



## ROCKLAND NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION

July 12, 2014

Mayor and Council  
Planning & Development Department  
City of Victoria

Re: 1745 Rockland Avenue

It is the RNA's understanding that this property clearly fits the definition of a panhandle lot according to Schedule A Definitions. There is nothing in the Schedule H Panhandle Lot Regulations to indicate time sensitivity (as with "Private Garage", for example); therefore, the regulations should apply to all lots which fit the definition. R1-A Zoning 1.1.2 refers only to the size of the lot area and the width of a lot required for building. The reference to panhandle lots in (e) falls within this heading. It does not limit the application of panhandle regulations in general.

Panhandle lot regulations were put in place to protect the privacy of all of the immediate neighbours. Floor area and height restrictions prevent a huge building from looming over back yards. Reasonable setbacks and site coverage preserve green space and buffer adjoining properties. Property owners rely upon the fact that the zoning definition of a panhandle lot protects them from overbuilding in their back yards.

The proposal for 1745 Rockland ignores these regulations:

Instead of respecting the 280m<sup>2</sup> floor space, the proponent seeks 836.04m<sup>2</sup>.

Instead of the maximum 1 storey, 2.

Instead of the 7.5m setbacks, 3.9m.

Instead of a single residential building, 6.

At the CALUC meeting of March 5, 2014, significant concerns about loss of privacy, site drainage, traffic and loss of the urban forest were raised, and the proponent committed to addressing them.

The applicant acknowledged concerns around the future of the property as strata and agreed to include legal language in the strata bylaws that would

1. protect the common property trees which provide privacy to the adjacent residents, including replacing them with equivalent species beyond their natural life and maintaining and replacing Good Neighbour Fencing as required, and
2. provide strata bylaw language preventing the development of secondary living units.

Further to privacy concerns, it is important that the dual row cedar hedging along 1723 Green Oaks Terrace and 926 Richmond be installed and promptly replaced in the event of die off.

The site slopes to the south, and the downslope neighbours on Richmond voiced concerns about increased run-off with more hard surfacing. A commitment was made by the applicant to provide engineered site services that would alleviate any problems with three catch basins and storm drains as required to remediate run-off.

There was considerable concern about traffic speeds on Richmond, the property entrance, and visibility. The proponent agreed to work with local residents and Transportation, reviewing what impact the proposed development would have on traffic. This would be supported by passing the proposed changes to the Street and Traffic Bylaw currently being considered to reduce speed from 50 to 40 kph on Richmond Road from Fort Street to Crescent Road.

A commitment was made to retain as many of the mature trees as possible and to protect the heritage home garden.

Understanding that plans change, we emphasize how important it is that the windows on the north and south sides of the strata units remain as shown, high and narrow on the walls to allow light but to prevent overview of the neighbours.

The RNA cannot overstate its primary objection to this proposal. With a panhandle lot in their backyards, neighbours should be able to trust that the regulations will be respected and that a one-storey single family dwelling with significant setbacks is all that can be built there. Council would be letting them all down by considering a development three times that in mass and six times that in density.

Sincerely,

Janet Simpson, President  
Rockland Neighbourhood Association