



234 Menzies St
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 2G7

www.jbna.org

June 11, 2015

Mayor & Council
City of Victoria

Re: Relocation of 524-526 Michigan Street Heritage Houses to Dallas Road

On Wednesday, June 10th, JBNA held its General Meeting at which the new sidewalk along Montreal Street, the relocation of the Michigan Street Heritage Houses and the proposed development for 701 Belleville (CALUC meeting). This letter is in response to the Heritage House discussion/feedback. A separate letter will be sent for the 701 Belleville CALUC review once Meeting Minutes have been completed.

By way of background when the siting of the heritage houses was being contemplated, considerations included finding a location that would provide a “fit” for the houses, both contextually and size, is difficult within Sites that would house both buildings are difficult to find.

The site being proposed has three directly adjacent neighbours. One to the east in a small single home, and two others to the north (back) in a front/back duplex and there is a lane way separating the Dallas property from the duplex. The owner of western part of the duplex has sent notes but is not a full-time resident and the property is normally rented.

Significant consultation has occurred with the eastern-most owners of the duplex. Tim VanAlstine and I have met with them on more than one occasion and convened a meeting with them and the developers (Karen Jawl and architect). Adjustments have been made, and discussions continue.

Attached for your consideration is a string of e-mails that detail the remaining issues.

There were 86 people in attendance at the JBNA meeting. Regarding the Capital Park development, there were general questions about the staging of various steps of the work with regards to the creation of the foundation of Capital Park and the relocation of the heritage houses to Dallas Road. Separating out the topics, comments regarding the heritage houses include questions or comments from four residents at the meeting and two written submissions were read out at the meeting and responded to by Karen Jawl. During the presentation, the rationale for the siting, and the adjustments made to resident considerations were described including front-back siting and revised side-yard setbacks.

Q/A:

Q: Dock St resident: Likes look of the proposal, knows the people who are neighbours and wants them to be “happy”. What is being done regarding site-lines and views.

A: In addition to the placement of the east house further back on the site, the high plantings will be removed and lower planting placed on the site. The issue of a second parking pad is still being looked at.

Q: What is the timing of the moving of the houses.

A: The Houses are likely to be relocated in September with work being done thereafter.

Q: 230 Dallas resident: This lot has been a single house lot. Did you look at 2 different lots for the houses leaving only one of the houses here? Concerned that heights and look will have impact on nearby properties when/if they are developed.

A: The site is historically approved for 2 separate houses. While some variances are needed to accommodate two intact heritage houses, the site density, shadowing, and sightlines will be less impacted by the 2 heritage houses than by a multi-family development that would likely be built if the heritage houses were not placed there.

Question: Marg read, for the public record, two letters from area residents regarding siting of the 2 heritage houses at 224 Dallas. The immediate neighbor behind the site (Westmost duplex) disagrees with the plan as it will reduce his view. A resident of Pilot Street is concerned that the houses are too large for the proposed site and suggested alternate sites (Kingston/Pendray), including the possibility or relocation outside James Bay.

A: As had already been described, careful attention has been paid to minimizing impact on sightlines and view cone. The reduction in view for the westmost owner, from what would be permitted without variance, is 4%.

A: Relocation of the 2 heritage houses within James Bay was a condition of the original project approval. As was described, numerous sites within James Bay were considered - some were too small another very good site was sold – in the end a list was reviewed with the City and, while not perfect, 224 Dallas was determined to be the best site available. The suggested location of Pendray and Kingston would not be suitable as the lot depth of 60ft is less than the depth of one of the houses at 62ft.

Comment: Most heritage houses in James Bay exceed current zoning limits and would require variances if constructed today. Site not perfect, but thanks for your extraordinary effort to achieve a good result.

Q: When do you expect the variance hearing be held for the heritage houses?

A: August



President, JBNA

Cc: Councilor Lucas
Murray Miller, Brian Sikstrom, Jim Handy, Planning
Christine Johnston, Resident

E-mail string of June 11, 2015 re Michigan Heritage House relocation to Dallas:

From: Karen Jawl <karen.jawl@jawlproperties.com>

Date: June 11, 2015 3:56:35 PM PDT

To: Christine Johnston

Cc: "Goff, Allan" XXXXXXX "Marg Gardiner, JBNA" <marg.jbna@shaw.ca>, Timothy VanAlstine

Subject: RE: Updated Site Plans

Thanks for your email Christine.

Yes there have been a number of versions of the site plan as the various iterations progressed to respond to neighborhood feedback, the most recent of which was the May 11th one that was drawn up after the meeting at your home. In this version the eastern house was shifted back 1.24m to respond to the request that front windows of this house be no closer to Dallas Road than the front windows of the other house which I believe is what was illustrated on Marg's sketch from that meeting. The front windows of the Eastern house are 6.95 meters off the street compared to the 6.49 meters back to the front windows of the western house, so I believe we have achieved what was requested.

The City has not indicated the number of additional residential stalls that will be added on Dock Street as this idea just came up this week but it is likely they will be able to add 2. They have been very cooperative and willing to accommodate our request on Dock Street. As I see it there are two priorities, one is protecting the safety and enjoyment of the lane and the other is ensuring there is adequate parking to serve the homes so as not to have people parking illegally on the lane or placing a level of demand on the surrounding parking that is upsetting to other neighbours. As mentioned we will delete the parking pad for the western house given that there will be adjacent street parking, but would like to have the option of retaining the parking pad for the eastern home but I will commit to landscaping this area should the buyer of this home prefer a larger yard to parking. I suspect the likely buyer for these homes will be a families with children who will share the priority of keeping the lane a safe and enjoyable area for everyone.

Karen Jawl

From: Christine Johnston [a1b57169@telus.net]

Sent: June 11, 2015 2:57 PM

To: Karen Jawl

Cc: Goff, Allan; Marg Gardiner, JBNA; Timothy VanAlstine

Hi Karen,

Thank you for getting back to me so quickly. There seem to be various versions of the map. The first one you sent on April 20, then a revised one in May 11, and then the modified one sketched in that Marg Gardner suggested, of having the two front windows parallel with the eastern house but further back. The complication is that the Dallas Rd is NOT at right angles to Dock and the 224 Dallas properties; so the May 11 version makes only the western corner of the windows parallel but the eastern house front window still quite a bit south of what we had drawn in, which is not so good for our view.

The parking does concern me as this lane is actually more a WALKWAY used by most of the tenants of the big apartment block on Dock.

Cyclers also use it avoid busy Dallas. Children use it as a safe place it for playing when a hard surface needed. Most of the houses in the neighbourhood (except the one originally planned as a B and B) have very few cars on this lane. Several houses use it for their MAIN FRONT DOOR. Nearly all use Dock or Pilot for visitors. If anyone parks in the lane way proper we have the right to call police to remove it altho we are often tolerant if we know them well. Our visitors are expected to walk the few feet to Dock St. We occasionally use our grass for a visitor who does not want to walk to the street but that is rare.

The Dallas cross walk is some distance from any proposed Dock street parking if that parking (reserved for two residential spaces all day) starts half way up the edge of the property. There should be no problem at all and many of the crosswalks around town have only about 20 feet empty near them. So that reasoning does not seem logical.

I think the city has not looked carefully at all this so we shall speak to them if you fail to convince them. Let us know.

Sincerely,
Christine and Mel Johnston

----- Original Message -----

From: [Karen Jawl](#)

To: [Christine Johnston](#)

Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2015 9:20 AM

Hi Christine,

Thanks for coming to the JBNA meeting last night. Further to your question the plans presented last night and submitted to the City reflect the changes we outlined below and in the attached that we sent after meeting with you at your home. The set back from Dallas Road of 226 Dallas is 6.95m which reflects the 1.24m increase from the previous version.

I did talk to the City about adding additional street parking so we could eliminate the parking pads. They will not add any street parking on Dallas due to the proximity to the cross walk but have agreed to add residential parking on Dock Street so we will be able to eliminate the parking pad on the western house. I will talk to our team about the parking pad on the eastern property. We don't want to create a situation where there is insufficient parking and owners end up parking in front of Linda's house or in areas where others are used to parking. If we are able to pre-sell the house and the owners just have one car it would be easy for us to just landscape this area instead. I understand it is concern of yours and we will keep it in mind to see how we can improve it.

Karen Jawl

From: Karen Jawl

Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2015 9:42 AM

To: Christine Johnston; Allan Goff; Rutherfords K and L;

Cc: Timothy VanAlstine; Marg Gardener (marg.jbna@shaw.ca)

Hi All,

Thanks for the feedback and comments in the last few weeks. In response to your suggestions the following changes have been made in the attached drawings:

1. The most eastern house (next to Linda's property) has been moved west by .14 meters to provide a slightly bigger gap between Linda's and this house.
2. The most eastern house (next to Linda's property) has been shifted back 1.24 meters to better preserve Christine and Mel's view from their living area.
3. Both garages have shifted to the east and closer back to the lane to prevent someone from parking behind the garage and potentially having the back of their parked car sticking out onto the lane. The shift to the east was determined to not impact views.
4. The western house was already optimally located to minimize the SW view impact. The attached View Cone illustrates the following:

- a. The black outline shows the current condition on site with Bruce's house. The black line shows the current view cone.
 - b. The yellow outline shows what could be built on the site fully compliant with the zoning. The yellow line shows what the view cone would be under this scenario. This represents an 8% reduction in the view cone from the current condition.
 - c. The blue outlines shows what it would be with the heritage houses on the site. The blue line shows what the view cone would be under this scenario. This represents a 12% reduction in the SW view cone from the current condition, or a 4% reduction in the view cone from what is permitted in the zoning.
5. We have engaged a landscape architect and I have given him the following direction:
- a. Maintain a fence between Linda's house and the heritage house.
 - b. Remove the bigger bushes that are in the sight lines from 15/17 Dock Street.
 - c. New landscaping should be kept under the sight lines from 15/17 Dock Street.

Our next step will be further developing the interior plan and site plan, so the plans will continue to evolve but the siting of the houses is now firming up.

We are aiming to submit our package to the City around June 1 and are also scheduled at the JBNA meeting on June 10th. If you would like paper copies of the attached I can mail them to you. I will also keep you updated as our plans progress.

Karen Jawl
Jawl Properties Ltd.
3350 Douglas St. - Suite 100
Victoria, BC, V8Z 3L1
Tel: (250) 414-4172
www.jawlproperties.com