



Planning and Land Use Committee Report

For the Meeting of January 14, 2015

To: Planning and Land Use Committee **Date:** December 18, 2015

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

Subject: Development Permit Application with Variances No. 00489 for 2035 Stanley Avenue

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that Council consider declining Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00489 for the property located at 2035 Stanley Avenue.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In accordance with Section 920(2) of the *Local Government Act*, Council may issue a Development Permit in accordance with the applicable guidelines specified in the *Community Plan*. A Development Permit may vary or supplement the *Zoning Regulation Bylaw* but may not vary the use or density of the land from that specified in the Bylaw.

Pursuant to Section 920 (8) of the *Local Government Act*, where the purpose of the designation is the establishment of objectives for the form and character of intensive residential development, a Development Permit may include requirements respecting the character of the development including landscaping, siting, form, exterior design and finish of buildings and other structures.

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 2035 Stanley Avenue. The proposal is to rezone from the R1-B Zone, Single Family Dwelling District, to two new zones in order to subdivide the lot, keep the existing non-conforming duplex and build a new small lot house.

The following points were considered in assessing this Application:

- Staff are recommending that Council decline the concurrent Rezoning Application due to insufficient lot sizes.
- The proposal is generally consistent with the objectives and guidelines for sensitive infill contained in Development Permit Area 15D: Intensive Residential - Duplex of the *Official Community Plan*, 2012 (OCP).

- The proposal does not meet the *Small Lot House Policy* for sensitive infill due to siting and massing that disrupts the existing street pattern.
- Despite the siting and massing challenges, the proposal is generally consistent with the design guidelines for sensitive infill contained in Development Permit Area 15A: Intensive Residential – Small Lot of the *Official Community Plan, 2012* (OCP).
- There are eight variances associated with the existing duplex. The variances related to height, number of storeys, front setback and one of the side setbacks are the result of the siting and size of the existing duplex. The reductions in the north side setback (small portion at the back of the building), the rear yard setback and the reduction in number of parking stalls would be a direct result of the proposed small lot.
- The three variances associated with the new house are to reduce the front and side setbacks and permit parking in the front yard. These variances are the result of the small lot size. The house would be located significantly closer to the front lot line than under the standard front yard setback.

BACKGROUND

Description of Proposal

The proposal is to alter an existing non-conforming duplex and construct a new small lot house.

Existing Duplex (Proposed Lot 1)

Specific details include:

- an existing two-storey building with a basement
- existing design elements such as a pitched roofline and distinctive front entryways
- existing exterior materials include stucco siding, wood fascia and trim, and fiberglass roofing
- proposed removal of the deck
- proposed construction of a new landing and stairs to access one of the dwelling units.

The proposed variances are related to:

- increasing the height (maximum) from 7.6m to 7.7m
- increasing the number of storeys (maximum) from 1.5 with a basement to 2 with a basement
- reducing the front setback (minimum) from 7.5m to 5.8m
- reducing the rear setback (minimum) from 10.7m to 1.5m
- reducing the side setback (south) (minimum) from 1.52m to 0.30m
- reducing the side setback (north) (minimum) from 3m to 1.5m
- reducing the combined side yard setback (minimum) from 4.5m to 3m
- reducing the number of parking stalls (minimum) from 2 to 1.

New Small Lot House (Proposed Lot 2)

Specific details include:

- a two-storey building with a basement
- design elements such as a pitched roofline, dormers, distinctive front entryway and traditional-style windows

- the exterior materials include cement board siding, cement board panels and trim, wood fascia and trim, and fiberglass shingle roofing
- new hard and soft landscaping would be introduced, including a flag stone path and a patio surfaced with decorative concrete pavers.

The proposed variances are related to:

- reducing the front setback (minimum) from 6m to 2.8m
- reducing the side setback (east) (minimum) from 2.4m to 1.5m
- permitting parking in the front yard.

Sustainability Features

As indicated in the applicant's letter dated September 10, 2015, sustainability features related to energy efficiency, indoor air quality and resource use are associated with this Application.

Active Transportation Impacts

The applicant has not identified any active transportation impacts associated with this Application.

Public Realm Improvements

No public realm improvements are proposed in association with this Development Permit Application.

Existing Site Development and Development Potential

The site is presently a non-conforming duplex. Under the current R1-B Zone, the property could be redeveloped as a single family house with a secondary suite.

Community Consultation

Consistent with the *Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) Procedures for Processing Rezoning and Variances Applications*, the applicant has consulted the Fernwood CALUC at a Community Meeting held on July 7, 2015. A letter dated September 10, 2015, 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

Development Permit Area and Design Guidelines

Should this property be rezoned as proposed, the *Official Community Plan (OCP)* would identify the proposed Lot 1 as being within Development Permit Area 15A: Intensive Residential – Small Lot and proposed Lot 2 as being within Development Permit Area 15D: Intensive Residential – Duplex.

Existing Non-Conforming Duplex (Proposed Lot 1)

The proposed alterations to the existing non-conforming duplex are generally consistent with the *Neighbourliness Guidelines for Duplexes*, 1996. The proposal would alter the existing duplex by removing the deck at the rear of the property and constructing a landing and stairway to access the entryway of one of the dwelling units. The proposed alterations are minor and the existing exterior design and materials of the house are in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.

New Small Lot House (Proposed Lot 2)

This proposal, for a two-storey house with a basement, does not integrate infill development that is compatible with the existing neighbourhood and, therefore, does not meet the objectives of DPA 15A: Intensive Residential – Small Lot.

The siting and massing of the building will break the established street pattern. The house would be located much closer to Pembroke Street than the houses on either side of it. This sudden change in street pattern would appear disruptive and would detract from the visual character and cohesiveness of the streetscape.

The design of the new small lot house is generally consistent with the *Design Guidelines for Small Lot Houses*, 2002. The new small lot house incorporates architectural elements, such as a pitched roofline, dormers, a distinctive front entryway and traditional-style windows. These elements are similar to features of other houses in the neighbourhood.

Regulatory Considerations

Existing Non-Conforming Duplex (Proposed Lot 1)

The applicant is requesting eight variances for the existing duplex (see table below). The height, number of storeys, front setback and one of the side setbacks are the result of the siting and size of the existing duplex. The reductions in the north side setback (small portion at the back of the building), the rear yard setback and the reduction in number of parking stalls would be a direct result of the proposed small lot. Reducing the number of parking stalls for the duplex would result in one of the dwelling units not having off-street parking.

Zoning Criteria	Proposed Variances Lot 1 Existing Duplex	Zone Standard R-2
Height (m) - maximum	7.7	7.6
Storeys - maximum	2 + basement	1.5 + basement
Setbacks (m) - minimum		
Front	5.8 (Stanley St)	7.5
Rear	1.5	10.7
Side	0.30 (south)	1.52
Side	1.5 (north)	3
Combined Side Yard	3	4.5
Parking - minimum	1	2

New Small Lot House (Proposed Lot 2)

The applicant is requesting three variances for the new house (see table below). They are the result of the small lot size. The house would be located significantly closer to the front lot line than under the standard setback, which would disrupt the existing street pattern and would make the building appear to stand out from the adjacent houses.

Zoning Criteria	Proposed Variances Lot 2 New House	Zone Standard R1-S2
Setbacks (m) - minimum Front Side	2.8 (Pembroke St) 1.5 (east)	6 2.4
Parking - location	Front yard	Rear or side yard

CONCLUSIONS

The proposal to alter an existing duplex and construct a new house is generally consistent with the design guidelines related to Development Permit Area 15A: Intensive Residential – Small Lot and Development Permit Area 15D: Intensive Residential – Duplex. The proposal, however, does not meet the sensitive infill objectives of the *Small Lot House Policy*. In addition, the small lot sizes result in a large number of variances that would have a negative impact. Staff recommend Council consider declining this Application because staff are also recommending that Council consider declining the concurrent Rezoning Application due to substandard lot sizes.

ALTERNATE MOTION

That Committee forward this report to Council and that after giving notice and allowing an opportunity for public comment at a meeting of Council and after the Public Hearing for Rezoning Application No. 00489, if it is approved, Council consider the following motion:

“That Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit Application No. 00489 for 2035 Stanley Avenue in accordance with:

1. Plans date stamped July 30, 2015.
2. Development meeting all *Zoning Regulation Bylaw* requirements, except for the following variances:

Existing Duplex (Proposed Lot 1)

- a. Part 2.1.4 (a): Increase the height from 7.6m to 7.7m;
- b. Part 2.1.4 (a): Increase the number of storeys from 1.5 with a basement to 2 with a basement;
- c. Part 2.1.5 (a): Reduce the front setback from 7.5m to 5.8m;
- d. Part 2.1.5 (b): Reduce the rear setback from 10.7m to 1.5m;
- e. Part 2.1.5 (c): Reduce the side setback (south) from 1.52m to 0.30m;
- f. Part 2.1.5 (c): Reduce the side setback (north) from 3m to 1.5m;

- g. Part 2.1.5 (d): Reduce the combined side yard setback from 4.5m to 3m;
- h. Schedule "C" (4): Reduce the number of parking stalls from 2 to 1.

New Small Lot House (Proposed Lot 2)

- a. Part 1.23 (8)(a): Reduce the front setback from 6m to 2.8m;
 - b. Part 1.23 (8)(c): Reduce the side setback (east) from 2.4m to 1.5m;
 - c. Schedule "C" (4): Permit parking in the front yard.
- 3. Removal of new stairs within the future 1.39m Right-of-Way on Pembroke Street from the plans to the satisfaction of staff.
 - 4. The Development Permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution."

Respectfully submitted,



Rob Bateman
Planner
Development Services Division



Jonathan Tinney, Director
Sustainable Planning and Community
Development Department

Report accepted and recommended by the City Manager:




Date:

December 29, 2015

List of Attachments

- Zoning map
- Aerial map
- Applicant's letter to Mayor and Council dated July 28, 2015
- Letter from Fernwood Community Association dated September 10, 2015
- Arborist report dated July 16, 2015
- Small Lot Housing Rezoning Petition
- Plans dated July 30, 2015.





July 28, 2015

Her Worship Mayor Lisa Helps and Councillors
Corporation of the City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, B.C. V8W 1P6

This application is a resubmission to rezone the property at 2035 Stanley. At the Public Hearing on July 22, 2014 Council waived the requirement for a one year waiting period to resubmit a revised application and asked me to address massing and design concerns expressed by the neighbour at 1413 Pembroke. I believe this is because Council felt that with some 'fine tuning' the proposal had merit. I therefore present to you a revised proposal for this property.

Description of Proposal

The basics of my proposal are largely the same. It is a request to rezone the corner property at 2035 Stanley Avenue to allow for subdivision that would retain the existing duplex and create an additional small lot for construction of a new home. The result would be an increase in available housing to support the City's projected population growth – an increase in an area identified for Traditional Residential small lot infill.

The existing duplex would remain 'as-is' and if rezoning is approved, the exterior would be upgraded in accordance with a covenant registered on the property May 2014. To summarize, the exterior of the duplex would be repaired where necessary and painted, and the picket fence repaired and painted (this was done last summer).

A new 3 bedroom family home would be constructed on the small lot facing Pembroke and sited to maximize street connectivity, visual presence and character.

Pembroke Elevation



Neighbourhood Consultation

This is where the main changes take place. At the Public Hearing of July 12, 2014, Mr. and Mrs. Berry of 1413 Pembroke expressed concerns around the design, massing and privacy with the new small lot home. In order to create a solution satisfactory to all, I contracted award winning Zebra Design to help revision the proposed design.

After many months of collaboration and meeting with the neighbour, Mr. and Mrs. Berry have indicated they are satisfied and have signed a letter of support for this new proposal. (*Detailed letters are included in the Small Lot Petition package*). The main changes are:

1. Complete redesign of the new home incorporating architectural features of the building façade in smaller elements creating an impression of a 1.5 story building (addresses massing and design).
2. Refashioned exterior finish and roof design to enhance visual character and create harmony with the neighbourhood (addresses massing and design).
3. Added windows on the east and west elevations to break up the 'blank' wall (addresses design).
4. Incorporated a Yew hedge along southeast portion of the 6' fence (addresses privacy).
5. Reduced backyard patio and moved it away from the east neighbour (addresses privacy).

Original Proposal



Revised Proposal



The revised proposal was also presented to contiguous neighbours. As you will see in the attached Small Lot Petition, 92% of these neighbours are in favor of the proposal.

As well, on July 07, 2015 a Community meeting with the Fernwood Land Use Committee was held. The summary of this meeting is forthcoming from their Chair, David Maxwell.

Road Dedication

This proposal is subject to the City's automatic road dedication requirement that comes into play anytime there is a subdivision request – in this case **1.39m off each street frontage**. The result is **12%** of the total land handed over which at today's market price, equates to **\$72,000**.

I understand the City's need to plan for the future and developers'/citizens' need to contribute to the betterment our infrastructure – when it makes sense. The dedication program for this proposal is impractical.

These are two established streets with little opportunity for further subdivision and therefore little or no opportunity for the City to acquire more land through its dedication program. Additionally, the existing homes have improvements (retaining walls, garages) close to lot lines which the City would have to purchase and refurbish in lieu of any automatic dedications.



Walls Along Stanley



Walls Along Pembroke

All of these factors make the road dedication program unreasonable and financially disproportionate to the scale of this proposal.

Requested Variances

Although I am required to show road dedications on our plans and in the Site Data metrics, I have also included this information without the road dedication, which I believe is a more realistic analysis of this proposal.

New Small Lot SFD

The new small lot home has three variances when compared to the standard R1-S2 zoning. The following table explains these variances.

New Small Lot SFD				
Variance	Required (R1-S2)	Proposed	Proposed (Ded'n)	Rationale
Setback - Front	6.00m	4.19m	2.8m	<p>The house sits 1.8m (6') closer to the street than the R1-S2 zoning allows. In my last proposal, Planning indicated the placement of the home was well sited for the lot. I agree, since the goal is to provide positive street connectivity, as outlined in the Design Guidelines, while maintaining a functional rear yard for home owners (<i>Note: There is no rear yard variance for the SFD</i>).</p> <p>The following are a few examples of current City small lot bylaws that support creative infill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R1-S5: Rudlin – Front 3.5m • R1-S19: Springfield – Front 3.0m • R1-S21: McKenzie – Front 3.0m
Setback – Int East				<p>Without a window, the proposal meets the setback requirement. However, the east neighbour has expressed the importance of these windows and there are no overlooks as a result.</p> <p>According to the Small Lot Design Guidelines: <i>Relaxation of side yard requirements may be appropriate in some instances to facilitate interesting and innovative design solutions, provided that the encroachment into the setback does not adversely affect the privacy, sunlight or views of the adjacent property.</i></p>
With window	2.40m	1.52m	1.52m	
No window	1.50m	1.52m	1.52m	

New Small Lot SFD													
Variance	Required (R1-S2)	Proposed	Proposed (Ded'n)	Rationale									
Lot Area	260.00m ²	247.82m ²	225.03m ²	<p>In practical terms, the lot is 12.18 m² shy of the R1-S2 requirement. However, the size and massing of the building has been designed for the site and to conform to zone requirements for floor area and site coverage.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td><u>R1-S2</u></td><td><u>SFD</u></td></tr><tr><td>Floor Area:</td><td>190 m²</td><td>148.68 m²</td></tr><tr><td>Site Coverage:</td><td>40%</td><td>24.48% (26.96%)</td></tr></table> <p>The City has approved other small lot bylaws in support of infill that utilizes available land in a creative harmonious way. My request is not precedent setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• R1-S21: McKenzie – Lot Area 240m²• R1-S22: Grant – Lot Area 215m²• R1-S25: Pembroke – Lot Area 219.5m²		<u>R1-S2</u>	<u>SFD</u>	Floor Area:	190 m ²	148.68 m ²	Site Coverage:	40%	24.48% (26.96%)
	<u>R1-S2</u>	<u>SFD</u>											
Floor Area:	190 m ²	148.68 m ²											
Site Coverage:	40%	24.48% (26.96%)											


Existing Duplex

To my knowledge the City does not have a zoning bylaw to support a duplex on small lot, which does not preclude creating one should the proposal make sense. If we compare the new proposed duplex lot to the R1-S2 zone, it fares quite favorably.

Analysis of the Lot Area, Floor Area and Site Coverage reveals that the existing duplex building would meet the zoning requirements in terms of its size and coverage of the site **even on a 260m² lot**. The proposed lot is much larger and provides for wonderful outdoor space for the two existing residents.

Reviewing the Rear Setback shows that it could be identified as a Side Yard (see Rationale in the table below) Therefore the only 'real' practical variance request is for reduced parking.

Existing Duplex				
	Required (R1-S2)	Proposed	Proposed (Ded'n)	Rationale
Lot Area	260m ²	359.17m ²	309.98m ²	
Lot Width	10.0m	16.59m	15.20m	
Setbacks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front • Rear • Side (Interior) • Side (Ext) 	6.0m 6.0m 1.5m 1.5m	6.26m 2.50m* 0.30m** 8.24m	4.87m 2.50m 0.30m 6.85m	<p>* The duplex rear yard (east) is against the west side yard of the new home. Because the duplex has a large greenspace at the north west of its lot, this 'rear' yard is not a place for outdoor activity. It could be argued that it reads more like a side yard and would therefore conform to the 1.5m requirement</p> <p>** This is an existing condition that has the benefit of creating a large green yard space (about 180m²/1940ft²) on the north east part of the property.</p>
Bldg Height	7.5m	7.70m	7.70m	This is an existing condition an in practical terms equates to 6inches.
Floor Area (Total)	190m ²	153.85m ²	153.85m ²	
Floor Area Ratio	0.60	0.43	0.50	
Site Coverage	40%	29.38%	34.05%	
Parking	2	1	1	<p>The parking is situated in its existing location.</p> <p>See Transportation Management Strategy for more details.</p>
Green Space	NA	180m ²	141m ²	This is a large green space for residents. In fact the current duplex tenants utilize and share this space today.



This Site Plan (#1) shows the separation between the houses as more of a side yard arrangement, with the existing residence enjoying a large outdoor space in the northeast of the property (#2)

Transportation Management Strategy

Providing for the car in urban centres is in transition. The cost of land and desire for affordable housing, is making it very difficult to give up this precious resource to the car. People are now looking for housing close to urban centres where they can choose alternative transportation options and move away from vehicle ownership.

For this reason, the Official Community Plan (OCP) asks that we *consider reductions in parking requirements where geographic location, residential and employment density, housing type, land use mix, transit accessibility, walkability, and other factors support non-auto mode choice or lower parking demand.*

The property at 2035 Stanley is centrally located with easy access to all amenities. It has a very favorable walkscore which supports the OCPs intention and which is why we are requesting a parking variance for the duplex of 1 off-street stall. To support transportation alternatives, there is secured bike storage in the basement of the duplex. As well, 2 guest bike racks will be installed on the property (currently not shown on plans).



The City's Traffic department is in favor of this solution. When the original submission for the July 2014 Public Hearing was reviewed by the City, they were in favor of two parking stalls (1 for the duplex and 1 for the new home). Their requirement was to use the existing access and design the parking space in accordance with the Highway Access Code. The proposal reflects this request.

As well, the Traffic department was supportive of on street parking. They indicated that even though the frontage is 'green space' dedicated, this area of Fernwood supports this type of parking. They suggested some frontage improvements to accommodate the on street parking, which have not yet been detailed by the City.


City Policies

Official Community Plan and Regional Growth Strategy

Over the next 30 years, Victoria is expected to grow by an additional 20,000 residents. As a built-out city with little remaining undeveloped land, the OCP identifies the need to create more compact built environments within the Urban Core, Town Centres and Urban Villages and in close proximity to transit. This trend toward urbanization is skyrocketing as people move toward more sustainable, balanced lives close to work, play and amenities.


The OCP and the Regional Growth Strategy both have established goals to address this trend. The table below shows how this proposal supports these goals.

OCP Goal	Proposal
Housing Supply for Future Need – <i>Seek to accommodate population growth in the strategic locations, including an additional 10,000 residents in the Urban Core, 8,000 residents in and within close walking distance of Town Centres and Large Urban Villages, and 2,000 in Small Urban Villages and the remainder of residential areas in the city.</i>	Property is located: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 minute walk to North Park – a Large Urban Village. • 5 minute walk to the Fernwood – a Small Urban Village.
Land Management and Development - <i>Housing forecast growth of approximately 20,000 additional residents by 2041 is expected to reach Victoria's capacity available under existing zoning for new ground-oriented residential and exceed that for apartments, running the risk that housing will become increasingly more expensive as available capacity is depleted.</i>	Proposal keeps housing cost lower by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximizing use of available land now. • Utilizing land for homes and greenspace and less for cars.
Land Management and Development – <i>Urban development should focus on building coherent, livable places of character, where the goods and services people need are close to home.</i>	Proposal includes a completely revisioned design for the new home which architecturally compliments the neighbourhood and creates a livable 3 bedroom family home. Property is located walking distance to most amenities and public transit.
Land Management and Development - <i>Give consideration to site-specific amendments that are consistent with the intent of the Urban Place Designations and that further the broad objectives and policies of the plan, as appropriate to the site context.</i>	Minor variances are required to achieve a very workable solution for this property. See Requested Variances for detailed explanations

OCP Goal	Proposal
<p>Transportation – Consider reductions in parking requirements where geographic location, residential and employment density, housing type, land use mix, transit accessibility, walkability, and other factors support non-auto mode choice or lower parking demand.</p> <p>Future development is to consider transportation options that reduce fossil fuel dependence, help conserve energy and produce low greenhouse gas emissions and other air contaminants.</p>	<p>Property is well located for a desirable walkscore creating opportunities for alternative transportation and reduced reliance on the car.</p> 
<p>Land Management and Development - For areas designated Traditional Residential, consider new development, infill, and redevelopment.</p>	<p>Property lies within the Traditional Residential designation, and was identified for Small Lot Infill consideration.</p>
<p>Environment, Climate Change and Energy - Continue to promote the reduction of community greenhouse gas emissions, through compact land use patterns such as walkable and complete centres and villages.</p>	<p>Property centrally located to support residents ability to walk, bike or use public transit.</p>

Fernwood Area Plan

The property at 2035 Stanley is designated as 'Traditional Residential' which is primarily ground-oriented building forms. Interestingly, the map below is the Fernwood Plan from 1996 showing that 2035 Stanley was part of an area to be considered for Small Lot Infill housing. Some 20 years later, this is exactly what we are proposing.



Design Guidelines

Building

The goals outlined for Small Lot rezoning, all of which are supporting through this proposal, ask the City to:

- Support growth through small, adaptive and gradual change
- Revitalize neighbourhoods by allowing new infill construction
- Make (optimal) use of neighbourhood infrastructure (schools, water and sewer).
- Increase the quantity of detached dwelling lots while providing other options.
- Meet changing needs, wants and values of existing and future residents throughout the life cycle (e.g., the need for ground-oriented housing for families with children, the desire for smaller houses and yards for seniors, couples, empty nesters or singles).

With these goals in mind, Zebra Design has expertly applied architectural elements that are sensitive to the siting, massing and visual character of this small lot home and meet the Design Guidelines, such as:

- A streetscape that is sensitive to the character and rhythm of the neighbourhood.
- Horizontal features and smaller elements to visually reduce the size.
- Stepping back of second floor roof line to create an impression of 1.5 stories instead of 2.
- Roof detail, pattern changes and proportional windows for visual character.
- Heritage color and material finishes to harmonize with the area.

Landscape

In the new home, the front yard creates a welcoming street connection by combining soft landscaping of drought tolerant native plantings against the traditional picket style fence. This fence is mimicked and matches that of the existing duplex along both street frontages. Side and rear yard fences are 6' panels for outdoor privacy.

Most trees being removed are because of poor health, and is welcomed by the east neighbour who often has large dead branches falling into their driveway. One tree is being removed from the SFD lot to accommodate the new home and is being replaced with a Milky Way Dogwood in the south east corner. One cedar tree is being removed to accommodate parking.

Apart from the rear patio and entry sidewalk of the SFD, there is no hardscape. The pathway to the rear yard is flagstone to support sustainable landscape design. The remainder of the site is plantings and grass.

There is no extensive landscaping required for the existing duplex apart from maintenance and basic cleanup.

An arborists report identifying all trees was submitted with the original application and is included again with this application. Additionally, Talbot and McKenzie provided an updated review (July 16, 2105) of the Robina Trees in the road dedication area identifying these trees are reasonably healthy and require no special maintenance.

Green Building Features

- Retaining existing duplex
- Providing secure bike storage and guest bicycle parking
- Drought tolerant, native plantings, flagstone pathways, pavers for patio
- Energy Star Windows
- Energy Star Appliances
- Use of non HCFC expanding foam around window and door openings
- Fibreglass Exterior Doors
- Natural Hardi Exterior Siding
- Minimum 30 year warranty of roofing material
- MDF casing and baseboard trim (reducing reliance on old growth forest products)
- Installation of hardwired carbon monoxide detector to ensure air quality
- Low Formaldehyde insulation, subfloor sheathing, exterior sheathing, insulation, carpet underlayment and cabinetry.
- Low VOC Interior paints
- Programmable Energy Star thermostat
- Energy Star ventilation fans
- Toilets CSA approved, 4.8L flush volume or less
- Low flow faucets and shower valves

Summary

Thank you for taking time to read through this detailed report. I trust I have adequately addressed the concerns raised at the July 2014 Public Hearing and respectfully ask Mayor and Council to approve my request to rezone 2035 Stanley. To summarize, here's why:

1. Victoria is a built out city with little land left to create additional housing to meet the demands of population growth.
2. The road dedication program for this property is impractical and hampers the development potential of this valuable corner lot.
3. The minor variances are not precedent setting and do not negatively impact the design, siting, massing, and character of the new home and have no impact on the livability of the existing duplex.
4. The proposal is a creative solution to available land in an area where the OCP supports small lot infill.
5. It is a centrally located property with a very high walk score making it practical for residents to seek alternate transportation options.
6. Fernwood will have a beautiful new home to welcome another family to its community ☺

Sincerely,
Kim Colpman



Fernwood Community Association

1923 Fernwood Road,
Victoria, B.C., V8T 2Y6

(250) 384-7441

Email: landuse@thefcaca

September 10, 2015

Mayor and Council
City of Victoria
#1 Centennial Square
Victoria, B.C. V8W 1P6

Re: 2035 Stanley Street Rezoning Application (REZ00489)

Dear Mayor and Council;

The Fernwood Community Association held the Official Community Meeting for this proposed development in the main hall at 1923 Fernwood Road on July 7, 2015. No Preliminary Community Meeting was held concerning this proposal.

The proposal is to divide this R1-B property that currently has a legal non-conforming up and down duplex into two site specific zones. One new zone will retain the duplex and the second zone will allow for the construction of a new small lot home.

This proposal requires a number of significant variances that in our opinion would set a precedent that erodes the spirit of both the small lot and duplex zones. Additionally the Fernwood Community Association has adopted the following planning guideline concerning the small lot zone.

The criteria for small lot developments are already generous by allowing houses to be built on smaller lots with smaller set-backs. As a result requests for variances that enlarge the footprint of the house significantly – therefore reducing required set-backs - are not supported. Modest variances to allow for steps, small porches or bay windows will be considered by the land use committee, in consultation with neighbours, on a case by case basis.

The above concern would logically also apply to the duplex zone requested.

Another way to make better use of this lot and also increase the supply of affordable rental housing would be for the City to allow the construction of a one storey garden suite on this site with appropriate off street parking for both residences. This would also address the concern some neighbours have about parking. When looking at parking we believe it is important to look at the number of houses in the immediate vicinity that currently do not have off-street parking. A review of this kind would also need to consider the number of legal and illegal suites in the immediate area. Neighbours of this rezoning application have reported that a number of such suites exist including more than one per lot. Requesting the City enforce its current guidelines concerning such suites could inadvertently lead to a reduction in affordable rental housing. The neighbourhood currently seems to have the ability to accommodate these secondary suites as well as, potentially, an additional yet compact rental unit on the property in question with appropriate parking. Conversely, this rezoning proposal with its larger building footprint and reduced parking could upset that balance.

Additionally concern has been expressed that the proposed new building, with its outside entrance to the basement, could invite the development of an illegal secondary suite.

Sincerely,
Naomi Simpson per David Maxwell

David Maxwell
Chair, Land Use Committee
Fernwood Community Association

Pc: Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department,
City of Victoria



Talbot Mackenzie & Associates

Consulting Arborists

July 16, 2015

K.J. Colpman
967 Bank Street
Victoria, BC V8S 4B1

Re: Robinia trees in municipal road dedication at 2035 Stanley Avenue

During our recent site visit, at your request, we visually inspected the health and structural characteristics of the above ground portions of three Robinia psuedoacacia trees numbered 0337, 0349 and 0350 located within the property boundaries, but where they will be in the area of a proposed road dedication on the frontages of Stanley Avenue and Pembroke Street.

All three trees appear reasonably healthy with no fruiting bodies or other indicators of the presence of wood root decay pathogens in evidence. There was also no soil cracking, heaving, root plate lifting or any other indicators of root plate instability observed at the time of this site visit, and the structural characteristics of the three trees observed is typical of most Robinia trees of this size and age.

Our assignment did not include taking resistograph readings, increment core samples or other detailed structural analysis, and while we did not observe any visual evidence of the presence of large cavities nor did we observe evidence of health decline or the presence of disease pathogens or infestations of insect pests, the canopy of Robinia #350 is covered in a dense layer of English Ivy, making it difficult to inspect the structure of the tree beneath this layer of ivy growth.

The growth characteristics observed in #349 are common for this tree species, where the tree develops multiple stems and growth leaders that have narrow angles of attachment, making them susceptible to failure during severe weather conditions or when decay is present at these stem unions.

Our visual inspection did not find any evidence to indicate that the health of any of the trees observed are in decline or that they pose an immediate risk; however, trees of this species do require pruning on a cyclical basis throughout their life to reduce weight from the major stems and limbs as a method of reducing the risk of stem failure and to correct structural defects as they occur. It appears that Robinia #339 has been pruned historically to remove some of the stems that had a weakness present at the unions, but we anticipate that additional pruning will be required on a 5 year pruning cycle to address any re-occurring structural defects and to reduce the risk of failure of the multiple competing stems.

It is our opinion that in future years the trees are likely to have maintenance requirements similar to other mature Robinia trees that are part of the municipal tree resource.

Please do not hesitate to call us at 250-479-8733 should you have any further questions.
Thank You.

Yours truly,
Talbot Mackenzie & Associates



Tom Talbot & Graham Mackenzie
ISA Certified & Consulting Arborists

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are professionals who examine trees and use their training, knowledge and experience to recommend techniques and procedures that will improve the health and structure of individual trees or group of trees, or to mitigate associated risks.

Trees are living organisms, whose health and structure change, and are influenced by age, continued growth, climate, weather conditions, and insect and disease pathogens. Indicators of structural weakness and disease are often hidden within the tree structure or beneath the ground. It is not possible for an arborist to identify every flaw or condition that could result in failure nor can he/she guarantee that the tree will remain healthy and free of risk.

Remedial care and mitigation measures recommended are based on the visible and detectable indicators present at the time of the examination and cannot be guaranteed to alleviate all symptoms or to mitigate all risk posed.



Talbot Mackenzie & Associates

Consulting Arborists

June 07, 2012

Phil Large
607 Vancouver Street
Victoria, BC V8V 3T9

Re: Tree Retention Report for 2035 Stanley Avenue

Assignment: Prepare a tree retention report to be used during the construction of an additional residence on the property at 2035 Stanley Avenue.

Methodology: For this purpose we reviewed the site plan and layout of the building, driveway and parking footprints. During a June 06, 2012 site visit we examined and documented the tree resource on the property. For ease of identification in the field, each tree onsite was identified using a numeric metal tag attached to the lower trunk. Information such as tree species, size (dbh), Protected root zone (PRZ), Critical root zone (CRZ), health and structural condition, relative tolerance to construction impacts and general remarks and recommendations was recorded in the attached tree resource spreadsheet.

Tree Resource: The tree resource consists mainly of non-bylaw protected exotic tree species. Two (2) bylaw-protected Robinia trees grow on the property, where they are away from the general area of construction and where they are unlikely to be impacted.

Proposal: The proposal as outlined in the plans is to construct an additional residence on the east side of the lot and to widen the existing driveway to accommodate additional off street parking.

Potential impacts on the tree resource: From the information compiled during our site examination we have determined that it will not be necessary to remove any trees of bylaw-protected size to accommodate this proposal.

We are recommending that the following non bylaw-protected trees that will be impacted by the proposal be removed.

- Tree of heaven #0344 and #0346 – a tree species with an aggressive root system that makes it unsuitable to retain close to houses, hardscape and underground services.
- Douglas-fir #0343 – a tree species that has a low tolerance to construction impacts and is unlikely to survive.
- Big Leaf maple #0342 – that is infected with a wood decay pathogen
- Larch #0347 and Chamaecyparis #0348 – that are located within the footprint for the expanded parking area.

The plans indicate that the remaining trees on the property are to be retained.

Excavation: The proposed building footprint is located where the excavation will not impact the bylaw-protected trees on the property.

Blasting and rock removal: We do not anticipate that any explosive blasting will be required on this site. If blasting is required, it is located where there is unlikely to be any impact on the bylaw-protected trees.

Grade changes: Any proposed grade changes are outside of the critical root zones of the bylaw-protected trees.

Pruning: The pruning of bylaw-protected trees should not be required to accommodate or attain clearance from the proposed new residence or aboveground services now or in future years. Any pruning that is required will be for the benefit of tree health or to address existing structural defects.

Servicing: We did not review the servicing drawings for the purpose of this report. It should be possible, however to install both the aboveground and underground services without impacting the bylaw-protected trees. Should it be determined that underground services must be upgraded or replaced near the bylaw-protected trees, their location and potential impacts must be reviewed by the Project Arborist.

Off site work: We have not been informed of any requirements to up grade or replace the offsite services or any of the municipal infrastructure. We also do not anticipate any alterations to the drainage patterns that would impact bylaw-protected or municipal trees.

Mitigation of Impacts: It is our opinion that the proposal as reviewed in the plans that were supplied is unlikely to impact any of the bylaw-protected or municipal trees. Any of the non bylaw-protected trees that you wish to retain should be isolated from the construction impacts by erecting barrier fencing.

- **Barrier fencing:** Areas, surrounding the trees to be retained, should be isolated from the construction activity by erecting protective barrier fencing. Where possible, the fencing should be erected at the perimeter of the critical root zones or at the edge of the canopy dripline. **We also recommend erecting barrier fencing along the west edge of the proposed parking area to isolate the adjacent bylaw-protected Robinia tree #0349 from accidental encroachment on its root zone.**

The barrier fencing to be erected must be a minimum of 4 feet in height and constructed of solid material or flexible safety fencing that is attached to wooden or metal posts. If a flexible fencing material is used, the top and bottom of the fencing must be secured to the posts by a wire or board that runs between these posts. The fencing must be erected prior to the start of any construction activity on site (i.e. demolition, excavation, construction), and remain in place through completion of the project. Signs should be posted around the protection zone to declare it off limits to all construction related activity. The project arborist should be consulted before this fencing is removed or moved for any purpose.

Conclusion: It is our opinion that the construction as proposed in the plans that were supplied will not have a detrimental impact on the bylaw-protected trees on the property or on any municipal trees.

Please do not hesitate to call us at 250-479-8733 should you have any further questions.
Thank you.

Yours truly,

Tom Talbot & Graham Mackenzie
ISA Certified, & Consulting Arborists

CC – Nigel Banks

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are professionals who examine trees and use their training, knowledge and experience to recommend techniques and procedures that will improve the health and structure of individual trees or group of trees, or to mitigate associated risks.

Trees are living organisms, whose health and structure change, and are influenced by age, continued growth, climate, weather conditions, and insect and disease pathogens. Indicators of structural weakness and disease are often hidden within the tree structure or beneath the ground. It is not possible for an arborist to identify every flaw or condition that could result in failure nor can he/she guarantee that the tree will remain healthy and free of risk.

Remedial care and mitigation measures recommended are based on the visible and detectable indicators present at the time of the examination and cannot be guaranteed to alleviate all symptoms or to mitigate all risk posed.

TREE RESOURCE
for
2035 Stanley Avenue

Tree #	d.b.h. (cm)	Species	PRZ	CRZ	Crown Spread(m)	Condition Health	Condition Structure	Relative Tolerance	Remarks / Recommendations
0339	9, 10, 12	Tree of heaven	N/A	2.0	4.0	Good	Fair	good	Tri-dominant, ivy covered trunk, located partially on neighbouring property at 2027 Stanley Avenue.
0340	7, 8	Mountain ash	N/A	2.0	2.0	Fair	Poor	good	Co-dominant, 1 dead stem, suppressed.
0341	23	Chamaecyparis	N/A	2.3	4.0	Fair	Fair	good	Deflected top.
0342	39, 47	Big Leaf maple	N/A	8.5	11.0	Fair	Poor	moderate	Co-dominant, large hangers, 1 stem heavily decayed, <i>Ganoderma</i> fruiting bodies on both stems, heavily pruned. Poor specimen.
0343	52	Douglas-fir	N/A	8.0	6.5	Fair	Fair	poor	Epicormic growth, end-weighted limbs.
0344	40, 42	Tree of heaven	N/A	12.0	6.5	Fair	Fair	good	Included bark, tri-dominant, may be shared tree. Poor species to retain in residential area.
0345	multiple Stems	Mountain ash	N/A	3.0	3.0	Fair	Fair	good	9 stems between 8 - 10 cm diameter, growing near base of 0344.
0346	50	Tree of heaven	N/A	5.0	10.0	Fair	Fair	good	Located at Northeast corner of property, recent limb failure. Poor species to retain in residential area.
0347	20	Larch	N/A	2.0	4.0	Fair	Fair	good	Growing at base of retaining wall.
0348	25	Chamaecyparus	N/A	2.5	4.5	Fair	Fair	good	Growing at base of retaining wall.
0349	170	Robinia	15.0	12.0	11.5	Fair	Fair	good	10 stems, union above dbh, crossing stems, narrow unions, history of large stem removal.
0350	36	Robinia	N/A	4.0	8.0	Fair	Fair	good	One-sided canopy, included bark.

Prepared by:

Talbot Mackenzie & Associates

ISA Certified, and Consulting Arborists


Phone: (250) 479-8733

Fax: (250) 479-7050

email: Treehelp@telus.net

TREE RESOURCE
for
2035 Stanley Avenue

<i>Tree #</i>	<i>d.b.h. (cm)</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>PRZ</i>	<i>CRZ</i>	<i>Crown Spread(m)</i>	<i>Condition Health</i>	<i>Condition Structure</i>	<i>Relative Tolerance</i>	<i>Remarks / Recommendations</i>
0337	130	Robinia	15.0	10.0	11.0	Fair	Fair	good	End-weighted limbs, ivy covered. Recommend ivy removal to examine structure more closely.
no tag	30	plum	5.4	3.0	4.0	Fair	Fair	good	Municipal tree, pruning wounds.



Recommended Nursery Stock

Shrubs

Botanical Name	Common Name	Size
<i>Taxus canadensis</i> 'Fastigata'	Italian Yew	#5 pot, 1.5m Ht

Herbs

Botanical Name	Common Name	Size
<i>Viburnum tinus</i> 'Spring Bouquet'	Spring Bouquet Viburnum	#5 pot


Perennials, Annuals and Ferns

Perennials, Annuals and Ferns

Botanical Name	Common Name	Size
<i>Oxycoccus spicatus</i>	Deer Fern	#1 pot
<i>Festuca glauca</i>	Common Blue Fescue	#1 pot
<i>Hieracium sempervirens</i>	Blue Oak Grass	#1 pot

Groundcovers

Botanical Name	Common Name	Size
<i>Pachysandra terminalis</i>	Pachysandra	#1 pot



Key to Headings in Resource Table

d.b.h. – **diameter at breast height** - diameter of trunk, measured in centimetres at 1.4 metres above ground level


PRZ – **protected root zone** - the area of land surrounding a bylaw-protected tree that contains the bulk of the critical roots of the tree. Indicates the radius of a circle of protected land, measured in metres, calculated by multiplying the diameter of the tree by 18.

CRZ – **critical root zone** - estimated optimal size of tree protection zone based on tree species, condition and age of specimen and the species tolerance to root disturbance. Indicates the radial distance from the trunk, measured in metres.

Condition health/structure –

- Good – no visible or minor health or structural flaw
- Fair – health or structural flaw present that can be corrected through normal arboricultural or horticultural care.
- Poor – significant health or structural defects that compromise the long-term survival or retention of the specimen.

Relative Tolerance – relative tolerance of the selected species to development impacts.



TREE PROTECTION FENCING
 FENCE WILL BE CONSTRUCTED USING
 38 X 89 mm (2"X4") WOOD FRAME:
 TOP, BOTTOM AND POSTS. *
 USE ORANGE SNOW-FENCING MESH AND
 SECURE TO THE WOOD FRAME WITH
 "ZIP" TIES OR GALVANIZED STAPLES

* IN ROCKY AREAS, METAL POSTS (T-BAR
 OR REBAR) DRILLED INTO ROCK WILL BE
 ACCEPTED

DETAIL NAME:

TREE PROTECTION FENCING

DATE: Oct 30/07
 DRAWN: DM
 APP'D: RR
 SCALE: N.T.S.

E105
 DRAWING

Received
City of Victoria
JUL 30 2015
Planning & Development Department
Development Services Division

Victoria City Council - 26 Jun 2014

1409	1344	1409	1409
1413	1350	1413	1413
1417	1356	1417	1417
1421	1360/62	1421	1421
1427	1400	1427	1427
1429	1404 S	1429	1429
1437	1406	1437	1437
1445	1414	1445	1445
1447	1418	1447	1447
1453	1422	1453	1453
PEMBROKE ST			
1347	1348	1347	1347
1353/55	1358	1353/55	1353/55
2028	2010	2028	2028
2026	2018	2026	2026
2024	2013	2024	2024
2021	2007	2021	2021
2027	2003	2027	2027
2035	2001	2035	2035
1413	1414	1413	1413
1417	1422	1417	1417
1421	1426	1421	1421



2035 Stanley Street
Rezoning #00350
Bylaw #



**SUMMARY
SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION**

I, Kim Colpman, have petitioned the adjacent neighbours* in compliance with
(applicant)

the *Small Lot House Rezoning Policies* for a small lot house to be located at 2035 Stanley
(location of proposed house)

and the petitions submitted are those collected by JULY 28 2015.**
(date)

Address	In Favour		Opposed		Neutral (30-day time expired)	
	OWN	RENT	OWN	RENT	OWN	RENT
1413 Rembroke *other correspondence attached	✓					
1406, Rembroke	✓					
1408 Rembroke	✓					
1410 Rembroke	✓					
1404 Rembroke (current)		✓			✓	
1404 Rembroke (new owner Aug 10)	✓					
1400 Rembroke			✓			
2026 Stanley	✓					
2028 Stanley		✓				
2026 Stanley	✓					
2027 Stanley	✓					
2027 Stanley		✓				
1360/1362 Rembroke					✓✓	
1362 Rembroke						✓

SUMMARY	Number	%
IN FAVOUR	11	92%
OPPOSED	1	8%
TOTAL RESPONSES	12	100%

*Do not include petitions from the applicant or persons occupying the property subject to rezoning.

**Note that petitions that are more than six months old will not be accepted by the City. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain new petitions in this event.

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim Coleman
(print name)

, am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 Stanley Victoria B.C.

to the following Small Lot Zone: RL-S2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) DAVID + CAROLYN BERRY (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1413 PEMBROKE ST.

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒ No ☐

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

We feel this design is a significant
improvement over the one proposed
previously.

June 17 / 15
Date

[Signature]
Signature

June 17, 2015


Follow Up Meeting with David and Carolyn Berry Re: 2035 Stanley

On March 23, 2015, I met with Mr. and Mrs. Berry to discuss changes to our Proposal at 2035 Stanley, Victoria BC. David and Carolyn Berry are the contiguous neighbours to the east, living at 1413 Pembroke Street. A signed letter from March 23, 2015 is attached, indicating their acceptance of these changes.


Subsequent to this meeting, additional changes were made to the design. We contracted Zebra Design to prepare electronic CAD drawings for our Rezoning Submission Package (previously submitted hand drawn plans). Zebra Design consultants highlighted ways to make our design better, and to provide what we believe is an even more pleasing additional to the neighbourhood. Their suggestions have been incorporated into this new design, presented today to Mr. and Mrs. Berry. A copy of which was left for their records.

Mr. and Mrs. Berry have reviewed, and are satisfied with, the updated proposal. We have maintained the windows on the east and west sides at their request, as this is an important design feature from their site line perspective.


Sincerely



Kim Colpman



David Berry



Carolyn Berry

March 23, 2015

Meeting with David and Carol Barry Re: 2035 Stanley

After meeting with Mr. and Mrs. Berry and discussing their concerns, the following changes were made to our Proposal at 2035 Stanley, Victoria BC. David and Carol Barry are the contiguous neighbours to the east, living at 1413 Pembroke Street:

1. Design modified to include windows on side walls (east and west elevations) to eliminate 'blank' wall look. Windows will provide interest to the design and respect the privacy of the neighbours.
2. Incorporated a hedge along the southeast portion of the backyard and against the 6' fence to provide additional privacy and sound barriers.
3. Reduced the size of the patio from 20x12 to 12 x 12 to keep outdoor BBQ activity further away from Mr. and Mrs. Barry's property.

Mr. and Mrs. Barry also expressed other concerns which we have discussed.

1. A full bathroom in the lower floor may invite 'rental'.
 - This home is marketed toward families and as such must provide sufficient facility. A second full bathroom is an essential feature.
2. Blasting near their home.
 - Should blasting be necessary it will be carried out by professionals who are expert in mitigating damage to secondary properties. In the past, we have had no issues.
3. Existing Duplex needs attention.
 - This past summer, the fence was restored and painted. As well the yard was cleaned up. Should the rezoning be approved, we will be painting the exterior of the existing home as well.

Sincerely,

Kim Colpman

We have read the above letter and are satisfied with the changes Kim Colpman has made to her proposal for 2035 Stanley.

David Berry

Carol Barry

WE ALSO FEEL THE WINDOWS ADDED TO THE FACADE ON OUR SIDE IS AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT TO OUR SATISFACTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT.

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim Coleman am conducting the petition requirements for the
(print name)

property located at 2035 Stanley, Victoria B.C.

to the following Small Lot Zone: R1-S2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) Dido Hunter - owner of (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1406 Penwilde St (1406 & 1410 Penwilde St)

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒

No ☐

no reports of the owner due to rental

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

June 17/15
Date

Dido Hunter
Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I

Kim Sigman am conducting the petition requirements for the
(print name)

property located at 2035 Stanley

to the following Small Lot Zone: RS2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) Jocelyn Naudet (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1404 Pembroke St

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☐

No ☒ - Family Home (rented)

RENTED.
Daughter of
owner.

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

July 12, 2015
Date

[Signature]
Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim Coleman (print name), am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 Stanley

to the following Small Lot Zone: RS2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. **Please do not include your phone number or email address.**

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) Dr. Naicker (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1404 Rembrock

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒ No ☐

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☐ I support the application.

NEUTRAL

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

Owner contacted by phone (live out of province). Home
has been sold. New owners take possession mid-August 2015
Therefore Their position is neutral. I (Kim Coleman)
am trying to connect with new owners. Their realtor has
been sent a copy of our rezoning proposal and asked
to share it with new owners and to contact me.

Date

[Signature] (for Dr. Naicker - 250-362 2348)

Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

KIM CAPMAN
(print name)

, am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 STANLEY AVE.

to the following Small Lot Zone: R1-S2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) ALIK TATARYN (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1404 PEMBROKE

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒ No ☐ NEW OWNER

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

JULY 28/2015
Date

[Signature]
Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

_____, am conducting the petition requirements for the
(print name)

property located at 2035 STANLEY AVE.

to the following Small Lot Zone: _____

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) ALIK TATAROV (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1404 PEMBROKE

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒ No ☐

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

JULY 28/2015
Date

[Signature]
Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim Colman
(print name)

am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 Stanley, Victoria, BC

to the following Small Lot Zone: B2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following.

NAME: (please print) Julia (Julie) Lommerse (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1400 Pembroke St

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒ No ☐

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☐ I support the application.

☒ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

We're not opposed to any development on this site -- but we are opposed to the current proposal on the table for these reasons:

1. No Parking for New Home: no additional stalls have been proposed over and above the 2 which are on the site serving the 2 units of the duplex. For a house of this size then a minimum of 1-2 stalls should be provided.
2. Sq. footage of house is too large for the lot: If house were scaled back then there would be room for required parking and adequate green space. Perhaps a small cottage style home/coach house?

July 18, 2015

Date

[Signature]
Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim Duncan
(print name)

, am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 Stanley

to the following Small Lot Zone: RS2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) _____ (see note above)

ADDRESS: 1360/1362 Rembrake

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☐ No ☐

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☐ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

NEUTRAL

Comments:

Residents were not interested in reviewing the proposal and indicated they had no comment.

July 20, 2015
Date

Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim (Alman) (print name), am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 Stanley

to the following Small Lot Zone: Rsa2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) John Viszlai (see note above)

ADDRESS: 2026/2020 Stanley Ave.

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒ No ☐

LIVES IN 1 SUITE, RENTS THE OTHER

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

ensure that there is adequate offstreet
parking

July 23, 2015
Date

[Signature]
Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim Wolman
(print name)

, am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 Stanley

to the following Small Lot Zone: RS2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. **Please do not include your phone number or email address.**

Please review the plans and indicate the following:

NAME: (please print) ANDREW McMULLAN (see note above)

ADDRESS: 3358 SALSBURY WAY. V8P3K3

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☒ No ☐ of 2027 Stanley

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

25 JUNE 15
Date

Andrew McMullan
Signature

SMALL LOT HOUSE REZONING PETITION

In preparation for my rezoning application to the City of Victoria, I,

Kim Coleman, am conducting the petition requirements for the

property located at 2035 Stanley, Victoria BC

to the following Small Lot Zone: R1-S2

The City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy requires that the applicant poll voting age residents and owners of neighbouring lots to determine the acceptability of the proposal. Please note that all correspondence submitted to the City of Victoria in response to this Petition will form part of the public record and will be published in a meeting agenda when this matter is before Council. The City considers your address relevant to Council's consideration of this matter and will disclose this personal information. However, if for personal privacy reasons you do not wish to include your name, please indicate your address and indicate (yes or no) if you are the registered owner. Please do not include your phone number or email address.

Please review the plans and indicate the following

NAME: (please print) CASEY JORDAN (see note above)

ADDRESS: 2035 STANLEY AVENUE

Are you the registered owner? Yes ☐ No ☒ RENTER

I have reviewed the plans of the applicant and have the following comments:

☒ I support the application.

☐ I am opposed to the application.

Comments:

06/19/16
Date


[Signature]
Signature

SITE DATA - 2035 STANLEY AVE (PROPOSED LOT 1 - EXISTING DUPLEX)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION - PROPOSED LOT 1 OF LOT 1, SECTION 15, VICTORIA DISTRICT, PLAN 262
ZONE - SITE SPECIFIC (PROPOSED)

	PROPOSED	PROPOSED (EXCLUDING 1.33M DEDICATION)
LOT AREA	354.11 M ² (3566.02 FT ²)	304.45 M ² (3336.62 FT ²)
LOT WIDTH	16.94 M (54.43')	15.20 M (49.87')
LOT DEPTH (AVG.)	21.53 M (70.64')	20.14 M (66.08')
SETBACKS		
FRONT	6.25 M (20.54')	4.81 M (15.80')
REAR (TO HOUSE)	2.50 M (8.20')	2.50 M (8.20')
REAR (TO STAIRS)	1.50 M (4.92')	1.50 M (4.92')
SIDE (INTERIOR)	0.50 M (1.64')	0.50 M (1.64')
SIDE (EXTERIOR)	6.24 M (20.63')	6.85 M (22.47')
AVG. GRADE	25.94 M (84.15')	25.94 M (84.15')
BUILDING HEIGHT	7.70 M (25.25')	7.70 M (25.25')
STOREYS	2 STOREYS + BSMT	2 STOREYS + BSMT
FLOOR AREA		
UPPER FLOOR	84.71 M ² (915.00 FT ²)	84.71 M ² (915.00 FT ²)
MAIN FLOOR	84.08 M ² (905.00 FT ²)	84.08 M ² (905.00 FT ²)
LOWER FLOOR (BSMT)	71.93 M ² (774.00 FT ²)	71.93 M ² (774.00 FT ²)
1ST/2ND STOREYS, TOTAL	156.69 M ² (1694.00 FT ²)	156.69 M ² (1694.00 FT ²)
ALL FLOORS, TOTAL	231.74 M ² (2490.00 FT ²)	231.74 M ² (2490.00 FT ²)
TOTAL FLOOR AREA	156.69 M ² (1694.00 FT ²)	156.69 M ² (1694.00 FT ²)
FLOOR AREA RATIO	0.45	0.50
SITE COVERAGE	24.35 %	34.05 %
PARKING	1 SPACE	1 SPACE

	EXISTING	EXISTING (EXCLUDING 1.33M DEDICATION)
LOT AREA	606.41 M ² (6593.56 FT ²)	535.01 M ² (5758.61 FT ²)
LOT WIDTH	16.94 M (54.43')	15.20 M (49.87')
LOT DEPTH (AVG.)	36.37 M (119.40')	35.16 M (115.42')



Pembroke Street

Proposed Site Plan

Scale: 1:100



SITE DATA - 2035 STANLEY AVE (PROPOSED LOT 2 - NEW SFD)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION - PROPOSED LOT 2 OF LOT 1, SECTION 15, VICTORIA DISTRICT, PLAN 262
ZONE - R1-52 (PROPOSED)

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED	PROPOSED (EXCLUDING 1.33M DEDICATION)
LOT AREA	260.00 M ²	247.82 M ² (2667.54 FT ²)	275.03 M ² (2952.14 FT ²)
LOT WIDTH	10.00 M	16.30 M (53.74')	16.30 M (53.74')
LOT DEPTH (AVG.)		16.60 M (54.46')	15.21 M (49.90')
SETBACKS			
FRONT	6.00 M	4.14 M (13.59')	2.80 M (9.19')
REAR	6.00 M	6.00 M (19.68')	6.00 M (19.68')
SIDE (INT. - EAST)	1.50 M	1.52 M (5.00')	1.52 M (5.00')
TO HAS. RM. RANDOM	2.40 M	1.52 M (5.00')	1.52 M (5.00')
SIDE (INT. - WEST)	1.50 M	3.02 M (9.91')	3.02 M (9.91')
AVG. GRADE		24.30 M (79.72')	24.30 M (79.72')
BUILDING HEIGHT	7.50 M	1.56 M (5.12')	7.36 M (24.15')
STOREYS	2 + BSMT	2 STOREYS + BSMT	2 STOREYS + BSMT
FLOOR AREA			
UPPER FLOOR		51.51 M ² (554.42 FT ²)	51.51 M ² (554.42 FT ²)
MAIN FLOOR		51.68 M ² (556.26 FT ²)	51.68 M ² (556.26 FT ²)
LOWER FLOOR (BSMT)		45.44 M ² (490.64 FT ²)	45.44 M ² (490.64 FT ²)
1ST/2ND STOREYS, TOTAL		103.19 M ² (1110.68 FT ²)	103.19 M ² (1110.68 FT ²)
ALL FLOORS, TOTAL		148.63 M ² (1600.32 FT ²)	148.63 M ² (1600.32 FT ²)
TOTAL FLOOR AREA	140.00 M ²	103.19 M ² (1110.68 FT ²)	103.19 M ² (1110.68 FT ²)
FLOOR AREA RATIO	0.60	0.416	0.454
SITE COVERAGE	40.00 %	24.45 %	26.46 %
PARKING	1 SPACE	1 SPACE	1 SPACE

LOT 1 (EXISTING DUPLEX) - Average Grade Calculation									
SECT	Area	Front	Side	Back	Side	Back	Side	Back	Side
AB	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
BC	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
CD	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
DE	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
EF	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
FG	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GH	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
HI	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
IJ	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
JK	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
KL	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
LM	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
NO	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
OP	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
PQ	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
RS	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
ST	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
UV	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
WX	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
YZ	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
ZA	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
TOTAL	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
AVERAGE GRADE	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

LOT 2 (NEW SFD) - Average Grade Calculation									
SECT	Area	Front	Side	Back	Side	Back	Side	Back	Side
AB	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
BC	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
CD	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
DE	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
EF	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
FG	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GH	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
HI	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
IJ	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
JK	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
KL	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
LM	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
NO	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
OP	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
PQ	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
RS	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
ST	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
UV	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
WX	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
YZ	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
ZA	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
TOTAL	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
AVERAGE GRADE	25.15	25.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0



- DRAWING LIST:**
- SK0.1 SITE PLAN AND DATA
 - SK1.1 LOT 1 FLOOR PLANS
4 ELEVATIONS
 - SK2.1 LOT 2 FLOOR PLANS
4 ELEVATIONS
 - SK3.1 STREETSCAPES
 - SUPP. LANDSCAPE PLAN



Received
City of Victoria

JUL 30 2015

Planning & Development Department
Development Services Division

ISSUED FOR
REZONING 4 DP
JUNE 17, 2015

ZEBRADESIGN

1161 NEWPORT AVE
Victoria, B.C. V6S 5E6
Phone: (250) 360-2144
Fax: (250) 360-2115

Drawn By: K. KOSHMAN

Date: June 17, 2015

Scale: AS NOTED


Project:

PROPOSED 2-LOT
SUBDIVISION
2035 STANLEY AVE.

Title:
SITE PLAN &
SITE DATA

Revision:


Sheet:
SK
0.1
Proj. No. TBD




Lower Floor Plan - Lot 1
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"




Main Floor Plan - Lot 1
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"




Upper Floor Plan - Lot 1
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"




NORTH SIDE ELEVATION
(FIBERSOKE ST.)



SOUTH SIDE ELEVATION



FRONT ELEVATION
(STANLEY AVE.)



REAR ELEVATION

Elevations - Lot 1
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



ISSUED FOR
REZONING & DP
JUNE 17, 2015

ZEBRADESIGN

1161 NEWPORT AVE
VICTORIA, B.C. V8S 5E6
Phone: (250) 360-2144
Fax: (250) 360-2115

Drawn By: K. KOSHMAN

Date: June 17, 2015

Scale: AS NOTED

Project:

PROPOSED 2-LOT
SUBDIVISION
2095 STANLEY AVE.

Title:
LOT 1
FLOOR PLANS &
ELEVATIONS

Revision: Sheet:

SK
1.1


Proj No. TBD




Lower Floor Plan - Lot 2
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



Main Floor Plan - Lot 2
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"




Upper Floor Plan - Lot 2
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



Roof Plan - Lot 2
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"




FRONT ELEVATION
(FD-BROCK ST.)



WEST SIDE ELEVATION



REAR ELEVATION



EAST SIDE ELEVATION

Elevations - Lot 2
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

Received
City of Victoria

JUL 30 2015

Planning & Development Department
Development Services Division

ISSUED FOR
REZONING & DP
JUNE 17, 2015

ZEBRADESIGN

1161 NEWPORT AVE
Victoria, B.C. V8S 5E6
Phone: (250) 360-2144
Fax: (250) 360-2115

Drawn By: K. KOSHMAN

Date: June 17, 2015

Scale: AS NOTED

Project:
PROPOSED 2-LOT
SUBDIVISION
2035 STANLEY AVE.

Title:
LOT 2
FLOOR PLANS &
ELEVATIONS


Revision: Sheet:

SK
2.1

Proj. No. TBD



Streetscape - Pembroke St.
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



Streetscape - Stanley Ave
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



ISSUED FOR
REZONING & DP
JUNE 17, 2015

ZEBRADESIGN

1161 NEWPORT AVE
Victoria, B.C. V8S 5E6
Phone: (250) 560-2144
Fax: (250) 360-2115

Drawn By: K. KOSHMAN

Date: June 11, 2015


Scale: AS NOTED

Project:
PROPOSED 2-LOT
SUBDIVISION
2035 STANLEY AVE.

Title:
STREETSCAPES

Revision:	Sheet:
	SK 3.1
Proj No. TBD	

Copyright Reserved. These drawings are the property of the Landscape Architect. Reproduction in whole or in part without written consent of the Landscape Architect is prohibited.



Recommended Nursery Stock

Trees Total - 1	Botanical Name Cornus kousa 'Milky Way'	Common Name Milky Way Dogwood	Size #7 DBH, 2.5mH
Large Shrubs Total - 10	Botanical Name Arctostaphylos uva-ursi	Common Name Sheepsummer Bush	#5 DBH
	Botanical Name Hydrangea macrophylla 'Endless Summer'	Common Name Tall Blue Lacecap Hydrangea	#5 DBH
	Botanical Name Taxus canadensis	Common Name Bald Cypress	#5 DBH, 1.5mH
Medium Shrubs Total - 5	Botanical Name Hydrangea macrophylla 'Sister Theresa'	Common Name Sister Theresa Hydrangea	#3 DBH
	Botanical Name Rosa rugosa 'White Rose'	Common Name Rosa rugosa	#3 DBH
Small Shrubs Total - 10	Botanical Name Cornus kousa 'Milky Way'	Common Name Milky Way Dogwood	#2 DBH
	Botanical Name Morus nigra	Common Name Black Mulberry	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Nandina domestica 'Nana'	Common Name Nandina	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Pieris japonica 'Forest Edge'	Common Name Pieris	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Pieris japonica 'Forest Edge'	Common Name Pieris	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Pieris japonica 'Forest Edge'	Common Name Pieris	#1 DBH

Perennials, Annuals and Ferns Total - 21	Botanical Name Brunnera macrocarpa	Common Name Saxifrage	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
Groundcovers Total - 110	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH
	Botanical Name Polygala vulgaris	Common Name Tall Polygala	#1 DBH

Notes:
1. All work to be completed to current BCALA Landscape Standards
2. All soft landscape to be installed with an automatic irrigation system

Received
City of Victoria

JUL 30 2015

Planning & Development Department
Development Services Division



SCALE - 1:25

2035 Stanley - Landscape Concept Plan

1.	June 12-15	Issued for DP
----	------------	---------------

REVISIONS

LADR

20-495 Dufferin Rd. Victoria B.C. V8Z 1B8
Phone: (250) 598-0105 Fax: (250) 412-1919

PROJECT	Proposed Residence 2035 Stanley Avenue	
TITLE	Landscape Concept	
SCALE	As Shown	DRAWN CHECKED
PROJECT NO.	1201	
DATE	June 12, 2015	1 of 1 SHEET