

Schedule No. 7

Comments received for Zoning Amendment 1590 Piercy Ave
and Staff Responses

COMMENT

Hello,

I am hoping there is a chance that the garbage bin area for the proposed 1590 Piercy Ave rezoning application (RZ000058) can be moved to the other side of the parking lot. I live at 1580 Piercy (so will be direct neighbors of the new complex) and the garbage bin will be right beside my small patio and house. The housing complex on the other side (1620 Piercy) have their garbage bin on the side against the new build so it would make sense to have them both together. Thank you for considering my request.

Jessica Cote (email 9/1/2021)

RESPONSE

The garbage can't be moved as the suggested location is not accessible for garbage/recycling collection. The garbage enclosure for 1580 Piercy is located along the fenceline that is adjacent to a rear patio and dwelling unit. This is a similar location to what is proposed for this application.

COMMENT

I live at 1620 Piercy so would be the most impacted by this development. Our living room and back patio is 4 ft from the fence line. Our concern is how close the building will be to the fence line? I can't decipher from the sketch plan. If there is no space, we will lose privacy. For the 3 units most affected, developers should be made to put bigger trees as a buffer, not the little ones proposed. We planted 5 big maples on our side of the fence in the front portion, which will benefit their development. I think they should do the same on their side. In general, like the looks of the project. In our strata we have parking for all units plus 4 visitor spots. Will they be parking on the street? Please make our concerns known to council.

Thank you...Doug Vollet (email 6/24/2021)

RESPONSE

The proposed duplex dwelling units will be located between 1.5 m (4.95 ft) and the rear triplex 2.2 m (7.3 ft) from the property lines. These are both side elevations and have limited windows. The units are proposed to be located a similar distance to the unit sitting on the neighbouring property. A large maple is being retained in the rear of the triplex building and a landscape buffer is proposed to be planted around the perimeter of the property.

COMMENT

[REDACTED]
Courtenay, B.C
V9N 3E9
June 7th, 2021

RE: 1590 Piercy Avenue Nine Peaks Development

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing with respect to the application to rezone the above listed property (RZ000058). I am a resident of Railside Lane Townhouse Complex at 1620 Piercy Avenue which borders the intended property for redevelopment.

I do support the development of this property, however, after having read through the documents to accompany this application I have a number of concerns.

- 1) Geotech Assessment Document: The date on this document is from June of 2017 with the sampling having been done in April of 2017. This document is 4 years old, and I ask **is there a time limit on when a report as important as this for recommending what may need to be done to prepare for foundations?** Further to this, the report states multiple times that plans for what may be built have yet to be decided. As such they can only make possible recommendations based on what they have found at the test sites. I ask, **does this testing need to be carried out again prior to approval of the proposed 9 units?** Lastly, within this document there is reference to Piercy Avenue as Piercy Creek Road. These are two different locations.
- 2) Landscape Plans Document: The one question that I have with respect to these plans is **how does the plan support the biodiversity within the local area, particularly along the back portion of the property nearest to the rail line?** I can see that there are plans to keep a minimal number of the mature foliage in the area. However, a number of animals use these areas on a regular basis: raccoons, rabbits, deer (on the odd occasion), rats, a number of different bird species (including and not limited to Hummingbirds, Steller's Jay, Pileated Woodpeckers, Robins, Starlings, Great Horned Owls, Barred Owl, Northern Flicker). So I ask again, **how is the landscaping going to support this biodiversity?**
- 3) Parking Study Document: I can see that this document is taking into consideration use of the space for vehicle parking as well as alternative conventional bike and electric bike storage. As we push forwards into the future to go more green, the 30 bike storage units is definitely a great way forward. However, I can also see that the current Courtenay bylaw states that there should be a minimum of 1.5 parking spaces per unit and should include visitor parking. Present plans of 9 resident parking spaces and one visitor parking space does not meet this requirement. The study conducted on January 29th and 30th, 2021 at 9pm on 8 townhouse sites within the City of Courtenay and Comox has several flaws. 1) This data was collected during a pandemic in which residents may have been impacted economically and as such have had to reduce their household vehicle numbers. 2) The data was collected during a particularly cold and rainy part of the year and in the evening in which residents and visitors alike may not be actively out. 3) Statistically, data should be collected over multiple time periods, under multiple weather conditions in order to be valid. 4) **Why were the adjacent units/complexes on Piercy Avenue not included in this study? Would it not make more sense to see how those individuals already residing in the area use the road and complexes?** 5) The study does not include information about a Family Day Care that resides almost directly across the road from the proposed development. **If there are more residents having to park on the road then how are**

Parents/Guardians going to find safe spaces to drop off and pick up their children? 6) Of the sites that were observed, **what was the socio-economic status of these properties? How many belong to individuals that are retired? Single parent families?** 7) Surely, properties with garages should also be included in the report. I understand that the proposed re-development does not include garages for the residents, however, this still supports the need for parking. 8) The observation of On-Street Parking is also flawed. It states that there is a possible 157 parking spaces available. However, there is not mention of the end of Piercy Road closest to Cumberland Road being primarily commercial property and a Licensed Day Care Centre. Again, safe access to drop off and pick up children is vital and if more road parking is used this becomes a concern. 9) Another proposed development is in the works by Habitat for Humanity at the end of Piercy Road near Cumberland Road. **How much on-street parking will result from this development?** Again, this has an impact on the 157 'available spaces'. 10) Even though there is an increase in the Comox Valley for demand on E-Bikes, **how many of those individuals within the age bracket that will either rent or reside in the proposed properties? How many e-bikes were observed on January 29th and 30th? Where do the individuals who are currently purchasing these products residing within the Valley?** Just because the bike shops are seeing an increase within the Comox Valley does not mean that individuals who choose to reside locally will be using them instead of a car. And let's be honest, my husband and I have conventional bikes and are in our mid-forties and have not used our bikes in over two years for a variety of reasons. 11) The proposed development is for multi-family use. The majority of families in today's current climate have a minimum of 2 vehicles. This is in part due to the fact that both parents have to work in order to support the family. Even with individuals wanting to be more 'green' they tend to choose a hybrid or electric vehicle over an electric bike.

- 4) Plans and Elevation Duplex Document: The parking plan document references 6 short term bike spaces, however, the plans and elevation duplex document references 8. **Could someone please clarify which one it is?** This information is repeated on the Plans and Elevation Triplex Document.
- 5) Plans and Elevation Complex Document: **Is there information missing from this?** I cannot see the detailed drawings similar to those for the Duplex and Triplex portion. I am assuming that Units 3 and 6 will be the 3-bedroom, but as there is no drawing to show this, it is unclear. It is unclear where the placement of windows along the back side are and how this may affect the properties possibly being overlooked located in the Railside Lane Townhouse Complex.
- 6) Project Summary Document: This only refers to 30 bike spaces and references 10% having e-bike accommodation. This needs to be clarified as the previous documentation states different information.
- 7) 9 Units: I also have concerns as to the number of properties that are being proposed to occupy this space. The Railside Lane Townhouse Complex is twice the size of the proposed 1590 property and consists of 10 units. The Habitat for Humanity Complex which borders the proposed 1590 property on the other side is a similar size and only contains 6 units. The front and back proposed properties do not appear to have windows that would be facing the other properties. However, the middle complex of four properties do have windows that face into the Railside Lane Complex. Further, to the above concern about the need for more parking the middle complex should be reduced in size to accommodate it and possibly the direction in which it faces should be changed to ensure that the windows do not overlook other properties privacy.

I look forward to your response to the above. Please feel free to contact me by email at

Kind Regards

Christina Kurshumliu

Resident of Railside Lane Townhouse Complex and Strata Treasurer - letter in email 6/7/2021

RESPONSE

1. Geotech Assessment Document
There are no steep slopes on this property. The geotechnical engineer on record has confirmed the site is safe for the intended use.
The building department may require a revised geotechnical report at the time of building permit application if that is deemed necessary.
2. Landscape Plan and biodiversity
There are no environmentally sensitive areas identified on DP Guidelines Map 5, Terrestrial Environmentally Sensitive Areas. A 4.5 m wide landscape buffer will be planted in the rear and lesser buffers around the perimeter of the proposed development.
3. Parking study
This comment resulted in the applicant providing an updated parking study. The two studies are attached to the staff report. The consultants concluded that the proposed number of on-site parking stalls is suitable for the proposed use and that there is adequate on street parking for the residential use.
The specific questions asked about purchasers of EV bicycles are beyond the scope for evaluating the suitability of the proposed use. This is a requirement in the Zoning Bylaw.
4. Elevation drawings
Revised elevation drawings were provided by the applicant. Windows are proposed on the rear elevation on the first and second floors. Overlooking onto adjacent properties is avoidable with infill and more dense developments. Landscaping will provide some screening.
The landscape plan shows and the applicant has confirmed that the required number of bicycle parking stalls, both class I and II, are being provided.
5. Numbers of units
The proposed density is a .4 floor area ratio and is a consistent density to the existing R-3 zone and other multi-unit developments.

COMMENT


I've received an information sheet regarding the 'Nine Peaks' proposed development and have the following concerns:

1. **Traffic** - This development, along with the one at 1435 Piercy, will add significant traffic along Piercy. The intersection at 17th St. and Piercy is currently a problem and there needs to be a traffic light installed to facilitate vehicles turning off of Piercy onto 17th.
I have raised this before but I have been ignored and it is an accident waiting to happen. Given that Council has approved bike Lanes along 17th, it would make sense to rectify the situation at the same time. As well, the intersection at Piercy and Cumberland will be affected and the traffic signals should be adjusted.

2. **Consultation area** - As indicated previously, the 100 meter community consultation perimeter is inadequate. In this case, it will not even include both intersections and the impact of the development will even go beyond this.
3. **Business plan** - The City does not require a copy of the business plan (the banks/funders do). There is no indication as to the proposed sale or rental revenue anticipated and how affordable or unaffordable these units will be. Will it alleviate any of the local housing pressure?; or is it a money grab to attract new residents from areas such as the Lower Mainland.
4. **Infrastructure** - *We are already impacted by water restrictions several times a year. How will this development exacerbate this? As well, several trees will require removal and how will the city demand compliance with the recent policies?*

Sincerely,

Fred Muzin (email 6/7/2021)


Courtenay V9N 1X8

RESPONSE

1. Traffic light – a traffic light has been determined to not be warranted in
The City's Transportation Plan (2019) does not identify this intersection as one where a high number of collisions take place as a result this intersection is not identified for future improvements for vehicular traffic. Nor does the plan does not propose pedestrian or cycling related improvements for this intersection.
Piercy itself is a recognized cycling route in the City's Cycling Network Plan. Cycling improvements at the intersection of Piercy and 17th are budgeted in the 2023 work plan.
2. Consultation area – the 100 m notification area is established in the Development Application Procedure Bylaw No. 2790. This bylaw is under review as part of the Bill 26 review and this includes notice distances.
3. Business Plan – the City does not require a business plan as part of an application. This matter is not part of evaluating the suitability of the proposed land use.
4. Infrastructure – Residents in this development will also be subject to water restrictions. The arborist report notes that trees located in the perimeter are cottonwood or red-alder and are not suitable for the landscape plan. And other trees have structural characteristics which preclude them from maturing into healthy, defect free trees.
The landscape plan shows protection of two mature maple trees and tree replacement for those that are being removed (32 new trees).