

Pamela Martin

From: Annie Fisher [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2016 3:26 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Desmond Fisher
Subject: 1016 Southgate

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this rezoning application and development permit application.

It appears to me, a layman, that not only is the applicant asking to rezone, but to take great privilege in asking for variances to the zone requirements. I take great exception to this ask in that a community plan is made from much work from the City of Victoria and input from the citizens. The neighbourhood should not have to fight for their wishes each time a developer approaches with grandiose plans to change the neighbourhood. Why have a community plan if we must go through the exercise of changing zoning and dealing with variances each time a developer comes with his bold requests?

For me and others I believe, traffic is the first issue. If each new redevelopment puts 6 times the number of vehicles in our neighbourhood than exist at present you can understand why our streets are plugged with vehicles that are sitting idling in traffic that is going nowhere. It will be very difficult to improve our transportation infrastructure now, so I do not believe we should be developing with more vehicles in mind.

If I understand correctly, the minimum site reduction is a massive reduction for the zoning that is being asked for. And the building is being pushed out over the site at all angles to accommodate the proposed building. This lot at most would serve a front and back two story duplex and thereby produce a slow approach to growing the neighbourhood, IF WE MUST!

Please follow the community plan and do not allow variances. Victoria neighbourhoods count on City Hall to look out for its residents, not developers.

Sincerely,

Annie Fisher,
Pakington Street.

Pamela Martin

From: Daniel Kell [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2016 1:13 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Charlotte Wain
Subject: 1016 Southgate Street - Zoning Change/Development Permit
Attachments: Vancouver Street Parking Survey.numbers

My name is D.F.Kell my wife and I reside at 412 Vancouver Street. We have recently received notification that you will be considering the captioned application to rezone and issue a development permit containing several variances with respect to the above. We are writing as we have a major concern with the parking amendments contained in both the rezoning and development permit applications.

We have read the April 16, 2016 Street Parking Report ("Report") conducted by Boulevard Transportation and would submit that the comparables used on Table 2 do not reflect the scope of the development or the parking situation in the immediate area, thereby skewing the conclusions therein. The comparables are large large apartment blocks located throughout Fairfield with sufficient off-street parking to accommodate the number of suites at each site. This is far from the case in our immediate area.

For your edification I have attached a spread sheet summarizing the current parking situation in the immediate area. I concede that the data may not be One Hundred percent (100%) accurate but it is certainly a more appropriate comparison than those referenced in the Report. Please note in determining the results, where possible, I have used the same ratios as those contained in the Report. You will see that this summary concludes that there is an off-street parking shortage of 29.85 vehicles.

Vancouver Street between Southgate and Pendergast, which is zoned residential parking only, is the main on-street parking area for those vehicles in the spread sheet requiring on-street parking. The referenced area can reasonably park fifteen (15) mid-size automobiles leaving the balance to find space elsewhere. As a result the parking on Vancouver Street is usually full leaving the Vancouver Street residents and the other individuals looking for alternate parking spaces. It also should be noted that a number of these individuals leave their cars parked for extended periods of time thereby denying SFD owners and their guests reasonable access. You can see by the aforementioned how this issue cascades throughout the area. Clearly, the lack of off-street parking is a major disrupter and you need to insure that any new development has sufficient residential and visitor parking.

In keeping with the above we cannot support any zoning changes or variances that reduces residential parking to less than 1.5 space per unit.

D.F.Kell
[REDACTED]