
From: Charlotte Dorion
Sent: January 9, 2025 9:52 AM
To: Legislative Services email
Subject: Input on proposed changes to 674,676 and 678 Battery Street, 675 and 685 Niagara st and 50 Douglas st

Dear Council

In regard to the proposed changes to 674,676 and 678 Battery Street, 675 and 685 Niagara st and 50 Douglas st I would like to register my opposition.

As a resident of 120 Douglas st I will feel the impact of these changes in many ways.

The proposal is too high, why should the current height restriction be changed for this project? It is in place to preserve the character and beauty of the area, close to the ocean and to Beacon Hill Park. What reason is there to increase it for this project? If they wish to build a building this high they should build it in an area already zoned for this height.

The building work will have a major impact on residents. There is already fierce competition for limited on-street parking for residents, the arrival of work trucks will massively increase this problem, particularly for those of us who use alternative transportation to get to work and leave our cars parked near our residence during the day. How will this issue be addressed?

I don't see any reason to adjust many current bylaws governing setbacks, height and green space simply to accomodate a for-profit enterprise who return nothing to the community. The bylaws are in place for a reason, we should ensure that all proposed developments fit into them.

Sincerely
Charlotte Dorion
120 Douglas st

From: [Jaymie Fletcher](#)
To: [Legislative Services email](#)
Subject: Questions + Concerns over Public Notice Amendment Bylaw 24-080
Date: January 10, 2025 10:42:33 AM

Hello there,

I am emailing following a public notice regarding the proposed changes to the Amica residence (674, 676, 678, 678 Niagara, and 50 Douglas St) in James Bay.

As a concerned neighbour on the corner of Douglas and Niagara, I am wondering when, if approved, the construction would start? Would it be daily noise (9-5pm, Mon-Fri?) to compound an already very busy corner (Douglas and Niagara)? For how long would this construction go on for?

Although I'm sure the opinion of one neighbour won't change anything, I must voice and honestly plead for the proposed changes not to go ahead. As graduate students, we could barely find affordable housing when we moved in here in 2021 and this development at Amica will displace us once again. There's no way we can live through the major construction proposed next door. This corner is already incredibly busy and loud, with bus routes 2, 3, 5 and 10. This location already functions as a major road for people getting in and out of James Bay, or heading to Dallas road. Over the last couple of years, it's become as busy as living on Quadra or Blanshard. If approved, we'll have to find another place to live while finishing the last 2 years of grad school at Uvic and likely will not be able to afford to live in Victoria at all, as costs have risen astronomically since we moved in 2021, and we are full time students. This is why I kindly request as much information as you can share on the timing of this construction, as we'll need to start planning when to start looking for a new home.

Not to mention the many Amica residents that will also have to find a place to live during these renovations, and may not be able to afford to return once the upgrades are complete. I understand assisted living facilities are necessary but Amica charges a staggering monthly fee that allows only the most wealthy of our senior citizens support, and this development only exacerbates the dominance of Amica and other private assisted living institutions in Victoria.

If there is City money going towards these developments, I kindly ask the City to consider redirecting it towards the multitude of actual housing crises this city faces. Even if there isn't money from the City being used, I ask you to consider rejecting this proposal as it simply supports this elitist private sector grow larger, when so many older adults and senior citizens who can't afford places like Amica need the City's energy and best efforts, desperately. This proposed project on Niagara and Douglas will also displace more local (adjacent) residents like ourselves, who won't be able to live through major construction like this due to working at home, or their studies. There's lots of students around us.

Finally, I beg of you to save the two beautiful, hundred year old birch trees on the corner of Niagara and Douglas that hug the north side of the Amica building, right beside the Niagara bus stop. I'm an avid birder who watches those trees daily for nests, and have witnessed bush tits, great horned owls, barred owls, finches, robins, nuthatches, kinglets and many others utilize those two trees for shelter and food. Could you please provide us with any information on the plans to preserve or destroy these gorgeous, life-bearing hardwoods?

Thank you very much for your time. I look forward to hearing back from you. Best regards,

Jaymie Fletcher

50 Douglas-Amica-Milliken

From Dean Rysstad

Date Wed 2025-01-08 5:23 PM

To Legislative Services email <LegislativeServices@victoria.ca>; Development Services email inquiries <DevelopmentServices@victoria.ca>; Rob Bateman <rbateman@victoria.ca>

Cc Jeremy Caradonna (Councillor) <jcaradonna@victoria.ca>; Marg Gardiner (Councillor) <mgardiner@victoria.ca>

Hello,

The letter that I received today in the mail is misleading to the general public about the changes being considered for 50 Douglas, the Amica/Milliken proposal.

I would like to request that the city reprint these letters with a better explanation of the variances being granted in this process, including an explanation that the dependencies for these zoning regulations will not be required (the dependencies being the number of storeys and number of parking spaces).

I would suggest changing the date of the reading of the first bylaw amendment to allow for a new letter to be drafted and sent to residents.

Reasoning:

The letter states that the city is considering the maximum site coverage from 40% to 53%.

However, 40% site coverage applies to building proposals up to 4 storeys.

Under the zoning regulation bylaw, a six-storey building as proposed would be restricted to 20%-30% site coverage, depending on whether or not the off-street parking requirement (Schedule C) is met.

So the city is in fact considering allowing the maximum site coverage to be utilized, regardless of number of storeys and regardless of whether or not the off-street parking requirement is met.

It is not simply increasing the maximum, because the maximum allowed is dependent on number of storeys. These dependencies are very important. By not explaining these dependencies, the letter is extremely misleading.

I look forward to a response.

Regards,

Dean Rysstad

648 Niagara Street

Cell:

Reference: (<https://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/residents/planning-development/development-services/zoning.html>)

PART 3.3 - R3-1 and R3-2 ZONE, MULTIPLE DWELLING DISTRICT

...

Site Coverage

4

(1) Subject to the provisions of this section, the site coverage of a multiple dwelling shall not exceed the percentage determined by reference to the number of storeys comprised in such multiple dwellings as follows:

Storeys	Maximum Site Coverage
1	30%
2	30%
3	30%
4	30%
5	24%
6 or more	20%

(2) Where all motor vehicle parking for any multiple dwelling as required by Schedule C is provided in an enclosed parking space, the maximum site coverage of a multiple dwelling shall be determined as follows:



Storeys	Maximum Site Coverage
1	40%
2	40%
3	40%
4	40%
5	32%
6 or more	30%