

# Applicant Outreach Summary



## Community Outreach on Planning & Development Applicant-led Outreach Summary

Please complete this form and include with your application submission.

**Project name:** 3 Unit with Secondary Suites Rowhouse - 2103 30th Ave SW

Did you conduct community outreach on your application?  YES or  NO

If no, please provide your rationale for why you did not conduct outreach.

### Outreach Strategy

Provide an overview of your outreach strategy, summary of tactics and techniques you undertook (Include dates, locations, # of participants and any other relevant details)

This project was designed originally as a 4 Unit Rowhouse and Suite building prior to submission for the Development Permit and Proposed Redesignation. Upon consulting with the neighboring property owners at #2107 30th Avenue SW, it was determined that they had sufficient concern with the proposed depth of the new proposed building, some overlook to their backyard, and shadowing of their backyard. Various options were discussed, including the option of removing a floor level on the southmost Unit 4. In the end, the neighbors at #2107, and the owner of #2103 agreed that reducing the proposed building to 3 Units would satisfy any concerns over the new proposed development regarding #2107. As a result, the neighboring property owners of #2107 gave our project a letter of support on the current proposal of 3 Units with 3 Secondary Suites. This was done prior to application to listen to and identify any issues that needed to be rectified with the directly adjacent and most significantly impacted neighbor to the West at #2107. Other neighbors separated from this property by roads and alleys were not directly consulted prior to application.

Additional comments had come in during the initial from the online application posting regarding this development from other neighboring community property owners after sign posting and their ability to access the information.

Councillor Walcott was contacted through his online portal for further comment.

The Richmond-Knobhill Community Association does not currently have a director for Development, but an email was sent via the current VP requesting any further comment from the board they they felt should be provided.

### Affected Parties

Who did you connect with in your outreach program? List all groups you connected with. (Please do not include individual names)

Primarily the neighboring homeowners @ #2107 since they are being highly impacted. They were extensively consulted after initial concept and drawings prepared prior to submission. Major revision was undertaken to their satisfaction.

Secondarily, neighbors in all other bearings separated by roads to the North and to the East, as well as across the lane to the South. Comments were submitted to planning authorities and no significant changes were indicated as being required by the planning authorities as we did not seek to maximize development to the maximum extent of the bylaws. We are impeding any significant view for the homes to the North or to the East. We have typical East façade fenestration with windows that look towards the Home to East across 20th Street. Any development on this site would feature abundant windows facing to this street. There is no additional windows on the North façade than would be typical of a semi-detached or single family home application. There is a modest amount of windows to the South, and only in one unit, so the neighbor across the alley should face less potential overlook uphill from this proposed redevelopment than in one large home or with two units of a semi-detached development at the same location.

Councillor Walcott was contacted through his online portal for further comment.

The Richmond-Knobhill Community Association VP was emailed requesting any further comment from the board.

### What did you hear?

Provide a summary of main issues and ideas that were raised by participants in your outreach.

Initially - reduce # units/length of building when it was 4 units up and down  
 Secondarily - once the project was submitted:

- Inclusion of suites making it from 3 units to 6 units.
- Not enough parking and concerns about increase in street parking.
- Waste collection
- Pedestrian and cyclist safety
- Stop signs limits parking
- Concerns about rezoning to R-CG
- Increased traffic
- A detached or a semi-detached project would quite appropriate to this neighbourhood

These secondary items were brought up through Planning Authority communication coordination

**How did input influence decisions?**

Provide a summary of how the issues and ideas summarized above influenced project decisions. If they did not, provide a response for why.

In general, the items of concern are items that we regularly hear of with similar applications. Our vehicle parking and mobility storage is designed to meet the standards of the bylaw. We made some changes regarding waste storage, bicycle storage, and mobility storage requirements through reconfiguration. No major changes were made

**How did you close the loop ?**

Provide a summary of how you shared outreach outcomes and final project decisions with those who participated in your outreach. (Please include any reports or supplementary materials as attachments)

Our key input was seeking review and comment from adjacent neighbors prior to application. The desired outcome was to have a negotiated mutual acceptance from the neighbor, which has been achieved with their letter of support for a building of reduced length and a lower number of units than what would be allowed under full density. Primarily the neighboring homeowners @ #2105 since they are being highly impacted. They were extensively consulted after initial concept and drawings prepared prior to submission. Major revision was undertaken to their satisfaction by reduction of units

Letter of Support attached.