

Development Services

Attn: Rob Bateman

1 Centennial Square

Victoria, B.C. V8W 1P6

May 19, 2021

The following outlines our response to the Application Review Summary sent by email April 08, 2021. Updated drawings and reports are also included.

Development Services

The application is still not supportable.

- After meetings with the Area Planner to discuss these most recent staff comments, the biggest concern is to protect privacy and overlooks for neighbours. To address this:
 - Lot A House – all upper bedroom windows have been removed from the rear (south). The only window on this elevation is an obscured bathroom window.
 - Lot B House – on the rear, 2 large windows have been removed from the ensuite and the remaining window is obscured. The master bedroom window sizes have been reduced to 'piano' type windows and are also obscured.
 - For Lot A - A site plan is included to show distances between neighbours:
 - Distance from Lot A house to the neighbours closest window is **27.5m (90ft)**.
 - The picture below shows a large tree that obscures windows and overlooks from the neighbour into the new yard of Lot A.



- This picture shows how the neighbours deck is higher and actually looks over/down onto Lot A, therefore it is more them looking into the new yard rather than the other way around.



- For Lot B – this site shows:

- Distance from Lot B house to the neighbours home is **9m (30ft)**. Note that Lot B rear yard is against their *side* yard making this setback reasonable.
- The picture below shows the side of the neighbours home. There is no outdoor activity space here for this neighbour nor any significant windows for Lot B to look over/into. As well, a large tree obscures the outdoor space and offers privacy to that neighbour.



- The Outdoor patio for Lot B is at the front of the home to increase privacy for both the rear southern neighbour. There is fencing and landscaping to provide a further buffer.
- There are only 2 piano windows facing the south neighbour, and therefore no overlooks.
- Overall, the setbacks, window placements, outdoor recreation areas and privacy are not inconsistent with other homes throughout the neighbourhood and are maintain reasonable living conditions for all.

Land Development Review:

Conditions to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

- As per the comments in the December 15th, 2020 Application Review Summary provided, Sheet 4 is still missing in the first 3 sets of sheets labelled Sheets 1-4. Please revise the next plan submission accordingly and revise the title blocks to reflect what each set conveys.
 - DONE
- Please confirm if the existing home and new accessory building on Lot 1 will be fee simple lot, or converted to a strata. Sheets 1 to 3 show the existing main residence as “Strata Lot 1”, yet the remainder of the plans do not indicate it as being a strata. Revise the next plan submission accordingly.
 - The existing home with the new Accessory Building will be on a fee simple lot.
- As per the comments in the December 15th, 2020 Application Review Summary provided with regards to removing the property line between the 2 proposed new strata lots as currently shown, the plans remain incorrect. Please see the attached mark up of Sheet 5 of 5 with staff’s understanding of Strata Lot 2’s property lines. Also, the numbering of Sheet 5 of 5 does not correspond with the previous Sheet 4 of 4. The reference to the scales do not match. The road dedication area has not been updated to match C1. Please revise the next plan submission accordingly.
 - As per discussions with Deb Becelaere, plans show a dotted line dotted between the 2 proposed new lower strata lots so project data can be evaluated more easily.
 - Remainder of comments DONE
- The proposed water service to Lot 2 is not allowed under the driveway crossing on the City right of way. It can be located directly south of the driveway and then can bend on private property as required. Please label the existing water service to the existing lot and show in blue. Please revise C1 accordingly.
 - Water has been shifted on drawing to be just south of driveway towards heritage wall. Because of the importance of the wall, it will be adjusted appropriately at build time.

Transportation Review:

Condition to be met prior to Committee of the Whole:

- Thank you for identifying the revised road dedication area and curb realignment to accommodate a wider sidewalk and existing rock wall. Please make the drawings package consistent across all plans for the next

submission. The Conceptual Servicing Plan (C1) is the most accurately drawn and other sheets contain old information or inconsistencies.

- DONE

Parks Division Review

Conditions to be met prior to the Committee of the Whole:

Arborist Report

- All comments addressed in updated Arborist Report

The Tree Management Plan

- The Tree Management Plan must include the location of all inventoried trees and show all proposed changes including buildings, hardscaping/landscaping, and frontage works. All existing and proposed utilities and existing and proposed grades need to be shown. The Tree Management Plan shall show canopy spread, PRZs/CRZs, and reference IDs in accordance with the Arborist Report. The plan must show where tree protection fencing, arborist supervision, ground protection or other mitigation measures are required.
 - Tree Inventory table updated as requested

Landscape Plan

- The Tree Summary and inventory table will require updating when the arborist report is revised (see above).
 - DONE
- New trees should be at least 2 m away from buildings, 1 m from property lines, and offset from existing and proposed trees to allow sufficient space for crown and root growth based on tree size at maturity. The applicant needs to provide appropriate soil volumes for any required replacement trees.
 - This was already addressed in original submission and should be OK

Site Plan (Proposed)

- The tree inventory table included on the plan does not match the current arborist report. If it is included on the plan, please ensure that it is taken from the up-to-date revised arborist report.
 - DONE
- The Site Plan must show the protected or critical root zones of all trees proposed for retention, along with their reference IDs, per the arborist report.
 - DONE

Site Servicing Plan

- It is strongly recommended that the proposed underground hydrotel be shifted further south, as far away as possible from trees.
 - Was moved in last submission. A note is added to Civil plan indicating '*Under supervision of Arborist services will be shifted as far south as possible when constructed*'
- The Site Servicing Plan must show existing and proposed locations of hardscape surfaces and utility services: sanitary sewer, storm drain, and water, as well as third party utilities such as gas, BC Hydro, and telecommunications. The locations of pad mounted transformers, kiosks, vaults, and conduits can significantly impact design feasibility. BC Hydro and telecommunications companies need to be consulted early in the planning phase, so that requirements can be incorporated into the design.
 - This was addressed in previous submission

I trust this addresses all the comments.

Sincerely,

Kim Colpman