



## **MINUTES – VICTORIA CITY COUNCIL**

### **SPECIAL MEETING OF THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2015, AT 7:00 P.M.**

**PLACE OF MEETING:**

Council Chambers, City Hall

**PRESENT:**

Mayor Helps in the Chair, Councillors Alto, Coleman, Isitt, Loveday, Lucas, Madoff, Thornton-Joe and Young

**STAFF PRESENT:**

P. Bruce - Fire Chief; B. Dellebuur - Acting Assistant Director of Transportation & Parking Services; J. Jenkyns - Deputy City Manager; K. Hamilton - Director of Citizen Engagement & Strategic Planning; C. Havelka - Recording Secretary; A. Meyer - Assistant Director of Development Services; C. Mycroft - Executive Assistant to the City Manager; J. Schmidt - Manager of Legislative Services; T. Soulliere - Director of Facilities, Parks & Recreation; S. Thompson - Director of Finance; J. Tinney - Director of Sustainable Planning & Community Development.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Manager of Legislative Services outlined the amendments to the agenda.

It was moved by Councillor Isitt, seconded by Councillor Alto, that the agenda be approved as amended.

Carried Unanimously

### **COMBINED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION**

**2. 1002-1008, 1012 Pandora Avenue**

**1. Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1005)**

To rezone the land known as 1002-1008 and 1012 Pandora Avenue from the CA-1 Zone, Pandora Avenue Special Commercial District and the R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District, to the CA-75 Zone, Pandora Vancouver Mixed Use District to permit a mixed use commercial and residential building.

<b>New Zone:</b>	CA-75 Zone, Pandora Vancouver Mixed Use District
<b>Legal Description:</b>	Lot 1, Suburban Lot 15, Victoria City, Plan 22437 Lot 2, Suburban Lot 15, Victoria City, Plan 22437 except Parcel A (DD C70855)
<b>Existing Zone:</b>	CA-1 Zone, Pandora Avenue Special Commercial District R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District

*Mayor Helps advised that Councillor Young and Councillor Coleman had moved and seconded third reading of Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1005) and therefore would be permitted to speak first.*

*Councillor Young spoke in support of the application:*

- The project meets the overall goals of the City as expressed in the Official Community Plan (OCP).*
- Regarding concerns about the Mason Street park and farm, the community plan sees those things changing.*
- The goals of the City are to see growth occur in the urban areas such as this.*
- Sunlight for Mason Street farm cannot be guaranteed; agriculture is only possible in low density areas*
- Another grocery store will bring retail diversity to shoppers in the area.*
- Access off Pandora Avenue is contrary to City Bylaws and could interfere with the proposed two-way bike lane on Pandora Avenue.*
- Developments are not able to provide large amounts of public space in response to concerns regarding the “inward looking” design.*
- This is a reasonable development that overall meets community planning objectives.*

*Councillor Coleman spoke in support of the application:*

- Noting a development in James Bay that also created divisiveness in the neighbourhood and ended up with the loss of 18 senior housing units.*
- It is appropriate for this site to evolve into this proposal with this density, as described in the OCP.*
- The design has gone through a few iterations which have addressed many of the concerns expressed.*

- *The amenity of providing 11 units of under market rental units in perpetuity is important for the community.*
- *There are some components of the application not as palatable, such as the access off Mason Street, but it is workable.*
- *This project will provide a renewal of the area.*

*Councillor Isitt spoke against the application:*

- *Noting the project doesn't have sufficient community support to move it forward and there is the concern it will have a destabilizing effect on the neighbourhood.*
- *A better proposal would be closer aligned with greenways, particularly on Vancouver Street, and with the food objectives outlined in the OCP.*
- *Noting the tax free status this land has had over several years and the owner could find other mechanisms to support the diocese.*
- *Noting how this proposal compares with the South Park proposal in James Bay which had similar massing, but had better proposals for green space and the public plaza and was supported by James Bay residents.*
- *The low income housing is welcomed but the other rental units are priced above the low rental market.*
- *The shadowing of the building will impact the agricultural land and the objectives for sustainable food systems.*
- *The large retail space will increase traffic volumes and impact safe bicycle travel along Vancouver Street.*

*Councillor Madoff spoke against the application:*

- *Noting the number and mixed demographic of people opposed to the application and supporting the concerns of those people.*
- *Noting the aspirations of the community but Council's decision making authority is constrained by land use regulations.*
- *The importance of good urban planning which should not trump neighbourhood objectives.*
- *Noting the principle-based planning for the redevelopment of the Capital Block in James Bay which was supported.*
- *The suggestion there was a failure of process and the concerns that were expressed about the proposal from the beginning of the process.*
- *Concerns that this proposal is inward-looking and isolating to the community: the development could have been more inviting.*

*Councillor Alto spoke in support of the application:*

- *Noting that the North Park local plan as well as the OCP envisioned mixed development and high density in this area.*
- *These plans provide developers with guidelines on what can be designed and what would be acceptable: this application is acceptable according to those design plans.*
- *The shortcomings have been discussed and the proponent has made refinements.*
- *The guarantee of 11 affordable units is in response for the need of housing and will address a gap in the community.*

*Councillor Lucas spoke in support of the application:*

- *Noting OCP and the Downtown area plans which were intended to create successful urban development and provide a framework for staff, the business community and residents to rely on.*
- *To be successful the plans have to be followed and the developer has made changes to address concerns.*
- *The City is getting 11 affordable housing units.*
- *Jobs will be created during construction and after, due to the retail that is being proposed.*
- *There will be living units of varying sizes to accommodate people wanting to move downtown.*

*Councillor Loveday spoke against the application:*

- *The process didn't work with this application; a CALUC process, like James Bay Neighbourhood Association uses, would help.*
- *The impacts the project will have on active transportation on Mason Street, as well as Vancouver and Pandora, are a concern and the highway access bylaw could have been amended.*
- *The proposed size of the retail store is too big and that is a concern for how it will look.*
- *The massing and density are an issue and more community and green space could be provided.*
- *The affordable units are welcome, but more overall inclusionary zoning is needed in the City.*
- *The community wasn't well enough engaged and a development that fits with the neighbourhood is needed.*

*Councillor Thornton-Joe spoke in support of the application:*

- *Noting the decision making process as it relates to Council's authority.*
- *Noting that the application didn't have variances and it was consistent with the OCP and neighbourhood plans indicating this is an area where change can occur. Staff has supported the massing being proposed.*
- *Noting the areas of concern, such as the LEED classification, the driveway access and the shading of the garden, but the proponent did respond to these issues.*
- *Support for the housing units which will be rental for 10 years and the 11 affordable housing units, which are needed in the community.*

- *Noting that the Capital City development in James Bay did have some opposition but the proposal was supportable.*

*Mayor Helps spoke in support of the application:*

- *The process in terms of the response in the neighbourhood and making improvements to land use processes and principles.*
- *Noting the addition of bikes lanes associated with this proposal and the suggestion traffic volumes won't be as high as anticipated.*
- *The innovation provided by the project in terms of affordable housing and roof top garden plots.*
- *Support for the amount of affordable housing units being offered as a basis for the proposed policy of having inclusionary zoning.*
- *This proposal responded to Council's strategic plan that received input from many residents.*
- *Noting that the proposed building is not likely to end farm production in spite of concerns about the Mason Street farm.*
- *The definition of neighbourhood and stewarding this neighbourhood and City for the next several decades.*

**For:**

***Mayor Helps, Councillors Alto,  
Coleman, Lucas, Thornton-Joe and Young***

**Against:**

***Councillors Isitt, Loveday and Madoff***

#### **Bylaw Approval**

It was moved by Councillor Thornton-Joe, seconded by Councillor Alto, that the following bylaws **be adopted:**

*Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1005)  
Housing Agreement (1002-1008, 1012 Pandora Avenue) Bylaw*

**For:**

***Mayor Helps, Councillors Alto,  
Coleman, Lucas, Thornton-Joe and Young***

**Against:**

***Councillors Isitt, Loveday and Madoff***

#### **Development Permit Approval**

It was moved by Councillor Coleman, seconded by Councillor Lucas, that Council authorize a Development Permit for 1002, 1008, 1012 Pandora Avenue, in accordance with:

1. *Plans for Rezoning Application No. 00381 and Development Permit Application No. 000351, stamped June 8, 2015;*
2. *Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements;*
3. *The Development Permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution.*

**For:**

***Mayor Helps, Councillors Alto,  
Coleman, Lucas, Thornton-Joe and Young***

**Against:**

***Councillors Isitt, Loveday and Madoff***

#### **CLOSED MEETING AT 8:30 P.M.**

It was moved by Councillor Loveday, seconded by Councillor Lucas, that Council convene a closed meeting that excludes the public under Section 12(6) of the Council Bylaw for the reason that the following agenda items deal with matters specified in Sections 12(3) and/or (4) of the Council Bylaw; namely:

**Section 12(3)(a)**      *Personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the City or another position appointed by the City.*  
**Carried Unanimously**

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Councillor Coleman, seconded by Councillor Alto, that the Special Council meeting adjourn.  
Time: 8:37 p.m. **Carried Unanimously**

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CORPORATE ADMINISTRATOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR OF THE CITY OF VICTORIA