

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: Reject the Proposal for Redevelopment of 943 Collinson St.

**From:** Megan Hawker [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2016 5:07 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <[mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca)>  
**Subject:** Reject the Proposal for Redevelopment of 943 Collinson St.

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of 967 Collinson Street and I am writing to tell you that I DO NOT support the proposal for the redevelopment of 943 Collinson Street as it is not appropriate for the site and the loss of green space, mature trees and all ready very limited street parking will not benefit anyone living on this street.

Please reject the application for redevelopment of 943 Collinson Street.

Regards,

Megan Hawker

**943 COLLINSON ST**  
**Proposed 3 unit townhouse development**

I support the project ☒

Name: Keyla Perry

Address: 967 Collinson

Comments:

I live in the apartments next door and have  
no problem with the proposed plan

I support the project ☒

Name: Abel Holderia

Address: 967 Collinson Street

Comments:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

I support the project ☒

Name: Raphaël Louis

Address: 910 Fairfield Rd.

Comments:

I think it is a  
good project for the community

\_\_\_\_\_

I support the project ☐

Name: Elizabeth Dichmont

Address: 205-967 Collinson

Comments:

No problem - nice looking building

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**943 COLLINSON ST**  
**Proposed 3 unit townhouse development**

I support the project



Name:

Stephanie Rothwell

Address:

918 Fairfield Rd

Comments:

---

---

---

I support the project



Name:

Anna Brisio

Address:

918 Fairfield Rd

Comments:

(None Resident.)

---

---

---

I support the project



Name:

\_\_\_\_\_

Address:

\_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

I support the project



Name:

\_\_\_\_\_

Address:

\_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

---

---

---

943 Collinson

From : Scott Mitchell [REDACTED]  
Subject : 943 Collinson  
To : [REDACTED]

Fri, Jun 03, 2016 09:40 AM

Dan

Scotty tree has examined your proposed 943 Collinson development. Two approximately 40cm dbh spruce and one 50 cm Douglas fir (located to the south of the lot and abutting the eastern property line) will not survive the development. Large lateral surface roots are predominate in the areas required for development.

Fir had co-dominant union with included bark. High hazard defect in Douglas Fir.

Regardless of development, previous topping events have made them poor candidates for retention.

Take care

Scott

Scotty Tree Service

Isa arborist 6831-a

Certified tree assessor Ctra 309

Shaw Webmail

---

expression of interest

---

**From :** Jim Connelly [REDACTED]

Mon, Jun 06, 2016 10:32 PM

**Subject :** expression of interest**To :** [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

My name is Jim Connelly , and I represent Nickel Brothers House Moving here on the South Island. I have been asked by Dan Hagel to reiterate , for the knowledge of Council and Mayor, our efforts thus far in regards to the possible relocation of the Building located at 943, Collingson.

For your information, I was made aware of the building some 15 months ago, and have been working diligently to ensure that the it will be removed rather than demolished. Our initial communication, I believe , was from the present owner, who was proposing to have us take the building to a potential lot in the Cowichan Valley. Initial discussions with both Ron Nickel, and later, with myself , and at least two site meetings, have hopefully provided the owner with all necessary information and a solid orientation as to how the House moving process works; included in this were some preliminary estimates as well.

Also, and concurrently, Mr Hagel has also made himself available to us to further the project should the present owner decide that the project was unworkable.

Much time has passed, and it now appears that the building is to be brought to us for removal. Let it be known therefore, that we are actively working on a removal, and have an interested party. It remains to be seen if all the moving parts can come together, but I will say for the record that the prospects are good, and that its been a pleasure to work with mr Hagel, who seems intent to get a positive result here, and has been extremely forthcoming from the start.

Should any of you have any specific questions or concerns, I would happily make myself available to answer all questions.

My cell number is [REDACTED]

best regards,

Jim Connelly

Nickelbrothers House Moving

---

[REDACTED] 2016-06-06

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: Development Permit with Variance Application - 943 Collinson St.

**From:** B Hobson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2016 11:11 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>  
**Cc:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** Development Permit with Variance Application - 943 Collinson St.

To Mayor and Council and Staff,

**Re: 943 Collinson St.**

I am writing this letter in opposition of this development application.

**1) I submit that the application is in conflict with the following sections of the Humboldt Valley Precinct Plan:**

*HUMBOLDT VALLEY PRECINCT PLAN*

*Pg 3. PLANNING PRINCIPLES:*

*# 4 The elements which define neighbourhood character and human scale development such as street trees and building massing are also valued.*

*# 6 The mature street trees and public and private green space are highly valued as community amenities and contributors to the liveability of the precinct.*

*PLAN SUMMARY MAP #2:*

*\*\*This map seems to indicate the property at 943 Collinson St. as General Residential with FSR up to 0.6:1*

*Pg. 8 TRANSPORTATION – POLICIES:*

*# 2 Parking variances may be considered subject to the provision of a parking study to the satisfaction of Staff and subject to Council approval.*

*Pg. 10 URBAN DESIGN – POLICIES:*

*# 4 Surface parking should be located to the rear of buildings or enclosed and should be adequately screened by landscaping.*

*Pg. 11 HUMBOLDT VALLEY DESIGN GUIDELINES:*

*# 2 Where new buildings with minimal setbacks are proposed, consideration should be given to the relationship of the new building to its immediate neighbours particularly with regards to shade and shadowing; visual privacy; balcony locations; window alignments; and overlook.*

*# 8 Mature street trees are identified by the community as an important neighbourhood characteristic. Retention of these mature trees is strongly supported. The impact of new buildings and in particular, reduced setbacks, on street trees will be assessed as part of a development application.*

A) The proposed building height and massing, in addition to the removal of trees and shrubbery will detract from the current appealing variety of the streetscape along Collinson St.

B) Review of the PLAN SUMMARY MAP #2 within the Humboldt Valley Plan appears to indicate the site as 'General Residential' with FSR up to .06:1. This proposal is for .09:1.

C) The Proposal has negligible screening of the surface and enclosed parking.

D) The parking variance requested should require a parking study, as the very limited street parking along Collinson will be negatively impacted.

E) The east side of our building at 936 Fairfield Rd. will be severely impacted by shade/shadowing and visual privacy. I believe a shadow study would be appropriate.

**2) The requested major variances to required site size and coverage (impacting required setbacks) are in conflict with the zoning. I submit that the intent of Variances is that they should be minor in nature.**

Correspondence from City Staff indicates:

*"In terms of the variances, these are largely as a result of the lot size. Normally, a larger lot would be preferable and could accommodate a development of this type with fewer siting variances, however, in this case all the adjacent lots have been developed and there is limited opportunity for lot consolidation"*

I submit that it is actually preferable the the proposal does not proceed as the lot does not accommodate the development of this type. Should the Developer wish to develop the site, he has the option to purchase the land and building to the rear of

943 Collinson. This would be a more normal and appropriate process for a development.

The development may be more appealing as a much smaller duplex and would likely still be economically beneficial to the developer.

Another option would be for Council to reduce the zoning of the site.

Thank you for your consideration in rejecting this proposal.

Cordially,

Brian Hobson

401-936 Fairfield Rd.

Victoria

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: email to Mayor and Council re: 943 Collinson

**From:** Elizabeth Dichmont [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2016 3:53 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <[mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca)>  
**Subject:** 943 Collinson

I understand that you are considering a development proposal at the following address.

I have seen the plans and want you to know I endorse them. The building is attractive and in my opinion will fit in terms of height and design with the surroundings.

E. Dichmont  
205-967 Collinson



## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: 943 Collinson Street

**From:** Brady Taylor [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 07, 2016 4:09 PM  
**To:** Council Secretary <councilsecretary@victoria.ca>; Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 943 Collinson Street

Good Afternoon Council,

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed development at 943 Collinson Street. I currently reside at 933 Collinson Street, in a single family dwelling.

I am writing in support of the development application made by Mr. Dan Hagel. I feel that in these times of low vacancy rates and high housing costs, that we need to flexible with relaxations to the Zoning Regulation Bylaws that propose to increase density and provide more homes in the downtown area.

I understand from that Mr. Hagel that most of the local residents are in favour of replacing the current single family dwelling with three townhouses, with the only concerns being raised by select occupants of the large multi-unit condominium building next door to the site. I would caution council to consider these concerns as 'NIMBY-ish' and from a place of self-interest, not what would be most practical for the neighbourhood.

As a single father of two young children, I am hopeful that increases in density and homes provided will allow access to the area for other young families, without having to choose to live in an apartment or condominium.

Please do no hesitate to contact me as outlined below if there are any questions or comments.

Best Regards,

Brady Taylor

**Brady Taylor, P.Eng.**



Herold Engineering Limited

1051 Vancouver St.  
Victoria, BC V8V 4T6  
Canada

Tel: 250-590-4875

Fax: 250-590-4392

Cell: [REDACTED]

Email: [BTaylor@Heroldengineering.com](mailto:BTaylor@Heroldengineering.com)

Web: <http://heroldengineering.com>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this email is intended only for the addressee. Its contents (including attachments) are confidential and may contain privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use,

**Pamela Martin**

---

**Subject:** FW: 943 Collinson development application - request for feedback from Council

**From:** B Hobson [REDACTED]

**Date:** May 18, 2016 at 4:07:59 PM PDT

**To:** <ccoleman@victoria.ca>, <mayor@victoria.ca>, <CWain@victoria.ca>

**Cc:** <malto@victoria.ca>, <bisitt@victoria.ca>, <jloveday@victoria.ca>, <mlucas@victoria.ca>, <pmadoff@victoria.ca>, <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>, <gyoung@victoria.ca>

**Subject:** 943 Collinson development application - request for feedback from Council

Re: 943 Collinson development application - request for feedback from Council

Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

My wife and I are very recent residents of Victoria, (after immigrating from Gordon Head in Saanich). To date we have been enjoying our new life at 936 Fairfield Rd, with our home overlooking Collinson St.

We attended a presentation a few days ago from the developer of 943 Collinson St. In this presentation the developer indicated that Council “wants” consistently high buildings along Collinson St, as his rationale for Council supporting the massive variances requested for this “orphan lot”, bringing the new building to the same height as the buildings on either side of it. Are not variances meant to be rather minor in nature?

We are looking at across Collinson to a Heritage Home nestled between two much higher multi-family buildings, and we submit the variances in height, especially with several trees and much green space is quite appealing.

We would respectfully request feedback from Mayor and Council to confirm if this is really what our City Council wants (all similar height buildings), and if so, please explain the purpose of the constraints of zoning on this property, and the contradiction to the guidelines from the Humboldt Valley Plan. We are concerned that the developer may have been misleading us, and our other neighbors to garner the support he seems to have obtained.

Thank you very much.

Regards,

Brian Hobson  
401-936 Fairfield Rd.  
[REDACTED]

**Pamela Martin**

---

**Subject:** FW: 943 Collison development application

**From:** Mike Nizker [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 08, 2016 11:54 AM  
**To:** 'Victoria Mayor and Council'; 'ccoleman@victoria.ca'; 'mayor@victoria.ca'; 'CWain@victoria.ca'  
**Cc:** 'malto@victoria.ca'; 'bisitt@victoria.ca'; 'jloveday@victoria.ca'; 'mlucas@victoria.ca'; 'pmadoff@victoria.ca'; 'cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca'; 'gyoung@victoria.ca'  
**Subject:** 943 Collison development application

Dear Mayor and Council,

We were quite disturbed to learn about the details of the proposal in question (Development Permit request 0008 for 943 Collinson Street). We were dismayed by the fact that this proposal even came so close to being approved. We are certain you are aware about fragrant violations by this proposal of the code for R3AM1. Therefore, in our letter would like to discuss not these violations, but rather public and legal aspects of the matter.

1. **Public aspect.** Accepting the proposal in discussion would set a very dangerous precedent. This would significantly devalue the validity of the decisions made by the **City** and bring serious damage to the reputation of the acts made by the **Council**. Indeed, what is the value of a rule that can be easily broken under the pressure from the same group of people this rule was designed to regulate?
2. **Legal aspect.** It is clear that accepting the proposal in question infringes the rights of the same very citizens whose rights **City Council** is called to defend. This would render the decision making body legally vulnerable and open it for the legal actions that would have rather solid grounds.

Based on the above we express our hope that the proposal that violates existing rules and infringes our intrinsic rights will be turned down. If required, we are ready to offer our help in the process because we are determined to defend our rights with all means that our society offers.

Several citizens have already sent their objection letters to Victoria Major and Council. They shared the replies they received. Unfortunately, these replies were carbon copies of one another. Concrete objections of the citizens are not even discussed. Were citizens' letters read?

The irony is that these responses have been sent by someone working in Citizen Engagement department. Should City of Victoria patent a new way to engage citizens by not addressing and not even listening their concerns? Do those responsible for enforcing the rules set by the city expect that the citizens whose rights are infringed will somehow stop objecting? Well, this is not going to happen.

Truly,

Dr. Eugene Nizker  
Dr. Mike Nizker  
403-936 Fairfield Rd.