

Laura Wilson

From: David Nicholls [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, Oct 21, 2016 3:26 PM
To: [REDACTED] planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca; Cloe Nicholls; Community Planning email inquiries
Subject: Proposal at 1068 Chamberlain Street

October 21, 2016

Good afternoon,

I was not able to attend the community meeting on October 20, 2016 with regards to the development proposal at 1068 Chamberlain Street.

I live at 5 – 1070 Chamberlain Street, which is a unit in the neighbouring property, and am very much in favour of the proposal.

The 6-unit townhouse complex where I reside is mostly owned and occupied by young couples and families. All of us feel very lucky to have found a lower-cost option for housing in very desirable neighbourhood. With houses on Chamberlain Street now in the million-dollar range, it is unlikely that any of us would be able to afford a house in the area. As a result, I welcome any proposal that will increase density and provide more affordable options for those of us who, one day, may wish to move to a slightly larger house in the neighbourhood.

The properties on Chamberlain Street are all fairly large, so I would suspect that the majority of the lots could handle a duplex addition. In this particular case, the owners at 1068 Chamberlain Street seem to have done their homework and are proposing a very thoughtful and well-suited addition to their property. I have also appreciated their efforts to keep all of their neighbours apprised of their efforts.

I support this project and hope that the City of Victoria will as well.

Thank you very much for considering my thoughts.

Sincerely,

David Nicholls

5 – 1070 Chamberlain Street

Laura Wilson

From: Marian [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, Nov 11, 2016 12:42 PM
To: Christy Love
Cc: Laura Wilson; [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: 1068 Chamberlain Street



PROPOSED REZONE
1068 CHAMBERLAIN STREET

Dear Christy and Matt. I am writing to you as a follow-up to the material you provided to us at the meeting of Oct. 20. You are not giving all the neighbours within 100 metres of your property all the facts and evading the issues

There are issues that don't seem to be resolved

A. You keep insisting the development is a duplex but with 3 units zoning at city hall says it is a triplex. Three units is not acceptable.

B. There are still privacy issues. Right at the beginning of the first proposed development you knew that privacy was very important to us. The two big windows on the south side of your new house are eye to eye with our big kitchen window where I do all my preparations for meals, etc.

C. The new build still does not conform to the existing house nor to the other houses on Chamberlain St. You have two completely different house styles together and the neighbours are not happy with that. Would like to see exterior finish being more compatible with the residences within the original 1910 streetscape. Could use shingles or lap siding rather than a more modern look. With the exception of our dwelling the vast majority of existing or upgraded dwellings on the street all have the same architectural theme. Your proposal does not work.

D. The two driveways are non compatible with the two parking spaces you have allowed on your property. There needs to be one parking spot for each unit, i.e. 3 parking spots. There is only one street access for vehicles allowed for a property. 2000 Chamberlain, corner of Brighton, has a garage and a driveway and the city has told the owner he can only use one.

E. Will there be City control over what is being proposed actually being what is built.

The above issues must be addressed before any building can be done.

Alex and Marian Piercy
1048 Chamberlain St.

cc:

1) Planning & Zoning Committee of Fairfield Gonzales Community Association

1330 Fairfield Rd. V8S 5J1 Don Monsour President/Interim Chair —

- planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca .

2)LAWILSON@Victoria.ca

Laura Wilson

From: Christy Love [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, Nov 19, 2016 1:17 PM
To: Marian
Cc: Laura Wilson; DON MONSOUR; Matt Mahoney
Subject: Re: Fw: 1068 Chamberlain Street

Hi Marian and Alex,

Thank you for sending these comments. We provide responses to each item below. We'd also be happy to continue discussing in person.

A) Duplex with secondary suite: The distinction is that a secondary suite can only be rented. A triplex could stratified into three units each owned and sold separately, and we are emphasizing that this is not what we wish to do. The suite is being added within the footprint of the existing house, and it could be changed back into a single dwelling as our needs change over time. As you know, our plan is to create this space so that we can live as a multi-generational family.

B) Privacy: We take your privacy seriously and this is a key reason we shifted to this proposal from our original small lot approach. As we discussed after the community meeting, the plans include an extension of the existing 6 foot fence between our properties, along with plantings for additional screening. If you'd like, we can stand in the yard to envision where the new windows will be in relation to your kitchen window and discuss improvements that you think would help. The upper floor windows are high clerestory windows that allow light into the rooms but do not look down into your yard.

C) We appreciate your concerns, although house design (as in taste in clothes and art) is subjective, and our block includes an eclectic mix of house styles that reflects the years they were built or added to. We have chosen materials (cedar siding and accents, stucco) that are consistent with the neighbourhood, and designed the landscaping to tie in with the existing mature landscaping. The flat roof is intentionally modern and distinct from the existing roof line, but is also intended to limit the height next to your home; to enable addition of solar panels, and to allow more south facing light to reach the north half of our property.

D) As we are proposing a duplex with secondary suite (small and rental only), we feel two stalls is adequate, especially given that our location is so close to shopping, buses, bike routes, and other amenities that can be accessed without a car. Garden suites and secondary suites have no requirement for off-street parking in the City of Victoria.

We don't think our home will generate more cars than a large single family with large secondary suite - which is permitted as a right under the existing zoning - and would require only one parking stall. We could have included more space for car parking by putting a driveway to the rear-yard. However, we heard from you and other neighbours that they didn't want the backyard turned into parking (nor do we!). With our proposal we are trying to balance these different issues and priorities.

E) The City will issue a Development Permit which guarantees we build the buildings as per the Council approved designs.

We are available to discuss further as desired.

Best Regards,
Christy Love and Matt Mahoney
Owners/occupants 1068 Chamberlain

On Fri, Nov 11, 2016 at 12:42 PM, Marian [REDACTED] wrote:

PROPOSED REZONE
1068 CHAMBERLAIN STREET

Dear Christy and Matt. I am writing to you as a follow-up to the material you provided to us at the meeting of Oct. 20. You are not giving all the neighbours within 100 metres of your property all the facts and evading the issues

There are issues that don't seem to be resolved

A. You keep insisting the development is a duplex but with 3 units zoning at city hall says it is a triplex. Three units is not acceptable.

B. There are still privacy issues. Right at the beginning of the first proposed development you knew that privacy was very important to us. The two big windows on the south side of your new house are eye to eye with our big kitchen window where I do all my preparations for meals, etc.

C. The new build still does not conform to the existing house nor to the other houses on Chamberlain St. You have two completely different house styles together and the neighbours are not happy with that. Would like to see exterior finish being more compatible with the residences within the original 1910 streetscape. Could use shingles or lap siding rather than a more modern look. With the exception of our dwelling the vast majority of existing or upgraded dwellings on the street all have the same architectural theme. Your proposal does not work.

D. The two driveways are non compatible with the two parking spaces you have allowed on your property. There needs to be one parking spot for each unit, i.e. 3 parking spots. There is only one street access for vehicles allowed for a property. 2000 Chamberlain, corner of Brighton, has a garage and a driveway and the city has told the owner he can only use one.

E. Will there be City control over what is being proposed actually being what is built.

The above issues must be addressed before any building can be done.

Alex and Marian Piercy
1048 Chamberlain St.

cc:

1) Planning & Zoning Committee of Fairfield Gonzales Community Association
1330 Fairfield Rd. V8S 5J1 Don Monsour President/Interim Chair —
- planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca

2) LAWILSON@Victoria.ca