

Lacey Maxwell

From: Kip Johl [REDACTED]
Sent: April 25, 2018 3:26 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed Development at Quadra and Southgate Street

April 25, 2018

To all those who might listen ,

I am writing about the Proposed Development at Quadra & Southgate Streets. I have recently moved into 906 Southgate, next door to the existing Beacon Arms. My husband and I live in the southwest corner top floor (fourth floor) of the apartment. Obviously we will see an immediate impact of a six storey building next door. As will our neighbours within the building , within the community and the micro wildlife around us.

I agree with affordable housing yet see no reason to impact the neighbourhood in a negative way, a four storey building would at least allow the neighbourhood to remain relatively similar to what it is, it can still be designed to meet additional rentals than exist on the present site. Light is important and essential to retain. Density as planned at six stories will have enormous repercussions of traffic, noise and even the experience of pedestrians whether along Southgate in the park or on the street.

Regarding Beacon Hill Park, I think it is unfortunate that it will appear dwarfed by a higher building as it does by buildings on Douglas Street. It should be the opposite, the park should dwarf us. Obviously with all the cutting of the trees the birds will also be evicted. A lovely awakening we have so noticed in the mornings and home to vulnerable creatures of our planet. Let us not find us destroying ourselves and nature in the name of affordability when most likely it is also in the name of profitability. I was born and raised in Vancouver and it is clearly a model that is not working . I hate to see Victoria go that route.

Trees of our strata will also surely have to be negotiated as well as other issues, but as neighbours we hope for and will work towards a resolution. It is a sad state not just for humans, but the birds and the squirrels, the cultured nature as well as the wildlife who make their home and try to adapt to our encroachment.

I would like to see all buildings around the park remain at four stories so the park will be an oasis, not just a small green space or a token jewel. It should be treasured to its fullest extent. To allow six stories is to allow the slippery slope. I prefer being in the park and not seeing the tall apartments on Douglas, but they are there, this project can be modified. This is one development that still is in the making.

Aside from being six stories the design is also encroaching further into the street, seeming more commercial than residential. Less room for vegetation.

This proposal does not have to be contentious if the impact is lessened at what should be four stories and keeping within community guidelines.

By the way having a lit up sign that says ‘ Beacon ‘ should force the developers to provide black out curtains to any resident in the neighbourhood who requests them, better yet, don’t put up an unnecessary, totally intrusive element.

Thanks for listening. Please take great care regarding this proposal.

Lacey Maxwell

From: SLOAN, Catherine (VICTORIA) [REDACTED]
Sent: April 27, 2018 11:35 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Development at 505 Quadra

Hello Mayor Helps and City of Victoria Council:

About a year ago I wrote to you regarding the concerns that we, the owners, of 906 Southgate have regarding our neighbours proposed redevelopment of Beacon Arms. The project is now being revisited and our concerns are mounting.

The proposal is to increase the units from 36 to 84, reduce parking and build up to 6 stories plus a roof top structure which essentially moves it 7 stories. The developer has stated that they need the extra density in order to make this financially attractive to them. This comes at our cost. They wish to move their building closer to our property line, the height of the building will block our sun and in the back, our views of downtown and St Josephs. This will negatively impact our own property values. Additionally, according to their own Arborist report, they will need to remove all our trees from the west side of our building. These are mature trees and provide shelter from sun, wind and green space that cannot be duplicated by planting a sapling to replace.

The project covers much of the property and in order to erect it, they will probably have to excavate to the property line (as per the reports filed in the development tracker). We consulted an Engineer, the size of the excavation could put our own foundations at risk.

We are only 14 units. However we have 4 owners over 90 and 2 over 70 that have lived here for decades. I am writing to you not only as an individual home owner but as a member of the Strata Council as our Seniors are extremely stressed and concerned. We understand the Beacon Arms needs upgrades and we support improvements in our neighbourhood, but the fact is that Analogue's request is maximize their profit by increasing density over 200% at the price of ourselves and the other surrounding property owners. This does not seem balanced.

I follow the project on the Victoria Development Tracker. Its notes there was a public design meeting held February 28th. We were not aware of this. No notices were received or any communication of any sort. If we had known, many of our owners and neighbours would have been there to vocalize our concerns. Frankly, the design of the building and not just only the over powering size, is unattractive. We do like the design of the Townhouses. I emailed the City of Victoria person assigned to this to ask why we were not made aware of the meeting over a month ago. I have not yet received a response.

Stewart from Analogue spoke to our Strata Council a year ago. He stated that the City was in support of the project as we needed more rental supply. I question this. The new units will be expensive and does nothing to help with affordable housing. I do not question their right to make money, Analogue is a business and not part of social services. They should not, however, be trying to cloud the issue by pretending they are helping the social landscape.

I thank you for taking the time to read this. We ask that we are notified of any public hearings/meetings so we can attend. This project has a direct impact on every home owner surrounding it and we should be given the opportunity to present our side as Analogue has been able to present to council several times.

Catherine Sloan
Senior Account Manager | Directrice principale

F [REDACTED]

Lacey Maxwell

From: Jim [REDACTED]
Sent: April 27, 2018 8:43 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: James LaBounty
Subject: Proposed Development at Quadra and Southgate streets

To concerned parties,

Two things come to mind when I think about the reasons my wife and I moved to Victoria a short time ago: "what an immensely beautiful city" and "thank god, it's not Vancouver". My wife being born there and us living in Vancouver a good portion of our lives, we've seen much of the beauty of that city been sacrificed to overdevelopment, quite often in the name of densification, availability of housing stock, world class city etc., etc.. The results of all that hyperbole are plain to see.

Which leads me to my concerns about a proposed building next to where I live at 906 Southgate. This is not a rant against all development in Victoria. Obviously, our city must add housing stock, modernize and keep up with the rapid changes in our world. But I do believe that development must come with some solid ground rules to prevent a slippery slope towards the modernized degradation and destruction of our city's unique character.

To wit:

1. A proposed 6 stories instead of 4 stories in the proposed complex. I call these types of developments, light blockers. As they increase in height and numbers, neighbourhoods, people, flora and fauna eventually wind up in light deprived, depressing grey canyons. Capping building heights is one step towards preventing this in residential neighbourhoods throughout the city. Two extra stories added may sound like a modest request but we all know that it won't stop there. Victoria is known as a sun blessed city throughout Canada but we don't want that to become increasing available to mostly those who can afford the top floors.
2. Removal of trees on the proposed development (and perhaps around our building as well). Removal of unhealthy, dangerous trees may be one thing but this is just one more piece of habitat destruction, homes of nesting birds, shade on hot days, fresh air for what seems to me more about expedited construction and accompanying costs with negative benefit to the neighbourhood. Trees are our heritage as well as historical buildings. One of the refreshing things I noticed when moving to Victoria are the abundance of beautiful mature trees; a rare thing in today's world.
3. A proposed neon sign on the new development. This hilarious/sad proposal seems to be an exercise in vanity and self-promotion to the detriment of surrounding neighbours due to light pollution. One can expect lost work hours due to bad sleeps and lack of expensive blackout curtains.
4. The impact on Beacon Hill Park if these types of developments are allowed to go through is that the park will get smaller and smaller in perception if not acreage. This is due to larger, higher buildings changing the balance in scale relative to the park. This will turn a magnificent large city park into just a green space surrounded by concrete and glass.

To conclude, I have no envy of the difficult tasks facing the mayor and council to strike a balance between development, the needs of our population for housing, economic opportunity, maintaining heritage,

conservation and healthy communities. My hope is that impending decisions such as the current Southgate subject of this letter will carefully weigh short and long term impacts.

James LaBounty

Monica Dhawan

From: Donald Sutherland <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2018 9:22 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: 505 Quadra

Good morning,

I am a resident living on Convent Place and I wanted to let you know I am very much in favour of the development proposal for the corner of Quadra and Convent which is currently going through a review before you. The plans look good and will enhance the neighbourhood significantly.

As a layman I believe your aims, in simple terms, to be densification and the provision of more rental housing. Both these objectives appear to be met by the current plans so I hope you and the developer can come to an agreement on the project.

The area which is to be revitalised is currently very tired looking and would benefit greatly from an uplift.

I should mention I have no affiliation with any person or entity connected with the property, or proposal.

Yours,

Donald Sutherland
[REDACTED]

Monica Dhawan

From: Loretta Blasco [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 10:49 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Rezoning and the Development of 505 Quadra Street

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Recently, It has been brought to my attention that a rezoning and redevelopment proposal for 505 Quadra Street, and 517, 519 Quadra, and 931 Covenant Street has been brought forward to city council for approval.

The most pressing issue for me is the displacement and eviction of all of the people already housed at the 505 Quadra Street Apartment Building, especially when you take into consideration Victoria 's rental market. There really isn't affordable housing available for people here in Victoria, and some of these tenants have been long time residents. My concern would be that some of these residents could end up homeless or forced to rent places they really can't afford. These renters deserve peace of mind and a home they can afford.

Secondly, is the idea that the developer would want to put a 6 floor rental unit building on that particular corner across from the park's entrance. If you take time and stand on this corner you would see, a 6 floor building would really look out of place, and frankly over power the neighbourhood. There is one 6 story building, but it is cleverly positioned behind mature trees, and is set back from the property line, but the rest of the neighbourhood is made up mostly of 4 or 5 story buildings.

The neighbourhood really doesn't support this high density living, and it will also increase traffic at the entrance of Beacon Hill Park on one of the last quiet corners around the park.

Please don't give me the argument that we need to have high density living on every available corner in Victoria because we have a housing crisis. Some of this housing crisis can be attributed to lack of inventory, but it can also be attributed to over priced rents, with many people who are currently struggling to remain in their housing.

High density living is NOT the only answer, and in some areas of Victoria, high density living might even be appropriate, but on this corner it is not. Go down there, stand on that corner, look at the building heights of the buildings around there, 6 stories would be too tall, and the development would look out of place for this neighbourhood.

As well, all new construction units will end up costing the renter much more than what they are presently paying on rent. I just don't see this development as appropriate for these renters already housed at 505 Quadra Street.

We'll end up with a city full of high cost rentals with people who will struggle to stay housed, and be forced to live in small square footage high density apartments. Personally, this doesn't seem like a happy life to me.

If this rezoning and redevelopment goes through, it will come at a risk for the renters presently living at 505 Quadra Street.

Do you have a plan in place to find these renters affordable housing?

I am urging you to rethink this rezoning and redevelopment proposal, and say no to this project. The developer needs to come back to the table and rethink this proposal.

Thank you.

Loretta Blasco
301-1025 Linden Avenue
V8V 4H4

Sent from my iPad

Noraye Fjeldstad

From: mashields <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 8:46 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Development Proposal

I am writing to you regarding the proposed development located on Quadra Street between Southgate Street and Convent Place. I am, specifically, concerned about the proposed access to underground parking off of Convent Place and the impact on residents and visitors parking.

Avon Court apartments on Vancouver St., four town homes on Southgate St., and Westminster Court Apartments on Humboldt St., all access parking off of Convent Place. The added burden of providing parking access for 83 units on Quadra Street and 4 townhomes on Convent Place seems, to me, to be pushing the limits for this small, narrow Street.

There are two small apartment buildings on Convent Place with limited parking spaces and homes with one or more suites, also, with limited parking spaces. Street parking is extremely important. Would this proposal in any way limit the street parking?

The apartment building slated for demolition, in this proposal, appears to have the parking entrance off of Southgate Street and the exit onto Quadra Street. This arrangement seems to to work well with little or no impact on the neighbourhood.

Convent Place appears to be a small, insignificant street, but, it is a community and I don't wish to see it become a laneway in the name of progress. Please revisit the parking proposal for this project.

Sincerely
Mary Shields
[REDACTED]

Sent from Samsung tablet

Noraye Fjeldstad

From: Deborah Rhodes <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 5:47 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed development at Southgate and Convent

I strongly object to the development proposal at Southgate and Convent.

The density is too large, the building will block light and views from our condo at 906 Southgate st. 3 or 4 stories could be acceptable, NOT 6 Stories!

There should be a height restriction of a maximum 4 stories around the park area. Leave the higher buildings for the downtown business core.

Deborah Rhodes

Deborah Rhodes Design
[REDACTED]

Noraye Fjeldstad

From: SLOAN, Catherine (VICTORIA) [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 3:55 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Proposed Rezoning Quadra and Southgate (Beacon Arms)

Hello Council:

I reside at 906 Southgate, 14 strata units, 4 storey building. Next door to us is a proposal for rezoning on height and density on the property currently known as Beacon Arms. The new proposal is to go up 6 stories, move 6-7 feet closer to our building and go from 24 units to 85 rental units.

Please note, I am all for regeneration of older buildings, in fact we are just about to start major renewals on our own building. Continued improvements to our neighbourhood are important. The improvements completed to the building at the corner of Southgate and Heywood are an excellent example of that.

However, the height, size and location of the proposed new building will loom over all others on Southgate. It will block our air space and views of St Anne's, St Josephs and Downtown. We have heard concerns from people behind on Covenant regarding the same issues. The proximity, size and loss of views will reduce our property values. Out of the 6 residents who lose their views entirely, 3 are long term residents over the age of 90.

This needs to be taken into consideration. The developers stated it was not economically feasible to build a smaller building or renovate the existing- in order to maintain their profitability it must be this size, but that comes at our financial cost. Why? That is not an equitable equation.

The renovations/repairs to the same era building on Heywood and Southgate seem to be successful and would repudiate Beacon Arms claim that this is not a wise investment.

Fairfield is not downtown. We are zoned low rise for a reason. It helps build a community atmosphere. There are great residential high rise buildings downtown and James Bay, but I specifically chose to live in Cook Street Village for its mixed density and community feel, not downtown. Not all neighbourhoods have to be the same and move towards height/ more people per square foot. That is part of our charm, and part of property values.

Thank you.

Catherine Sloan
906 Southgate Street
Victoria BC
V8V 2Y2

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return email, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank-you!

Information confidentielle: Le présent message, ainsi que tout fichier qui y est joint, est (sont) envoyé(s) à l'intention exclusive de son ou (ses) destinataire(s); il est de nature confidentielle et peut faire l'objet d'une information privilégiée. Nous avisons toute personne autre que le destinataire prévu que tout examen, réacheminement, impression, copie,

distribution ou toute autre utilisation de ce message et tout document joint est (sont) strictement interdit(s). Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire prévu, veuillez en aviser immédiatement l'expéditeur par retour de courriel et supprimer ce message et tout document joint de votre système. Merci!

Noraye Fjeldstad

From: Kate Morrison [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 3:52 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Development proposal for 505, 517, 519/21 Quadra St. & 931 Convent Pl

Good afternoon,

I write in relation to the development proposal for 505, 517, 519/21 Quadra St. & 931 Convent Place.

I understand from the developers that the city's bylaws require the parking entrance and exit to the new development to be from a minor street, Convent Place, rather than Quadra St.

Quadra Street affords a superior and safer parking entrance/exit because it is a wide street with good visibility. Quadra St. is already an established access point for the large apartment block currently there. By contrast, Convent Place is narrow and does not have the benefit of large, established lanes. It already acts as the entrance/ exit driveway for a large apartment building. Finally, Convent is a well-used and safe commuter street for pedestrians and cyclists.

Please consider changing the bylaw in relation to this entrance and exit, which would utilize an established option for accessibility (Quadra), while ensuring all users and commuters in the neighbourhood are safe.

I thank you in advance for your consideration.

K. Morrison

Noraye Fjeldstad

From: Naomi Yeker [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 3:21 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Parking Entrance for the Development at the end of Convent

Hello,

I am a current resident of Convent place, and have been informed about the new development on Quadra between convent place and southgate. Due to city bylaws, the parking entrance is set to be off convent (as it is a minor street), but I believe it would make much more sense for the parking to go off Quadra as the road is wider, there isn't much traffic and it has better visibility. Convent street is quite busy as it has traffic from the big Humboldt building, Avon Court, and the townhouses on Southgate at the end. Please consider having the parking entrance come off Quadra street rather than Convent.

Thank you,
Naomi

Noraye Fjeldstad

From: Mark W [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 12:26 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Parking access issues, relevant to development proposal at Quadra+Southgate

Hi Mayor, Council,

Warning: this may be long, please get yourself a cup of tea and settle in.

About me: lifelong Victoria resident, I've lived on Convent Place for 13 years now.

The other night I learned about the development proposed at Quadra and Southgate and Convent, at the community meeting with the land use committee. The development has many great features, such as being all rental, and the developers are trying very hard to accomodate their current tenants and keep them informed and help them with relocation.

Part of the proposal that concerned several of us at that meeting was the parking access for the building is off Convent Place. We learned that it is a City law (bylaw? policy?) that the parking access for parkades go off the "minor" adjacent street, presumably for safer ingress/egress of vehicles. The developers made clear they could easily change their design to access off Quadra if possible, but the current policy restricts them to going off Convent Place.

This policy of going off the "minor" street is troubling to me for several reasons. The 1008 Pandora (St Andrew's School) development was, I recall, controversial for the same reason. While it makes sense from a car traffic perspective to go off the minor street, there are several good reasons to consider revising the policy for a few reasons:

First there is the issue of liveability on the minor street so served.

Convent Place is mostly smaller homes and townhouses that front Convent, and serving as a driveway for bigger buildings that face away from it really detracts from the street ambience and makes it more like a crappy back alley than a front yard. We are currently the parking access for a big building on Humbolt, the back of which is pretty ugly and we get to look at their parking and dumpsters. Avon Court on Vancouver is a beautiful building but the back, which Convent serves, is, again, parking and garbage. Also the townhouses on Southgate right at Vancouver have parking opening onto Convent. If the entire street were a back alley that no building faced onto that would be no problem, but most of the street is still people's front yards and living spaces.

Often, and this is the case in the 1008 Pandora project too, the "minor" street which the policy dictates should serve as the parking access, are the more human, liveable, streets, which having increased traffic and parkade entrances branch off of really detracts from.

Here we have Convent, with lots of houses and front yards that will be looking at yet another parkade entrance, versus Quadra (which serves the current apartment building parking at 505 Quadra), which would bother nobody having the access off of it - it is much wider, the buildings are screened by trees, it is low enough traffic to make parking access safe, and nobody is looking right into the current parking entrance. Making a rough estimate, the distance across Convent Place from the potential parking entrance to the house front door across the street is about 1/3 the distance across Quadra.

Second is the safety issue. Convent is a major pedestrian and bike route between downtown and Fairfield, Quadra is about the same, maybe less, and Southgate is much lower. Putting yet more traffic coming out of a parkade clashes with this environmentally friendly traffic. I appreciate that part of the proposal includes widening the sidewalk along

Convent, which is currently far too narrow (telephone poles right in the middle of the sidewalk mean a lot of people just walk on the street), but having more traffic across that sidewalk is a safety hazard (and it will be visually restricted due to being right next to the townhouses). There is also the issue of a narrow cul-de-sac serving yet more car traffic, though this is mitigated somewhat in this case by the parking access being near Quadra.

So to summarize, I can see the rationale for the policy of having parking access off the minor street: it makes sense from the (car) traffic safety perspective. However the policy ignores the cost in pedestrian/bike safety on the minor street, and the liveability of the minor street also.

In the case of the Quadra/Southgate/Convent proposal, the developers said they would easily be able to reconfigure the access to go off Quadra, it was the city policy that restricted them to Convent.

I hope you can discuss either revising this policy or taking it on a case-by-case basis, as I'm sure other developments will have the same issues. Thanks for your time!

Mark W

May 18, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Beacon Arms Apartments Development Proposal
at 505, 517/21 Quadra & 931 Convent Place

I am a resident of Convent Place. I have now attended two meetings regarding the development proposal for the Beacon Arms Apartments at the end of Quadra and Southgate – group looking for R3-AM-1; R-3-A1; R-K rezoning. To use the language of the developer (Surfside Holdings I believe), this ‘purposeful rental development project’ involves the demolition of an existing 34 unit rental apartment and 3 adjacent houses to construct a new 6 storey 83 unit rental apartment and 4 rental townhouses with underground parking accessed off of Convent Place. I write this letter to you to make some comments as this project is in my neighbourhood, and to voice some concerns, all for your consideration as the developer takes the next step in this proposed build which is to make an application to the City for the rezoning.

I do think the developer is trying to make a reasonable proposal and to work with the neighbourhood. The design/exterior of the 83 unit rental apartment is taking into consideration the character of the existing homes in the area - look will be brick and more traditional rather than modern, and 4 townhomes (rather than a more 6 storey apartment) are proposed where the single family dwellings are slated to be torn down. The developer seems approachable and the family has owned Beacon Arms Apartments for 37 years (not sure when they purchased the 3 neighbouring homes). The developer as well has made efforts to put together a somewhat comprehensive plan of the development and the neighbourhood.

The notes that were taken at the recent May 15, 2017 meeting at the Fairfield Community Centre were:

1. Those in attendance are concerned about parking entrance on Convent Place.
2. Those in attendance are concerned about original (first meeting) parkade size being 104 spots, but developer looking to reduce to 95? (new variance coming in soon for City apparently).
3. Those in attendance are concerned about modern design of townhouses on Convent not fitting the neighbourhood look.
4. Those in attendance are concerned about the tear down and rebuilt necessity and process.
5. Those in attendance are concerned about the size (6 stories) of the rental apartments.
6. Those in attendance are concerned about the displacement of the residents of the Beacon Arms.

I am pulling this off the top of my head. You will receive the official notes I believe. But definitely the biggest concern by the residents within 100m of this development (that is who was invited to this meeting) was the entrance of the parking being positioned off of Convent Place. The developer explained that it is City bylaws that state the entrance must be on the quietest accessible street (3 adjacent streets are Southgate, Quadra, and Convent). I would speak in favour of the parkade entrance being moved onto Quadra. The builder in the meeting did say that this could be a possibility if the City allows it. The developer, after the first open house for the property, where again the biggest comment people voiced was the parkade entrance, had at the meeting a young fellow who was a traffic control analyst. He said that with about 100 underground parking spots for this build, it is likely at peak traffic time - going and coming home from work, that likely 30 vehicles would flow in and out of the Beacon Arms parkade; which basically more than doubles the traffic on Convent at those times. A resident brought up the fact, and I had at the first open house as well, that Convent is a pedestrian and cyclist ‘connector’ route. It is a well-used route between Cook Street Village and downtown. To position four 3-storey townhomes on the corner of Convent and a parkade entrance in such a small space will be both

dangerous and detract from the welcomeness of this pedestrian/cyclist connector route. My thought is to put the parkade entrance on Quadra, as it currently exists at the Beacon Arms, and as is for the existing apartment complex across the street from the Beacon Arms on Quadra; this end of Quadra is very wide and quiet. The number of underground parking stalls the Beacon Arms Development will have has been first said to be 104 stalls, and at second meeting 95? under new City bylaws that are pending. This is interesting because with 104 stalls, the likely apartments and townhomes with 2 to 3 bedrooms would have more off road parking availability. However, that means more cars coming and going in the area. If 95 is the number of parkade stalls built, that might move more new tenants to Beacon Arms Development to park on the street. Parking, as with every new build it seems, is always a huge issue for consideration.

Having just viewed the key points for the Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan and having attended the Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan meeting at the Cook Street Activity Centre (I did the on-line survey as well), I know that neighbourhood character is something people feel strongly about maintaining in Fairfield. So I wish to draw your attention to point 3 above about the exterior of the four townhomes proposed to line the corner of Convent Place. The developer talked about maintaining neighbourhood character with the 83 unit apartment and then presented the 4 townhomes as being 'modern'. Nothing on Convent or in the surrounding area is 'modern.' I would hope the builder heard this message at the meeting and will keep with the neighbourhood look (I didn't hear them refute this.) In addition, the setback of the proposed 83 unit apartment building and the setback of the townhomes were discussed. The builder talked lots about setback of apartment building (a good 20') as I am sure they can't build too close to the existing chestnut trees - super, but when asked about the townhome setback, the explanation was a little unsure and vague. It was something about 10' from the center of Convent Place road, and the City making the builder give some of their property for a boulevard-sidewalk combo, but they did not have it represented in their presentation materials; thus lots of question about setback of townhomes on Convent Place. With the generous (maybe imposed because of the trees?) setback of the new 83 rental apartments, I would hope the builder could be uniform and afford the same generous setback for the 4 townhouses on Convent Place, a much smaller area used widely by pedestrians and cyclists.

The need to tear down the existing Beacon Arms 34 apartment building and the 3 adjacent houses instead of refurbishing like done with other apartments along Southgate, most recently on the corner of Heywood and Southgate and 930 Convent Place, was brought up. Even with the 3 homes proposed for demolition, each has ample land for a lane house or to duplex or triplex, etc. the existing properties. Why demolish and not refurbish was asked at the meeting. The owners said the building would need new windows, some plumbing, etc., but I am sure the other Southgate properties mentioned above needed all of this, too. The size of the proposed new build (apartments - too many stories, townhomes - too tall and too close to the sidewalk/road), and the dig for the parkade (Will piles need to be driven? What is the soil like? What about asbestos and other toxic products?, etc.), namely the environmental impact, the stress on the neighbourhood of a new build, etc., was brought up at the meeting. The people at the meeting living on Southgate right next to the new proposed build and across the street had many concerns about a new build. Why not just refurbish? And if a new build, why a taller apartment building then the existing 4 storey structure? The meeting was told by the Fairfield Community Council hosting the meeting that 6 stories is kind of the norm now in Fairfield, news to me, but that was what was said. And, the fate of the people presently residing in the existing properties to be torn down, was brought up. The builder/owner said he had 200 more rental units in the Fairfield and James Bay area where the current tenants of the Beacon Arms can if they wish, when a unit comes available, likely move to one of those - although I heard an older woman who currently lives in Beacon Arms Apartments say under her breath this was the first she has heard of this plan - to be fair to builder, they said they hadn't spoken to everyone in the apartments and houses yet. When asked what the

difference likely in the rental cost for the existing Beacon Arms as opposed to the new build would be, the owner said the rent in the new build would likely go up about 40%. So to me, that signals the displacement of more long-time Fairfield residents and replaces them with those that have money. "That's progress." some might say, and I know progress is necessary, but at what human and neighbourhood/community cost? Change is a difficult process, and I just hope that sensibility will prevail in the consideration of the proposed Beacon Arms Apartments Development Proposal at 505, 517/21 Quadra & 931 Convent Place.
Hoping for your wisdom and support,

Lisa Hebb
3-977 Convent Place

PS – I know that Victoria City Council voted for no Foreign Buyers Tax, but might look to fine people who have properties that could be rented, but are sitting empty (case in point in our neighbourhood 531/533 Quadra St.), how do we report this or is there nothing in place yet to have these owners free up their properties for people to get into?

Noraye Fjeldstad

From: Mike Merkel [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 19, 2017 6:36 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Parking for proposed 931 convent condo

The meeting minutes from a recent town hall regarding the proposed 931 convent place development has the parking entrance off of convent instead of the more accessible quadra. The builders cited that they could easily reconfigure to move it to Quadra but current City bylaws mean the parking has to go off the "minor street" which in this case is Convent. It would make more sense to have the parking go off Quadra as there is not much traffic there, the road is wider and has better sight lines, and Convent is already busy enough what with serving as the driveway for the big Humboldt building, Avon Court, and the townhouses on Southgate at the end. As an owner of a townhome in 977 convent place i'm concerned with this issue and hoping the city can change the "minor street" bylaw for this case. This will increase safety, and reduce congestion for this project.

Thanks,
Mike Merkel

To Mayor Lisa Helms May 10 '17
Re 505 Quadra St application for
rezoning.

This building has had a new roof,
new balconies, repair to the elevator and
renovations to apartments when a
tenant leaves. Some tenants have had
their hardwood floors refinished at
their own expense. Also the laundry
room has been renovated. All within
the last few years. It is quiet, has
tenants of all ages and a good
manager which makes life here
peaceful and pleasant.

The threat of eviction is causing
overwhelming stress to many here,
including me. I am 89 years old and
a 14 year tenant and being forced to
move with nowhere affordable to
move to. To replace this one bedroom
unit will cost me more than half
my income. This building represents
huge profits to the developer but
as it represents home.

This is a busy corner and it will
affect both traffic and the horse
drawn carriages which pass frequently

over a long period of time if the
demolition and rebuilding occur.
Please consider all aspects before
allowing this to happen. It will
affect a great many people.

Sincerely

B. J. Henry.

MRS B. J. HENRY

309-505 QUADRA ST

VICTORIA BC

V8V 3S2

MAYOR'S OFFICE

MAY 15 2017

VICTORIA, B.C.

Lacey Maxwell

From: marne st claire [REDACTED]
Sent: June 7, 2017 11:23 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: 986,988 Heywood

Dear Mayor and councillors

I am writing to express support for the Jawl proposal to build a four story apartment at 986-988 Heywood.

The scale of the proposal is comparable to the neighbouring apartments and single-family dwellings.

Generous parking will be provided on site underground.

With respect,
Marne St. Claire
33 Howe
Victoria

Sent from my iPhone

Lacey Maxwell

From: Ryan Painter [REDACTED]
Sent: June 7, 2017 7:30 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Beacon Arms redevelopment

Good morning Victoria Mayor and Council,

I am contacting you as a resident of Fairfield and as a tenant who is potentially facing what is commonly known as a "demoviction". My fiancée and I learned that our apartment, Beacon Arms at 505 Quadra, will be demolished in the next 6-8 months to make way for redevelopment of a new building with more updated units.

Let me be clear that I agree with increasing rental density in Victoria; lord knows we need it. My concern is that the new development will have a significant increase in monthly rental rates, what appear to be double the current rentals at a minimum, and the forced relocation of the many seniors who occupy units here.

My fiancée attended an open house back in April and asked some important questions of the owners, Surfside Holdings. Primary to the concerns we share are affordability and holding some of the units aside as low cost rentals for people/families/seniors on a lower or fixed income. The response from the owners was concerning: they hadn't considered low cost rentals, and were less concerned about affordability than creating more density, albeit at significantly higher rates.

The other concern that didn't seem to weigh as heavy on the owners minds as we would have liked is the issue of the number of seniors that will be put out into a market with low vacancies, only to offer them spaces at a redeveloped site at double the rental rate.

Currently the rental rate at our apartment is between \$900/month - \$1300/month. According to the open house, the minimum rate for new units at the redeveloped site will be around \$1800/month.

My concerns are that the current tenants are going to be forced out of affordable units, into a market with very low vacancy rates, only to be facing double the rates where we used to live. This is untenable, and doesn't make for what we would like to promote as a livable city.

It is my hope that my concerns, and the concerns of other tenants at Beacon Arms, can be reflected by you and council as the application makes its way through the zoning process. I would ask that Mayor and Council consider that 15%-20% of the units in the new building be zoned as affordable units for at least 10 years, in order to allow more rental units to be built in Victoria, and the market to settle.

I'm happy to meet with either of you if you wish, to speak further on this issue.

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission.

Sincerely,

Ryan Painter
Fairfield Neighbourhood
Victoria, BC

Lucas De Amaral

From: Robert Archer [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 18, 2017 6:35 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Affordable rental housing re demolition of 505 Quadra

Dear Mayor and City Councillors,

I wanted to voice my opinion re the application to demolish 505 Quadra st. and replace it with an expensive taller structure

I am a resident of the location and can speak to the condition of the structure.

A new influence on the owner has been suggesting that it needs to be demolished because is in poor repair. That is incorrect. It has been well maintained. The elevator has been recently renewed. outside of the exterior has been refurbished. The outside parking roof was just recently replaced. A new sprinkler system was installed.

The will significantly decrease affordable housing in the city core.

I also feel that it will decrease the attractiveness of the Beacon hill park to have a higher structure so close to the perimeter of the park.

I heartily agree and support the proposal to have a moratorium on the demolition of older structures

Respectfully
Robert Archer

Lacey Maxwell

From: Deborah Rhodes [REDACTED]
Sent: April 11, 2018 4:30 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed development at Quadra & Southgate Streets

Greetings all,

I would like to put in my two cents on this proposed development. I find it intrusive and insensitive in scale. The apartment block, 6 stories, and what looks like a 7th level on the south elevation, with variances to as close as the street as possible, blocks out light, trees and residential views from lower buildings and houses in the neighbourhood.

The proposed townhouses on Convent are more in scale with the neighbourhood.

I understand the requirement for rentals, surely you must understand how a building of this scale is not in keeping with our community.

Please consider this proposal carefully.

Respectfully,
Deborah Rhodes

Deborah Rhodes Design
[REDACTED]