

## Christine Havelka

---

**Subject:** FW: Late addition to January 28, 2016, Council Meeting - Item F.1.1. Zoning Regulation Bylaw (No. 1050) - 16-004

---

**From:** Marg Gardiner, JBNA [

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 27, 2016 8:52 AM

**To:** Christine Havelka

**Subject:** Late addition to January 28, 2016, Council Meeting - Item F.1.1. Zoning Regulation Bylaw (No. 1050) - 16-004

**To:** Mayor & Council  
City of Victoria

**Fr:** Marg Gardiner, President JBNA & Co-Chair JBNA CALUC

**Re:** **Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw No. 1050 Public Hearing**

Please accept this e-mail as input to the Public Hearing regarding the Zoning Regulation Bylaw No. 1050.

Having received the notice of the Hearing only yesterday morning, the JBNA Board has not had sufficient time to prepare a full response. However, I believe that this input is important and ask that the bylaw be given further consideration in light of the experience gleaned over the past couple of years as developers have been directed to comply with the amendment prior to its approval.

With changes, there can be unintended consequences. That is what has been experienced as the policy has led to developments that do NOT complement the City's food/garden initiatives and the need for "family-friendly" dwellings. I understand that there needs to be a balance between roof height and front-slanting garage entrances, but perhaps the balance needs to be re-considered, for reasons that follow.

The Situation:

- ~ The default zoning for most James Bay properties is R-2.
- ~ Typically, a small house or tired duplex is replaced by a duplex
  - ~ such developments do not go through the CALUC process as zoning changes are not required
  - ~ developers have been asked to comply with the draft bylaw amendments.
- ~ Rather than create two driveways at the street, one driveway is being created, running down the side of the duplex with the backyard serving as a double parking area with access to garages, resulting in hard surfacing of most of the rear area.
- ~ The rear of the property, being a turn-around space for vehicles and occupied by driveways is no longer suitable for use by families as a play area. With the rear yard being dominated by cars, young children can not play freely.
- ~ "traditional" back-yard garden opportunities are diminished or lost.
- ~ In passing, developers of these properties have complained as they understand that the residences are becoming less family-friendly, and the loss of a green private space becomes a quality of life concern.

In summary, the cost of more public space at the front of a duplex with the creation of one drive-way has resulted in more hard-surfaced areas (whether or not permeably surfaced) and considerably less area available, if any, for food garden and/or other family-use.

As densification creates condo-living, the availability, especially for families, of yard spaces for children and gardens becomes more rare, and even more important.

Could not the City become more "creative" and solve this dilemma of this policy not being compatible with other City policies?

For your consideration,

Marg Gardiner

cc: JBNA Board