment, there should be a setback from the natural boundary (high tide). Given that this is a fully developed residential waterfront area, a reasonable setback of 12.5 meters could be considered.

If the intent is to preserve views and prevent jockeying with neighbouring properties, one could require that buildings lie not more than 2 meters in front of a straight line drawn between neighboring R1G houses.

Implementing these two rules together would protect the environment while allowing fair use of personal property. The vast majority of properties in R1G waterfront would be compliant with these rules. The intent would be simple to understand, and the outcomes would be better for the environment than the rules as currently proposed.

I would be pleased:	to discuss th	nis further with	council or staff
i would be bleased	เบ นเรเนรร เเ	ns iuitiei with	COUNCILOR STAIL

Sincerely,

Alan Andrew

## Appendix:

Based on approximate measurements performed using VicMap, the following properties will be non compliant with the proposed rules:

Crescent Road:

1811, 1831, 1837, 1841, 1851, 1861, 1863 (7 of 13)

Robertson Road:

157, 159, 161 (3 of 3)

**Hollywood Crescent** 

1777, 1807, 1811, 1825, 1827, 1851, 1881, 1893, 1899 (9 of 37). Many of these lots on Hollywood Crescent are quite short and it would be perilous to build back to 36.5 m from the street, so the setback rules as proposed are irrelevant.