Committee of the Whole Report
For the Meeting of September 6, 2018

To: Committee of the Whole  Date: August 23, 2018
From: Jonathan Tinney, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development
Subject: Rezoning Application No. 00610 for 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place

RECOMMENDATION

That Council instruct staff to prepare the necessary Zoning Regulation Bylaw Amendment that would authorize the proposed development outlined in Rezoning Application No. 00610 for 505, 517 and 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place, that first and second reading of the Zoning Regulation Bylaw Amendment be considered by Council and a Public Hearing date be set once the following conditions are met:

1. Preparation and execution of the following legal agreements:
   a. Statutory Right-of-Way to secure 1.59 metres of the site adjacent Southgate Street, to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and Public Works
   b. Statutory Right-of-Way to secure 2.02 metres of the site adjacent Convent Place, to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and Public Works
   c. Housing Agreement to secure the residential units as rental for a 20 year period, to ensure that these units are not strata titled prior to the 20 year term of the agreement lapsing and to ensure that future strata bylaws cannot restrict the rental of units to non-owners, to the satisfaction of the Director of Sustainable Planning and Community Development

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In accordance with Section 479 of the Local Government Act, Council may regulate within a zone the use of land, buildings and other structures; the density of the use of the land, buildings and other structures; the siting, size and dimensions of buildings and other structures; as well as, the uses that are permitted on the land, and the location of uses on the land and within buildings and other structures.

In accordance with Section 483 of the Local Government Act, Council may enter into a Housing Agreement which may include terms agreed to by the owner regarding the occupancy of the housing units, and provided such agreement does not vary the use of the density of the land from that permitted under the zoning bylaw.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present Council with information, analysis and recommendations for a Rezoning Application for the properties located at 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place. The proposal is to rezone from the R3-AM-1 Zone, Mid-Rise Multiple Dwelling District, the R3-A1 Zone, Low Profile Multiple Dwelling district and the R-K Zone, Medium Density Attached Dwelling District, to a new site-specific zone in order to increase the density and allow for a six-storey, multi-unit residential building with approximately 83 units and four townhouses with an overall density of 1.9:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

The following points were considered in assessing this application:

- the proposal is consistent with the Official Community Plan (OCP) Urban Residential Urban Place Designation, which envisions densities up to 1.2:1 FSR with potential bonus density up to a total of approximately 2:1 FSR in strategic locations for the advancement of plan objectives
- consistent with the City’s Density Bonus Policy, the applicant opted to have a land lift analysis prepared to determine if the proposal could support a community amenity contribution; it was determined that the increase in land value is insufficient to support a community amenity contribution
- the site is currently occupied by several buildings which contribute 38 units to the city’s rental housing stock. The proposal would replace these units with 87 new rental units for a net gain of 48 units
- the applicant has declined to identify a general rent level; however, a Housing Agreement is proposed to secure the units as rental for a 20 year period and to restrict the strata titling of the building during this period
- the applicant has provided a tenant assistance plan with this proposal to ensure existing tenants are supported through a transition to new housing
- in order to help achieve the standard Right-of-Way width, Statutory Right-of-Ways would be provided along Quadra Street and Convent Place
- there are no bylaw protected trees on the subject property and the mature chestnut trees within the Quadra Street boulevard would be retained with this application

BACKGROUND

Description of Proposal

This Rezoning Application is to rezone the subject properties to a new site-specific zone in order to increase density, and allow for a six-storey multi-unit residential building with approximately 83 units and four townhouses with an overall density of 1.9:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

The majority of the site is in the R3-AM-1 Zone, Mid-Rise Multiple Dwelling District. The new zone would allow for increased density, height, site coverage, and reduced open site space and setbacks in comparison to the R3-AM-1 Zone. In addition, a parking variance is proposed and will be discussed in relation to the concurrent Development Permit with Variances Application.

Affordable Housing Impacts

The applicant proposes to replace the existing rental units with approximately 87 new residential units which would increase the overall supply of housing in the area. A Housing Agreement is also proposed to secure rental of the units for a 20 year period, prohibit the strata titling of the units during this period, and to ensure future strata bylaws cannot prohibit the rental of units to
non-owners. Under current City policy, if the vacancy rate is less than four percent, any future strata conversion applications would require Council approval.

The existing building (Beacon Arms), located at the corner of Southgate Street and Quadra Street, contains 34 rental residential units. Overall, there are 38 existing rental units on the subject properties. A Tenant Assistance Plan has been submitted (attached) to ensure that the existing tenants are assisted through the transition to new housing.

Sustainability Features

The applicant has identified a number of sustainability features which will be reviewed in association with the concurrent Development Permit with Variances Application for this property.

Active Transportation Impacts

The application proposes the following features which support active transportation:
- secure bicycle rooms with 116 bicycle parking stalls and bicycle repair areas
- 12 visitor bicycle parking stalls located in close proximity to the building entrances.

Public Realm Improvements

No public realm improvements are proposed in association with this Rezoning Application.

Accessibility Impact Statement

The British Columbia Building Code regulates accessibility as it pertains to buildings.

Land Use Context

The area is characterized by low to mid-rise multi-unit residential buildings, single-family dwellings and duplexes. Beacon Hill Park is located south of the site on the opposite side of Southgate Street.

Existing Site Development and Development Potential

The site is presently developed with a four-storey rental building (505 Quadra Street), duplex (519/521 Quadra Street) and two single-family dwellings (517 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place).

The current zoning of 505 Quadra Street is R3-AM-1, Mid-Rise Multiple Dwelling Unit District. Under this zone the property could be developed with a four-storey, multiple-dwelling building with a floor space ratio of 1.6:1, subject to parking and open space requirements.

The current zoning of 517 and 519/521 Quadra Street is the R3-A1 Zone, Low Profile Multiple Dwelling District. Under this zone the property could be developed with a three-storey multiple dwelling building with a floor space ratio of 1.2:1, subject to parking and open space requirements.

The current zoning of 931 Convent Place is the R-K Zone, Medium Density Attached Dwelling District. Although this zone permits attached dwellings, due to the smaller lot area (501.9m^2), development of the site is limited to a single-family dwelling with a secondary suite or garden suite, subject to the R1-B Zone, Single Family Dwelling District regulations.
The majority of the site is within the R3-AM-1 Zone; therefore, the following data table compares the proposal with the regulations of the R3-AM-1 Zone. An asterisk is used to identify where the proposal is less stringent than the existing zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Criteria</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>R3-AM-1</th>
<th>OCP Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site area (m²) - minimum</td>
<td>3738.00</td>
<td>920.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (Floor Space Ratio)</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
<td>1.2:1 (base density)</td>
<td>1.2 (base density)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (m) - maximum</td>
<td>19.62* (six-storey building)</td>
<td>8.04 (townhouses)</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storeys - maximum</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site coverage % - maximum</td>
<td>73.23*</td>
<td>30.00 (base)</td>
<td>40.00 (with enclosed parking and 50% open site space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open site space % - minimum</td>
<td>26.77*</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks (m) - minimum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Quadra St)</td>
<td>5.88* (building face)</td>
<td>3.00* (townhouses &amp; above ground parking structure)</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (Convent Place)</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
<td>9.81 (half the building height)</td>
<td>9.81 (half the building height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (Southgate Street)</td>
<td>3.80*</td>
<td>9.81 (half the building height)</td>
<td>9.81 (half the building height)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking - minimum</td>
<td>95*</td>
<td>115 (requirement for condominium)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minimum) included in the overall units</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle parking stalls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minimum)</td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Consultation

Consistent with the Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) Procedures for Processing Rezoning and Variances Applications, the applicant has consulted the Fairfield Gonzales CALUC at a Community Meeting held on May 15, 2017. A meeting summary from the CALUC is attached to this report.

ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan

The OCP identifies the site as being located in the Urban Residential Urban Place Designation, which envisions buildings up to six-storeys in height with FSR generally up to 1.2:1 with increased density up to approximately 2:1 FSR. Policy 6.23 of the OCP notes that an application seeking density towards the upper-end of the scale will generally be supported when the proposal significantly advances Plan objectives and is located adjacent to an arterial or secondary arterial road; in this instance, the property is located on Quadra Street and Southgate Street, which are both classified as secondary arterial roads.

The OCP encourages a range of housing types, forms and tenures across the City; the proposal would provide approximately 83 new multi-unit rental residential dwellings in a combination of one and two-bedroom units, and four three-bedroom townhouses fronting Convent Place. These new units would contribute towards the City’s market rental housing stock. Policy 13.23 of the OCP notes that consideration of higher-density redevelopments of buildings with four or more rental units should be supported where the same number of rental units is secured on-site, and a general rent level identified through a Housing Agreement. A Housing Agreement is proposed to secure all 87 units as market rental for a twenty year period, and to restrict the strata titling of the units prior to receiving occupancy. This would ensure that future strata titling of the building would require Council approval if the City’s vacancy rate is below four percent, as per City policy. The applicant has declined to identify a general rent level with this application.

Local Area Plans

The land use policies of Suburban Neighbourhoods, 1984, that relate to the Fairfield neighbourhood identify the subject site as suitable for apartment residential development and encourages four-storey buildings.

Tree Preservation Bylaw and Urban Forest Master Plan

An assessment by a certified arborist was conducted with this application (attached). There were 23 trees inventoried on public land and the adjacent neighbouring properties. There are no protected trees on the subject property; however, there is a large mature Blue Atlas Cedar tree on the south-west corner of the subject property that would require removal as it is within the building footprint, but as noted, it is not bylaw protected. Six mature Horse Chestnut trees on the Quadra Street boulevard, and two Flowering Cherry trees on Southgate Street, would be retained. The excavation for the underground parkade would require supervision by a professional arborist during the construction phase to ensure measures are taken to protect these public trees during construction. Five new street trees are proposed along the Convent Place street frontage. An additional 18 trees are proposed on the subject site.

Staff requested an additional arborist report (attached) to explore the root systems of the neighbouring trees located near the property line at 906 Southgate Street. The assessment
found that the majority of the tree’s roots are contained on the neighbouring property due to an existing retaining wall and would not be negatively impacted by the parkade or building construction. The retention and protection of these trees would be determined by the property owners of 505 Quadra Street and 906 Southgate Street, as they are not bylaw protected nor public trees.

Density Bonus Policy

A land lift analysis conducted by Coriolis Consulting Corporation has been provided with this application. It concludes that the additional density proposed with this Rezoning Application does not generate a land lift due to the rental tenure of the proposed residential units.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is consistent with the OCP as it relates to low-rise, multi-unit residential development within Urban Residential areas, and furthers the goals in the OCP with regards to increasing the supply of market rental housing. Staff recommend for Council’s consideration that Council advance the application to a Public Hearing, subject to the preparation of legal agreements.

ALTERNATE MOTION

That Council decline Rezoning Application No. 00610 for the property located at 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place.

Respectfully submitted,

Alec Johnston
Senior Planner
Development Services Division

Jonathan Tinney, Director
Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department
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- Attachment C: Plans date stamped August 20, 2018
- Attachment D: Applicant’s letters to Mayor and Council dated September 19, 2017 and August 20, 2018
- Attachment E: Community Association Land Use Committee May 15, 2017 Meeting Summary
- Attachment F: Arborist Report and Arborist Supervision Report dated June 15, 2018
- Attachment G: Transportation Impact Assessment dated September 13, 2017
• Attachment H: Tenant Assistance Plan dated July 26, 2018
• Attachment I: Advisory Design Panel Meeting Minutes dated February 28, 2018
• Attachment J: Correspondence
To: Committee of the Whole  Date: August 23, 2018
From: Jonathan Tinney, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development
Subject: Development Permit with Variances for 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place

RECOMMENDATION

That Council, after giving notice and allowing an opportunity for public comment at a meeting of Council, and after the Public Hearing for Rezoning Application No. 00610, if it is approved, consider the following motion:

"That Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00088 for 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place, in accordance with:

1. Receipt of final plans generally in accordance with the plans date stamped August 20, 2018, with the following changes to the satisfaction of the Director of Sustainable Planning and Community Development:
   i. correct minor inconsistencies between plans
   ii. siting and design of the proposed fence and guardrail as shown on the landscape plan
2. Development meeting all Zoning Regulation Bylaw requirements, except for the following variances:
   i. reduce the required vehicle parking from 115 stalls to 95 stalls;
   ii. reduce the required visitor parking from 9 stalls to 8 stalls
3. Receipt of a car share agreement that includes MODO car share memberships for 50% of the residential units to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and Public Works.
4. The Development Permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution."

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In accordance with Section 489 of the Local Government Act, Council may issue a Development Permit in accordance with the applicable guidelines specified in the Official Community Plan. A Development Permit may vary or supplement the Zoning Regulation Bylaw but may not vary the use or density of the land from that specified in the Bylaw.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present Council with information, analysis and recommendations for a Development Permit with Variances Application for the properties located at 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place. The proposal is for a six-storey multi-unit residential building at the corner of Quadra Street and Southgate Street and for four townhouse units fronting onto Convent Place. The variances are related to reduced vehicle parking requirements.

The following points were considered in assessing this Application:

- the proposal is generally consistent with the objectives of Development Permit Area 16: General Form and Character and the associated Design Guidelines
- the applicant has provided a parking study with the proposal to support the proposed parking variances.

BACKGROUND

Description of Proposal

The proposal is for a six-storey multi-unit residential building at the corner of Quadra Street and Southgate Street and for four townhouse units fronting onto Convent Place. Specific details include:

- a low-rise building form consisting of contemporary architectural features
- building massing and siting close to the street to minimize shadowing and overlook of buildings to the east and to the north
- one level of underground parking with 95 parking stalls accessed via Convent Place
- secure bicycle parking rooms located within the parking level with direct access to Quadra Street
- exterior materials include: brick, stucco, cementitious panels and wood patterned metal soffits
- private open space for each unit in the form of a patio or balcony
- lobby entryway to the six-storey building fronting Quadra Street
- separate at-grade entrances and pathways for the six-storey building’s ground floor units.
- common amenity room and outdoor amenity area for residents, located on the parkade roof between the six-storey building and the townhouses
- retaining walls to manage grade-changes.

The proposed variances are related to:

- reduced vehicle parking
- reduced visitor parking

Sustainability Features

As indicated in the applicant's letter dated September 19, 2017, a number of green building features are associated with this proposal, including:

- construction following the principles and guidelines of Built Green Canada
- passive design principles such as heat recovery ventilation
Advisory Design Panel

The application was referred to the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) on February 28, 2018. The ADP was asked to comment on the overall building and landscape design with particular attention to the following aspects of the proposal:
   a) building massing and articulation
   b) potential landscaping improvements along the Quadra Street frontage
   c) exposed parkade walls and retaining walls as it relates to the pedestrian experience along Quadra Street.

The ADP meeting minutes are attached for reference, and the following motion was carried:

"It was moved...that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council, that Rezoning Application No. 00610 and Development Permit No. 000511 for 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and policies and should be declined with reconsideration of the architectural language and massing in building design, materials and detailing, particularly on the six storey building, to be more authentic to the nature of new development on this site."

In response to the ADP motion, the applicant has made changes to the proposal, focusing primarily on the six-storey building:
   • the architectural expression now uses a mix of traditional and modern materials in a more contemporary style with simplified detailing and cornice treatment
   • horizontal bands have been introduced to the upper storeys to reduce the perceived height of the building
   • the sixth-storey has been stepped back 1.5m to reduce the apparent height of the building
   • greater articulation and breaks in the horizontal façade to reduce the massing and perceived length of the building
   • variation in materials between the upper and lower floors to break up the massing and reduce the apparent height and length of the building
   • the first and second storeys at the corner of Quadra Street and Southgate Street have been offset and rotated to further break-up the massing while providing visual interest to the prominent corner of the building
   • the townhouses have remained virtually the same with slight changes to the colour palette and cornice treatment to complement the design of the six-storey building.

ANALYSIS

Development Permit Area and Design Guidelines

The proposal is consistent with the Official Community Plan, 2012 (OCP) place character features under the Urban Residential Urban Place Designation, through the provision of variable setbacks with primary doorways facing the street, enhanced landscaping, boulevard and street tree planting and collective driveway access to underground parking.

The OCP identifies the site in Development Permit Area (DPA) 16: General Form and Character. The objectives of this DPA are to integrate new buildings in a manner that
compliments and enhances the established place character of an area through high quality architecture, landscape and urban design. Other objectives include providing sensitive transitions to adjacent properties with built form that is often three-storeys or lower, and to achieve more livable environments through considerations for human-scaled design, quality of open spaces, privacy impacts and safety and accessibility. Design Guidelines that apply to DPA 16 are:

- Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial Design Guidelines (2012)
- Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010).

Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial Design Guidelines

The Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial Design Guidelines are applicable for multi-unit residential building of three or more units with the overall aim of achieving design excellence, livability and contribution to a sense of place. Overall, the proposal is consistent with these Guidelines. The low-rise horizontal form with a flat roof and stepped back sixth storey is generally consistent with the character of the area which has several low-rise apartment buildings. The provision of separate at grade entrances, front patios and gardens for the ground level units within the six-storey building and the four townhouses along Convent Place enhance the character of the area and compliment some of the nearby ground-oriented multi-unit buildings, such as 893 Academy Close and the duplexes located at 525/527 Quadra Street and 920/922 Convent Place. Staff recommend that the character of the building and street-level design of the building compliments the surrounding buildings and contributes to a sense of place.

The Guidelines encourage multi-unit residential development to provide an appropriate transition to lower density building forms, which is often three storeys or lower. The proposed three-storey townhouses on Convent Place provide a sensitive transition in height and form between the proposed six-storey multi-unit building and the existing two-storey building on the opposite side of Convent Place. The six-storey building's setback from the east property line ranges from 5.73m (near Southgate Street) to more than 17.0m to minimize the impact on the existing four-storey building located at 906 Southgate Street and the single family dwellings along Convent Place. The applicant has provided a shadow study which shows the proposed buildings would have minimal shadowing impact on the adjacent properties. Staff recommend that the proposed building does provide an appropriate transition to the lower density building forms within the immediate context.

The Guidelines also encourage new development to be designed with sensitivity to context. Staff originally raised concerns with the projecting underground parkade and the potentially stark interface this creates with adjoining properties and along Quadra Street. Due to the sloping topography of the site, the parkade is fully underground at the Southgate Street end of the site and projects up to approximately 2.9m above finished grade at the north end of the site. The parkade is setback from the west and east property lines by 3.0m and 1.5m respectively. The applicant proposes raised gardens and landscaping within the setback to screen the exposed parkade wall and retaining wall. The bike room within the parkade has been sited at the north-west corner with clerestory windows and an entrance onto Quadra Street to provide some visual interest and soften this portion of the parkade structure. In addition, the deck of the parkade is also landscaped to provide private patios, a common lawn, common outdoor courtyard, garden beds and a vegetable plots for the residents. The north end of the parkade is hidden behind the four townhouses fronting onto Convent Place. Staff recommend that Council consider supporting this aspect of the proposal.
Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings

The Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings state that an acceptable application will include consideration of an attractive streetscape and that the architecture and landscaping of the immediate area be identified and acknowledged. In evaluating a design, particular emphasis is placed on the solution to these general aspects: design approach, relevancy of expression, context, pedestrian access, massing, scale, roofline, street relationship and landscape plan. The Application is consistent with these Guidelines.

Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters

The Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters state that fences, gates and shutters must complement the character of the street and not result in a fortress-like appearance, must integrate with building design, architectural finishes and materials for a cohesive effect, and not be the dominant feature of the building façade. The Application is consistent with these Guidelines.

Regulatory Considerations

As referenced in the accompanying staff report for Rezoning Application No. 00610, the proposal is to create a new site specific zone with an increase density allowance of 1.9 FSR and six-storey building, consistent with the Urban Residential Urban Place Designation. The new zone would differ from the current R3-AM-1 Zone with regards to height, number of storeys, site coverage, open site space and setbacks. In addition, the applicant proposes to vary the vehicle parking requirements.

Building Height & Number of Storeys

The proposed building height is 19.62m for the six-storey building, which is 7.62m above the maximum allowance in the current zone. To mitigate the impact of the increase height, the applicant has stepped back the sixth storey by 1.5m to reduce the perceived height of the building. The townhouses along Convent are also lower in height (8.04m) which provides a more sensitive transition with the lower height buildings to the north and east of the subject site. In addition, articulation of the building façade, changes in materials and landscaping help to emphasize the ground level and create a more human scaled design at the street level. Staff therefore recommend Council consider supporting the increased building height and number of storeys.

Site Coverage and Open Site Space

The proposed site coverage is approximately 73% and the open site space is approximately 26%, whereas the R3-AM-1 Zone allows for 40% site coverage where parking is enclosed and there is 50% open site space. The higher site coverage and lower open site space is due to the projecting portion of the underground parkade which counts towards building site coverage. To mitigate the impact of the increased site coverage, the parkade deck has been landscaped to provide private patios for the ground level units, as well as, a common outdoor amenity space and garden beds and vegetable garden plots for the residents. Raised planters also provide additional soil depth for small trees and shrubs. The site coverage of the habitable portion of the building is approximately 37.5%. Staff therefore recommend that Council consider supporting the increased site coverage.
Setbacks

The proposed front yard setback (Quadra Street) is 5.88m to the face of the six-storey building and 3.0m to the exposed parkade wall and townhouses. A 10.5m front setback is required under the R3-AM-1 Zone for a four-storey building. The proposed setback is generally consistent with the setback of the current building at 505 Quadra Street and would not disrupt the existing streetscape pattern as the new building would be positioned similar to adjacent properties to the north.

The proposed side setbacks are 3.80m (Southgate Street) and 3.05m (Convent Place), and the rear yard (east) setback is 5.73m to the face of the six-storey building and 1.50m to the above ground portion of the parkade and garden shed. In comparison, the R3-AM-1 Zone requires a setback equal to half the building height, which would equate to a 9.81m setback. As mentioned above, due to the positioning of the six-storey building, the proposed setback from the east property line increases from 5.75m near Southgate Street to approximately 17.5m at the northeast corner of the building. Interventions to mitigate the impact of the reduced setback include stepping back of the upper storey and landscape screening and new trees along the property line to soften the transition and provide visual screening. The proposed setbacks from Convent Place and Southgate Street are supportable as the provision of enhanced landscaping and individual unit entrances enhance the street character and provide visual interest for pedestrians. Staff recommend Council consider supporting the reduced setbacks.

Vehicle Parking

The proposal includes 87 parking stalls (one per dwelling unit) plus eight visitor stalls for a total of 95 parking stalls. Schedule C of the Zoning Regulation Bylaw requires 106 stalls based on the site location, unit sizes and tenure plus an additional nine visitor stalls for a total of 115 parking stalls. The Schedule C parking requirements for the building if rental where secured in perpetuity would be 96 stalls plus nine visitor stalls for a total of 105 parking stalls. The applicant has provided a Transportation Impact Assessment (attached), which recommends that the 95 proposed stalls are sufficient to meet the anticipated parking demand based on rental occupancy of the residential units and a comparison with other rental buildings in the area.

The applicant is proposing a Housing Agreement to secure the building as rental for 20 years; however, should the building be converted to a strata-condominium in the future, the parking demand may not be met on-site given the higher parking demand associated with condominiums and further transportation demand management (TDM) measure may be needed.

To mitigate the variance, the applicant proposes to provide 50% of the units with MODO car share memberships. These memberships would run with the unit and not the occupant. The applicant is also exceeding the requirements for long-term and visitor bicycle parking. Therefore, staff recommend that Council consider supporting the proposed parking variance.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposed development is generally consistent with the applicable Design Guidelines and includes high-quality building materials and landscape finishes. The contemporary design is supportable and complementary to the existing character of the area. The variances related to building height, siting and setbacks are supportable through appropriate building articulation and the provision landscaping to mitigate potential impacts. Staff, therefore, recommend for Council’s consideration that Council support the Application.
ALTERNATE MOTION

That Council decline Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00088 for the property located at 505, 517, 519/521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Tinney, Director
Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department

Alec Johnston
Senior Planner
Development Services Division
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September 19th, 2017

City of Victoria
No. 1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC
V8W 1P6

Attn.: Mayor & Council

Re: Rezoning & Development Permit Application
505, 517, 519, 521 Quadra Street & 931 Convent Place, Victoria, BC

Analogue Projects Ltd., on behalf of Surfside Holdings Ltd., is pleased to submit this rezoning and development permit application for the properties located at 505, 517, 519, 521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place. The intent of the application is to replace the existing 34-unit Beacon Arms apartments, 2 adjacent single-family homes and duplex in order to construct a new 6-storey, 83-unit, purpose-built, rental apartment building and 4 rental townhomes over top of one level of secure underground parking and bicycle storage.

History

This approximately 1-acre site is predominantly characterized by the 34-unit Beacon Arms apartments. Surfside Holdings Ltd. – a family-owned company currently in its 3rd generation of ownership – has owned the Beacon Arms since 1979 and has responsibly managed it ever since. Over the past 20+ years, Surfside Holdings has acquired the adjacent properties in anticipation of the Beacon Arms’ inevitable redevelopment.

The Beacon Arms was constructed in 1965 and is now approaching the end of its useful life. The building is experiencing significant issues, such as a failing foundation, aging plumbing and pipes, sagging windows, exterior siding that is separating from the structure, etc. This proposal is a proactive response with the intent to create a new, energy-efficient, rental legacy for this site.

Project Benefits

The benefits of this project are substantial. The total number of rental units on the site will be more than doubled. This project will replace 34 aging rental apartments, 2 rental houses, and a rental duplex with 83 new, efficient purpose-built rental apartment units. In addition, there are 4 rental townhomes for a total unit count of 87. The townhomes are 3-bedroom + den and will be a perfect fit for families. The intent is to provide long-term rental solutions for a broad range of ages and needs.

The building design has been carefully considered to respond to the neighbourhood. High-quality materials such as brick provide a timeless look that reflects the existing character of nearby buildings. The inclusion of garden suites with patios will enhance the overall public realm and bring a sense of connection to the street. The lower-scale massing of the townhomes along Convent Place responds directly to the neighbouring properties while at the same time allowing for a more substantial separation between the adjacent buildings thus providing more privacy.

Landscaping has been given careful consideration. The garden suites will have private patios and the common areas around the building are designed to cater to a wide range of uses. Abundant greenspace, community gardens for residents, and indoor/outdoor amenity spaces for entertaining larger groups will all add to the sense of community being fostered within the building and is a great benefit for families.
Analogue

The street parking in the vicinity will be improved by the increased on-site parking ratio. The existing building has a parking ratio of approximately 0.67 parking spaces per suite, whereas the new building will have a ratio of greater than 1.0 parking spaces per suite. Parking for the project is secure and entirely underground, providing a total of 95 tenant and visitor parking spaces for our 87 suites.

Secure bicycle parking is being provided based on the new bylaw requirements. The current bylaw requires 87 bicycle stalls. We are providing 110 bicycle stalls. The bicycle stalls will be located with convenient, at-grade access from the parkade directly onto Quadra Street, facilitating ease of access.

Further, we have made allowances for 6 scooter parking stalls located around the elevator lobby in the parkade level for tenants with mobility concerns.

Tenant Engagement and Relocation Plan

In February of 2017, when we first contemplated this proposal, we met individually with each of our tenants in order to give them an early indication of our redevelopment intentions. It was important to us that we contact them first before we announced our plans to the public-at-large. At that time, we committed to the tenants that we would keep them informed of our progress on a regular basis by way of an e-mail distribution and postings in the common areas of the building.

In view of the current low vacancy rate, we also offered to assist our Existing Tenants in finding alternate accommodation in the neighbourhood. We define “Existing Tenants” as those tenants in situ as of February 1, 2017.

Surfside Holdings is fortunate to own and manage another 160 units in Fairfield and James Bay. We have offered Existing Tenants the first opportunity to rent in our other local properties as vacancies come available. Additionally, Analogue Projects has 116 units in Fairfield and James Bay which are being made available to Beacon Arms tenants on a priority basis. In total, that is 276 units across six local buildings which are potentially available for selection by our Existing Tenants as vacancies arise. During the approximately eighteen months, before redevelopment begins, no one will be rushed into making a hasty choice. Given that the normal tenancy turnover rate is about 20% - 25% per year in all our buildings, there will be ample selection for all Existing Tenants.

We understand that some tenants, particularly the elderly, may be anxious and upset at the prospect of moving. Accordingly, we have hired a Tenant Relocation Coordinator, beginning October 1, to assist our Existing Tenants in their relocation search and moving arrangements.

A summary of our Tenant Relocation Plan is as follows:

A. Rents have been frozen at their current levels for Existing Tenants effective February 1st, 2017.

B. Tenants are being informed on a regular basis, by email and by posting in a common area, about upcoming vacancies in other buildings within the Surfside and Analogue portfolios. Tenants will be given first opportunity to rent any vacancies. Tenants are given approximately one week’s advance notice of any vacancies prior to them being advertised to the general public. In addition, the locations of our other properties, and the contact information for their respective resident managers, have been made available to all the Existing Tenants.

C. The Tenant Relocation Coordinator will be responsible for keeping the remaining Existing Tenants informed and facilitating their relocation prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

To date, there are 24 Existing Tenants remaining. Ten tenants have already relocated—some to our other properties and some elsewhere. As time goes on, normal turnover will continue to reduce the number of
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Existing Tenants, possibly at an accelerating pace. Between the normal turnover and the efforts of our Tenant Relocation Coordinator, we anticipate that there will be relatively few of the original Existing Tenants still in place by the time we have completed the development approval process. We will keep City staff informed as to our progress.

Community Engagement

Our community consultation process included neighbouring properties, the Fairfield Gonzales CALUC and the surrounding community. This process informed our concept and design. A summary of the consultation is as follows:

- Pre-Planning Meeting, City of Victoria: February 15th, 2017
- Tenant Engagement, Beacon Arms: February 22nd – February 25th, 2017
- Pre-CALUC Meeting: February 23rd, 2017
- 906 Southgate Strata Council Meeting: March 8th, 2017
- Pre-Application Open House: April 20th, 2017
- CALUC Presentation: May 15th, 2017

Feedback for the project was mostly gained from the Pre-Application Open House and the CALUC Presentation. A summary of the feedback is as follows:

Pre-Application Open House:

The Pre-Application Open House was held on April 20th, 2017 at the Church of Our Lord located at 626 Blanshard Street from 5:00pm – 7:00pm.

- 700 invitations were delivered by Canada Post
- 34 people registered at the Open House
- 17 feedback forms were received
- Generally, feedback was supportive especially because the proposal is a purpose-built rental building as opposed to strata condominiums. The architecture and massing were generally supported. The primary concerns expressed pertained to the increased traffic and parking along Convent Place. Suggestions were made to have access come off of Quadra Street.

CALUC Presentation:

The CALUC Presentation was held on May 15th, 2017 at the Fairfield Gonzales Community Centre located at 1330 Fairfield Road starting at 7:00pm. A report from the CALUC has been submitted to Staff summarizing the questions and concerns regarding the project. Community comments centred around: concern for existing tenants; opposition to the modern design of the townhomes; and concerns regarding access to the parking from Convent Place.

Addressing Concerns:

To address the concerns raised from the Pre-Application Open House and the CALUC Presentation, we performed the following:

- Bunt & Associates traffic engineers were engaged to perform a Traffic Impact Assessment for the proposal in order to address the concerns regarding parking and access off of Convent Place. They analyzed the existing and future traffic operations. Considerations were given to traffic volumes, queuing generated by turning, alternative forms of transportation i.e. transit, bicycles, etc., and the land use in relation to the street network. Their conclusion was that the "proposed development
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is anticipated to have minimal impact to vehicle operations..." Further, the consultant raised concerns regarding the safety of vehicles making left-hand turns onto and off Quadra Street.

- The architecture of the townhomes was amended to move away from contemporary design. The revised design uses materials similar to those being used in the apartment building, such as brick. The design is now a more traditional aesthetic to match the character of the surrounding properties.

Site Context, OCP & Zoning

The site is located at the intersection of two Secondary Arterial roads, Southgate Street and Quadra Street. It is bordered by a variety of building types and land uses including Beacon Hill Park, multi-unit residential buildings ranging from 3-7 storeys and one- and two-storey single-family and attached dwellings. The 40,231sf site is comprised of three parcels with differing zoning: R3-AM-1; R3-A1; and R-K. As the current zoning on the site only allows for a maximum of 4 storeys a rezoning is required. However, the site is designated as Urban Residential by the OCP, meaning it is intended for multi-unit residential buildings up to 6 storeys.

Project Description

Massing & Siting:

Creating a higher density family-oriented rental community within close proximity to single family lots, influenced this project’s massing and siting. We chose to lessen the massing along Convent Place in order to transition from single family homes to the proposed townhome units and ultimately to the multi-storey apartment building located at the south west corner of the site. This is in keeping with the existing increased density of multi-storied buildings along Southgate Street. The proposed multi-storey building is weighted towards Quadra Street in order to provide ample separation between the neighbouring apartment building to the east while minimizing the shadow impacts to the east.

The buildings are situated in such a way to provide a cloistered internal courtyard that provides semi-private greenspaces, individual private patios and an outdoor community area outside of a multi-purpose room.

In terms of massing, the development is comprised of a 6-storey multi-family building, a 3-storey townhouse building and below grade parking with an FSR of 2:1. The building follows the intent of the Official Community Plan (OCP) Urban Place Guidelines for Urban Residential which allows for six storey buildings. Additionally, three to five storey brick building facades define the street wall on Quadra Street and Southgate Street with upper storeys visually set back above.

Streetscape / Relation to street:

The building has been provided with significantly increased landscaped setbacks along the majority of Quadra Street in order to reduce the visual massing along public/pedestrian routes. Ground floor units have individual garden gates, patios and main entrances with direct access to the sidewalks. The building lobby has a prominent canopy and fully glazed wall to help clearly identify the building entrance. These elements of the building form address the principles of the OCP Design Guideline Section 2 which state that "individual entrances with direct connections to the public sidewalk are encouraged" (2.4.1) and "residential use at street level should have strong entry features and building designs that encourage interaction with the street." (2.4)
**Exterior Finishes:**

Strong horizontal cues were introduced on the lower floors utilizing high quality, durable and traditional finishes including brick cladding, EFIS cornice, picket guardrails, and heavy concrete lintels and sills. The upper floors use a lighter modern aesthetic with larger spans of glazing, glass guardrails, corrugated metal siding and topped off with a thin roof fascia profile that follows the undulating exterior walls. The juxtaposition of these two styles (modern on top of the traditional on bottom) helps to emphasize a "setback" look of the upper floors in order to reduce the visual impact of the 6-storey building. The use of brick on the lower floors off of Quadra Street and Southgate Street and robust contemporary materials on the upper floors provide a timeless look to the building while addressing the OCP guidelines for exterior finishes, which state that "exterior building materials should be high quality, durable and capable of weathering gracefully." Additionally, the brick façade wraps the south/east corner where it transitions to a robust stucco façade on the east elevation. This use of materials addresses the OCP guidelines which state that "quality materials used on the principal façade should be continued around any building corner or edge which is visible from the public realm."

Blank wall surfaces have been treated in a variety of ways. Above-grade parkade walls are lined with planter beds containing varied and luscious landscaping. The north elevation, comprised primarily of a stucco wall finish hosts an illuminated building sign stating: "The Beacon". These measures address guideline 4.3 which state that "exposed party walls and blank side elevations, where necessary should incorporate features such as texture, reveals, colours, planting or other treatments to provide visual interest."

Materials have been carried over from the multi-storey building to the townhouse units, including the brick walls, EFIS cornices, concrete lintels and sills, corrugated metal at upper floors and wood-like soffits to provide cohesion between the buildings.

**Safety & Security (CPTED)**

The programming and configuration of buildings provide healthy opportunities for natural surveillance. While privacy is maintained for individual dwellings, all common areas and outdoor spaces have sightlines from multiple dwelling units. The buildings will also be equipped with ample video surveillance and on site security.

Landscaping has been utilized to create a sense of ownership for residents on the site. Symbolic barriers in hard and soft landscaping create a sense of place when entering the site. Additionally, ample outdoor spaces – including a community garden – and programmed courtyards and benches provide places for residents to meet and interact.

**Transportation & Infrastructure**

The site is well situated and fully serviced by City of Victoria infrastructure. Beacon Hill Park, schools, hospitals, commercial facilities including auto repair, restaurants, convenience stores, and cultural centers are all within walking distance from the site. Additionally, being in close proximity to Downtown and Cook Street Village the site has adequate work and shopping opportunities, making the site suitable for an increased population density. The site has adequate transportation infrastructure to serve the increased population, including bus stops to service multiple bus routes and direct access to bike lanes and two Secondary Arterial roads.

An intensive Traffic Impact Assessment has been undertaken by Bunt and Associates to define the off-street parking demand for the site. While the proposed parking supply does not meet the current Bylaw minimum of 114 spaces for the site, it does meet the Proposed Bylaw minimum of 95 spaces, based on the
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Cities Off-Street Parking Review. Bunt’s analysis indicates that the 95 parking spaces will meet the peak period parking demands and proposed Bylaw requirements. The analysis therefore recommends that the vehicle parking supply is appropriate for the proposed development.

The development will exceed the bylaw requirements and Off-street Parking recommendations for bicycle parking by supplying 125 Class 1 (long term) spaces and at least 6 Class 2 (short term) spaces.

Green Building Features

We plan to construct the building using the following green building features as per the City’s Green Building Indicators:

- **Rating system:**
  - We plan to construct and develop the project using the principles and guidelines of Built Green Canada as a reference. Any decision to pursue formal certification under Built Green will be determined during construction.

- **Passive Design:**
  - Maximum of 50% windows on all facades
  - Overall wall assembly RSI value target between 2.3 and 2.9
  - Use of heat recovery ventilation during heating season only, and use of natural ventilation for ventilation and cooling during the remainder of the year
  - Use of clear glass with low U-value and low-e coating
  - All windows EnergyStar rated
  - Minimal glazing on north façade of the multi-family building for increased thermal performance

- **Innovation and Design:**
  - All ductwork to be sealed with low toxin mastic
  - Individual residences have private outdoor deck living space
  - Natural and recyclable building materials used where possible, and where possible materials will be sourced within 800km of the site. Exterior envelope materials are highly durable, and detailing will suit life-span management of components.
  - Directly metered suites
  - Multiple thermostatically controlled heating zones within each residence

- **Building retention and reuse:**
  - The existing building is experiencing significant issues, such as a failing foundation, aging plumbing and pipes, sagging windows, exterior siding that is separating from the structure, etc. The proposed development will provide a significant increase in density to the site. To achieve this density and the required parking, a new building is required with below grade parking covering the majority of the site. Best practices will be used for disposal of building material including recycling of building material where possible.

- **Transportation:**
  - By using the Cities proposed off-street parking and bicycle parking Bylaw minimums rather than the current Bylaw minimums, the project will provide increased bicycle parking and decreased vehicle parking.

- **Energy efficiency:**
  - The project aims to reduce energy use by 10% compared to ASHRAE 9.1 2007.
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- Renewable Energy
  - The building will obtain a minimum of 5% of building energy consumption through the use of a heat recovery ventilation

- Water
  - High efficiency toilets, clothes washing machines and showerheads will be used
  - Faucets with flow rate of 8L/min or less will be used

- Site Permeability
  - Permeable surfaces will be used in open site space, where possible

- Landscaping and urban forest
  - The development will see an increase in the number of trees on the site
  - Landscaping will be of native or adapted vegetation, typically.

- Urban agriculture
  - A community garden will be provided for tenant use

Closing Comments

We request Council's favourable consideration of our proposal. The City desperately needs more rental supply, particularly during the current housing crisis. Our project represents a positive step in this direction.

The number of rental suites on the site will be more than doubled. This can be achieved with only a minimal increase in zoning density. This is a relatively rare opportunity within the City since we are able to consolidate three contiguous single-family parcels of low current density with the existing apartment property.

Rather than build another strata condominium project, we have chosen to build a purpose-built rental project. We are prepared to forego the short-term financial profits of condominiums for the longer-term investment of rental apartments, since we plan to retain ownership for the foreseeable future. Rental property is the business our family knows, and has been committed to for four decades and three generations. We hope to continue our legacy with this and other properties.

Sincerely,

ANALOGUE PROJECTS LTD.

[Signature]

Stuart Kerr
Principal
August 20th, 2018

City of Victoria
No. 1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC
V8W 1P6

Attn.: Mayor and Council

Re: Development Application Revisions
Rezoning and Development Permit Applications REZ00610 and DP00511
505, 517, 519, 521 Quadra Street & 931 Convent Place, Victoria, BC

This letter is submitted to provide context and updates to various aspects of our development proposal for the construction of a new 83-unit residential apartment building and 4 townhouses on the above noted properties, specifically:

A. Tenant Update
B. Design Revisions
C. 20-Year Rental Covenant
D. Economic Considerations of Purpose-Built Rental

A. Tenant Update

Tenant Assistance Plan

Since February 2017, we have been updating our tenants on our development progress through regular, monthly updates and we have been offering our tenants first-priority to rent vacant units in other apartment buildings in our portfolio. In addition, since February 2017, we have frozen rents in the existing Beacon Arms building and existing houses on the property, foregoing the 3.7% (2017) and 4.0% (2018) allowable rent increases. Since then, the City has developed a new Tenant Assistance Policy to be implemented in September 2018. We are pleased to confirm that we have adopted all of the City’s recommended policies and folded in many of our pre-existing tenant compensation and tenant assistance measures in order to create a new and even more robust Tenant Assistance Plan that fully meets and, in some respects, even exceeds this new policy. Please refer to our letter dated July 26th, 2018 for further details.

Beacon Arms Vacancies

At the time we started our consultation process with our tenants and the broader community in February 2017, the Beacon Arms and adjacent houses were 100% occupied (38 tenants). As we progressed through the process, many tenants decided to relocate to other housing of their own accord. Prior to December 11th, 2017, we had some success in re-renting vacant suites by using shorter, fixed-term tenancies offered at a discounted rent. The recent changes to the Residential Tenancy Act have limited the use of fixed-term tenancies and so this option is no longer available to us or prospective tenants. As a result, the Beacon Arms is now only 50% occupied (17 tenants). We expect that this condition will worsen as we continue. The current loss of revenue due to vacancies is approximately $14,500 per month.
B. Design Updates

On February 28th, 2018, we had the opportunity to present our development proposal to the Advisory Design Panel. Based on their feedback and our on-going discussions with City staff, the following outlines the revisions reflected in our most recent submission dated August 20th, 2018. They are as follows:

Character

Through our initial public meetings, we heard from the community that they desired a more traditional approach to the architecture. Our initial submission weighed heavily towards that aesthetic. However, feedback from Advisory Design Panel suggested a desire for a more contemporary approach. In order to balance the views of the community and the Advisory Design Panel, this most recent submission maintains many of the elements of traditional architecture, but introduces modern elements applied in a more transitional way. This is accomplished by maintaining enduring materials such as brick along the base of the proposed building but introducing lighter materials such as Hardi-Panel to the top. Simplified window details and less-ornate cornice features help to transition the building’s overall character. The current design is a wonderful balance between the two design philosophies.

Form and Massing

We heard from both Staff and Advisory Design Panel that they would like to see the massing of the building broken up and reduced. We addressed these comments by stepping-back the 6th floor of the proposed building on all sides in order to bring down the scale of the building – which now appears as a 5-storey building from the street. The impact of this is that we have reduced the density from 2.0 to 1.9 and adjusted the unit mix to allow for an even percentage of 2-bedroom vs. 1-bedroom units. To further address the comments about height, the brick was retained along the base and reinforced at strategic corners of the building. The exterior cladding on the upper floors was horizontally banded to reinforce the perception of lower height.

Another comment from Staff and Advisory Design Panel was that given the length of the site, they wanted to see some design measures to mitigate the perception of length; however, the site is generally long and narrow, so the building naturally reflects that. To address this, larger breaks in the face of the building have been introduced and repeated using the inset balconies. This breaks up the apparent length of the building.

We also heard feedback that the corner of Quadra and Southgate required a stronger presence. Therefore, the southwest corner of the building has been raised and twisted at an oblique angle to give it more significance and interest. By twisting this corner, an opportunity arises to provide exterior balconies along its mid-elevation. This also helps to step the building back off of Southgate. Brick has been maintained as the prominent material choice to help anchor the corner.

C. 20-Year Rental Housing Covenant

Our proposal does not contemplate a stratification of the development and we have no intention of doing so; however, we recognize that Council wishes to secure long-term rental housing. Therefore, to further demonstrate our commitment to rental housing in the City of Victoria, we are voluntarily offering to place a covenant over the development to ensure that the development remains rental housing without restrictions for a period of 20 years.

While it is not our intention to stratify the apartment building at any time, Council can be secure in knowing that the development will be secured as rental housing for at least 20 years. After that period, any
Analogue

stratification of the development would require approval of the City and, if the future owner wished to pursue stratification, the Council at the relevant time could consider a change in use of the building based on the then prevailing circumstances.

D. Economic Considerations

Based on meetings regarding our development proposal with various members of Council, it was suggested that some discussion of the economic considerations around our development proposal would be helpful. As we have said, the economics of purpose-built, rental apartment buildings are very different from those of other possible uses for the properties, such as a 'for-sale' condominium project. Below is some discussion of some of the major differences.

Valuations

Valuations of rental apartments are significantly lower than valuations for condominiums.

Rental apartments are valued and financed based on their net income, resulting from rents paid by tenants after deducting maintenance and other expenses. That net income is then capitalized at a rate determined by the investment market (~4.5%) to arrive at the market value of the rental apartment building as a whole and the individual rental units. If either (1) the values of the rents for the rental units, individually or as a whole, go down or (2) the number of rental units goes down, then the viability of the rental apartment building diminishes exponentially.

For example, assuming the tenant of a rental unit pays monthly rent of $1,000, banks and others in the marketplace would calculate the value of that rental unit as follows:

Example: \((\frac{1,000 \text{ per month of rent} \times 12 \text{ months}}{4.5\%}) = 266,666 \text{ value of the rental unit}\)

Currently, the value of new rental apartment units in this location within the City of Victoria would be approximately $350,000 - $450,000 per rental unit, given current rent levels.

Conversely, condominium projects are valued and financed based on their profitability. Net sales revenue is subtracted by the overall costs of purchasing the land and constructing the building in order to achieve a certain profit margin (which is usually 15-20%).

The value of new condos in this location would be valued from $500,000 - $1,000,000, depending on the size, number of bedrooms and bathrooms, and level of fit and finish, and other factors.

As you can see, the development of a condominium project yields much higher values to a developer/owner than does a purpose-built, rental apartment building and, given the alternative of a condominium project, the viability of developing a purpose-built, rental apartment building is highly dependent on the rents and number of units in the building.

Land Values

Re-development and re-construction of new, purpose-built, rental apartment buildings in place of existing purpose-built, rental apartment buildings is, in most cases, prohibitive because of the land cost.

In June 2018, Coriolis Consulting Corp. performed an economic analysis specifically for our development proposal and submitted it to staff. The purpose was to determine what the difference was between the land
value of the properties under the current zoning and the land value of the properties after rezoning, all for the purpose of calculating Community Amenity Contributions. The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Change in Value Due to Rezoning</th>
<th>Estimated Property Value (improved)</th>
<th>Estimated Land Value (unimproved)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value based on Existing Use &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>$9,225,000</td>
<td>$7,975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Land Value Under Applicant's Proposal for Rental Apartments</td>
<td>$6,698,000</td>
<td>$6,698,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$(2,527,000)</td>
<td>$(1,277,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For clarity, the above shows that the properties of the existing Beacon Arms and existing houses are worth $9,225,000 as an existing rental operation or $7,975,000 as vacant land; however, a 3rd party developer would only be able to value the property at $6,698,000 with a view to developing and constructing a condominium project. Depending on the lens of analysis, by pursuing the development and construction of a purpose-built, rental apartment building according to our development proposal we are effectively devaluing our land anywhere from $1,277,000 - $2,527,000. This analysis reinforces the significance of our eventual contribution towards the creation of rental housing in this location.

The discrepancy in land values is why density is such an important factor as it relates to rental development. The existing stock of market rental apartments is dominated by 4-storey buildings. The inherent value of these buildings as income-producing properties is higher than their developable value unless there is an opportunity to (a) assemble with adjacent, lower-density land in order to achieve higher overall density in a new building or (b) to build on the existing land at substantially higher density than the 6-storeys contemplated in certain areas of the OCP.

Construction Costs

Even though the value of rental apartments are significantly lower than the value of condominium units, the construction costs of building rental apartments are almost the same.

Condominiums and purpose-built, rental apartments have moved closer and closer towards the same level of fit and finish. As a result, the costs to construct both types of developments are now almost the same in most cases. Condominiums are generally more expensive because the level of fit and finish is slightly higher and there are greater costs for sales and marketing; however, that gap continues to shrink. Our current estimates are that the total costs to construct are, for condominiums, approximately $345 per square foot and, for rental apartments, $329 per square foot — a difference of only ~ $15 per square foot. In light of the difference in valuation

In addition, the fact that construction costs have been steadily climbing at a rate of 5% - 10% annually in recent years is a further complicating factor for the viability of developing and building rental apartments.

Summary re Economic Considerations

The differences discussed above in the economics of developing purpose-built, rental apartment buildings result, in most cases, in significant incentives for developer/owners to develop and build condominium projects on their properties.

We in the unique position to be able to propose a purpose-built, rental apartment building for these properties because, as we have said, our family has owned the properties for nearly 40 years and, therefore, we have not had to factor in the cost of acquiring the land at current values for the existing Beacon Arms
and houses. However, we are still cognizant of the economic challenges surrounding our development proposal and, more generally, our commitment to rental housing in the City of Victoria.

**Conclusion**

We are very proud of the revised proposal that we are presenting. It represents a real opportunity to greatly increase the number of rental units in an area of the City that has seen little-to-no increase in this inventory for quite some time. Further, this represents the continuation of a legacy of proud rental ownership for the foreseeable future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ANALOGUE PROJECTS LTD.

Stuart Kerr
Principal
Community Meeting Feedback Form

Location of proposed development:
505 Quadra

COMMUNITY MEETING DETAILS

Date: Thursday, May 15, 2017

Location of Meeting: Fairfield Gonzales Community Association, Centre, 1330 Fairfield Road, Victoria, B.C. V8S 5J1

Meeting hosted by: the Fairfield Gonzales Community Association

Approximate total number of people in attendance: approx. 57 and 5 CALUC members

Meeting Chair: Andrew Brownwright

Note Taker: Alice J. Albert, CALUC member

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DETAILS

Applicant represented by:

Messrs S. and D. Kerr, Analogue Projects and David McGrath (?), Wensley Architectural Ltd. and consultants.

The applicant explained that this proposal is to change the zoning and/or Official Community Plan for the subject property to accommodate the following proposal:

The current zoning is R3-AM-1, RK, and R3-AI. The proposal is to have the building re-zoned to CD, 'a site specific zoning', to accommodate one apartment building with 83 rental units and 4 three bedroom townhouses. They are requesting to build a 6 storey 2FSR building.

Community Questions and Answers:

Questions about Parking/Stalls/Bike storage/scooters and Visitors: It will meet and/or exceed the current and proposed bye-laws. There will be parking for bikes and potential for scooters. Visitor parking might be an issue if there is not enough spaces in the underground parking lot. No need for a variance for parking stalls.

Traffic: entrance to parking for building off of Convent Place. This is a great concern for residents of Convent Place. Unhappy because Convent Place is not a wide nor a long street. This is a City demand—to have access to parking off a minor road: the highway access bye-law.
Construction Noise and drilling and etc. Will there be pounding and/or blasting? Potential for shaking damage to houses/buildings in surrounding area. There should be no blasting. The contours of the site will be used to the greatest advantage during construction. What is known about the soil conditions? A geotechnical engineer will be consulted. Construction time line will be approximately 18-24 months from, approximately, February 2018.

Variances for Height? None.

Construction Materials: Traditional materials to be used such as brick and in particular on the first 4 storeys and a more modern material on the upper 2 floors. The town houses will have similar materials and have a modern design. Would any of the current materials be used in the new building? No. The building will be close to condo standards: 5 appliances.

Shadowing: there should be no or little impact from shadowing.

Engagement with tenants: there has been engagement with tenants since February, 2010. Tenants are being offered to re-locate to other Kerr properties in Fairfield/Rockland/James Bay.

Setbacks: setback on Convent Place for townhouses; width of setback* to be approximately 10' from property line; new apartment building will be approximately 4 – 6' closer to the building on Southgate and setback further from the current building on Quadra Street. The apartment building will be approximately 60' away from Convent Place.

When will permits be disclosed and when will the City’s approval of re-zoning occur? Applications will be made to City when ready and City appears to want to fast track multi-storey buildings—8 months suggested.

Community Comments (including positive, negative, and neutral):

Concerns expressed about current residents finding other, similar affordable accommodation given the current climate for ‘renovictions’ and escalating cost of apartment rentals. Some residents have mobility issues. Owners concerned to be good and responsible landlords and assist with re-locating.

Opposition to modern design of townhouses. Contrasts with houses on Convent Place.

Biggest issues raised about parking and egress off of Convent Place to apartment parking. Many voices were raised opposed to the use of Convent Place as the access to underground parking for the apartment building. Desire expressed to advocate to have this changed.

Generally speaking, parking for visitors, as well as traffic on Convent Place, were significant issues.

(Attach more detailed notes if necessary)
CONSTRUCTION IMPACT
ASSESSMENT AND TREE
PRESERVATION PLAN
505-521 Quadra St. & 931 Convent Pl.,
Victoria (Beacon Hill Residential)

PREPARED FOR: Wensley Architecture Ltd.
104 – 3212 Jacklin Rd.
Victoria, BC
V9B 0J5

PREPARED BY: Talbot, Mackenzie & Associates
Noah Borges – Consulting Arborist
ISA Certified # PN-8409A

Box 48153 RPO - Uptown Victoria, BC V8Z 7H6
Ph: (250) 479-8733
Fax: (250) 479-7050
Email: tmtreehelp@gmail.com
Summary: Based on the existing site conditions and the information provided, we anticipate it will be necessary to remove trees on the neighbouring property to the East numbered: NT9, NT10, NT11 and NT13 to accommodate the proposed excavation for the underground parking area. The trees located on municipal property have a good potential for being retained providing their critical root zones can be adequately protected during the construction process and the proposed excavation does not go beyond the property line of the subject property.

Scope of Assignment: To inventory the existing bylaw protected trees and any trees on neighbouring properties that could be potentially impacted by construction or that are within 3 meters of the property line. Review the proposal to demolish the existing buildings and construct one new 6-storey apartment building, four town homes, one shed, and underground parking, and comment on how construction activity may impact existing trees. Prepare a tree retention and construction damage mitigation plan for those trees deemed suitable to retain given the proposed impacts.

Methodology: We visually examined the trees on the property on August 15, 2017 and prepared an inventory in the attached Tree Resource Spreadsheet. Each tree was identified using a numeric metal tag attached to its lower trunk. Information such as tree species, DBH (1.4m), crown spread, critical root zone (CRZ), health, structure, and relative tolerance to construction impacts were included in the inventory. The trees inventoried with their identification numbers were added to the Site Plans. The conclusions reached were based on the information provided within this site plan specification package.

Summary of Tree Resource: 23 trees were inventoried, none of which are located on the subject property. There are eight trees on the south and west municipal frontages, and 15 on neighbouring properties. The large Cedrus atlantica tree at the southwest end of 505 Quadra Street is not bylaw protected size.

Trees to be Removed: There are no bylaw-protected trees within the property boundary in direct conflict with the building footprint that require removal prior to construction.

Potential Impacts on Trees to be Retained and Mitigation Measures
- **Underground Parking:** The highest potential impact on the tree resource will be related to the excavation for and construction of the underground parkade. Excavation will encroach within the critical root zones of several municipal and neighbours' trees, some of which may require removal. To minimize impacts, we recommend the proposed excavation be shored, rather than sloped, to reduce the likelihood of encountering structural roots. An arborist should also be present to supervise all excavation. If roots are encountered, the arborist should prune the critical roots back to sound tissue to encourage rapid compartmentalization and root re-growth, and re-evaluate the health and stability of the trees.

  - Trees NT9-11, and NT13: These trees are located on the neighbouring property to the east on Southgate Street. They are separated from the existing parking lot by a retaining wall, though it likely does not extend to a depth sufficient to prevent root growth onto the subject property. Therefore, we expect roots to be encountered during excavation for construction of the underground parkade, which will likely necessitate their removal. To better evaluate the potential impacts on these trees, exploratory digging is required (currently precluded because of the existing asphalt surface covering the root zones).

  - Trees NT1-7: Construction of the underground parkade may impact the six Horse chestnut and one Cherry tree located on the west and south municipal frontages. NT1, NT2, and NT7 are most likely to be impacted, as the parkade extends to the property boundary at the southwest corner of the lot, or about 6 m away from NT1 and NT2 and about 3m from NT7. Given the depth of excavation required, additional excavation for working room outside this footprint will be required. If a cut slope is used, it will infringe on municipal property where structural roots are expected to be encountered, and the health and the stability of the trees may be significantly impacted.

  - Trees NT18-23: Excavation for the underground parkade will not be as extensive on the north end of the property given the north-south slope. However, the parkade is only a 1.5m setback along the entirety of the east property line, and with additional required working room, excavation will likely impact trees NT18-23. We have been provided no information as to whether the homeowner consents to their removal.

- **Underground services:**

  - **Water service:** Construction of a water service connection may impact Cherry NT7 located on the south municipal frontage. Site plans indicate a vault is to be located on the south boulevard. The excavation will likely encroach on the critical root zone of the tree. An arborist should be on site to monitor the excavation and prune any roots that are damaged. Depending on the exact location of the service connection, it may be advantageous to excavate using Hydro-Vac or Air Spade. If the excavation must encroach into significantly into the critical root zone of this tree, it may require removal and a replacement tree be planted.

  - **Drain service:** Excavation for the drain service connection at the northwest end of the property may encounter roots from Horsechestnut NT6, located on the west municipal frontage. An arborist should be on site to monitor the excavation and prune any roots that are damaged. Depending on the exact location of the service connection, it may be advantageous to excavate using Hydro-Vac or Air Spade.
- Clearance pruning:
  - Trees NT9-NT11 and NT13: These trees will need to be pruned to create clearance for construction equipment and the new 6-storey apartment building. Some of the lower branches of the cedar trees have been pruned previously for driveway clearance, and it is unlikely that additional pruning may significantly impact the health of the trees.

- New sidewalk construction:
  - It is our understanding that the existing sidewalks on the Southgate Street and Quadra Street municipal frontages are to remain undisturbed, and the existing driveway entrances off of Quadra will be decommissioned and turned into boulevard area.

- Barrier fencing: The areas surrounding the trees to be retained should be isolated from the construction activity by erecting protective barrier fencing. Where possible, the fencing should be erected at the perimeter of the critical root zones. The barrier fencing to be erected must be a minimum of 4 feet in height, of solid frame construction that is attached to wooden or metal posts. A solid board or rail must run between the posts at the top and the bottom of the fencing. This solid frame can then be covered with plywood, or flexible snow fencing (see attached diagram). The fencing must be erected prior to the start of any construction activity on site (i.e. demolition, excavation, construction), and remain in place through completion of the project. Signs should be posted around the protection zone to declare it off limits to all construction related activity. The project arborist must be consulted before this fencing is removed or moved for any purpose.
    - All municipal trees should be protected using barrier fencing encompassing as much of the critical root zones as possible.

- Arborist Supervision: The excavation of the underground parking be completed under supervision by the project arborist. Any roots encountered must be pruned correctly to sound tissue to encourage rapid compartmentalization of the wound and re-growth of new roots.

- Methods to avoid soil compaction: In areas where construction traffic must encroach into the critical root zones of trees to be retained, efforts must be made to reduce soil compaction where possible by displacing the weight of machinery and foot traffic. This can be achieved by one of the following methods:
  - Installing a layer of hog fuel at least 20 cm in depth and maintaining it in good condition until construction is complete.
  - Placing medium weight geotextile cloth over the area to be used and installing a layer of crushed rock to a depth of 15 cm over top.
  - Placing two layers of 19mm plywood.
  - Placing steel plates.

- Demolition of the existing building: The demolition of the existing buildings and any services that must be removed or abandoned, must take the critical root zone of the trees to be retained into account. If any excavation or machine access is required within the critical root zones of trees to be retained, it must be completed under the supervision and direction of the project arborist.
• **Mulching:** Mulching is an important proactive step in maintaining the health of the trees to be retained and mitigating construction related impacts and overall stress. Mulch should be made from a natural material such as wood chips or bark pieces and be 5-8cm deep. As much of the area within two times the dripline of the tree should be mulched, both inside and outside of the critical root zone. No mulch should be touching the trunk of the tree. See “methods to avoid soil compaction” if the area is to have heavy traffic.

• **Arborist Role:** It is the responsibility of the client or his/her representative to contact the project arborist for the purpose of:
  - Locating the barrier fencing
  - Reviewing the report with the project foreman or site supervisor
  - Locating work zones, where required
  - Supervising any excavation for the proposed new houses, road upgrades, driveways and service footprints that are within the critical root zones of trees to be retained.
  - Reviewing and advising of any pruning requirements for machine clearances.

• **Review and site meeting:** Once the project receives approval, it is important that the project arborist meet with the principals involved in the project to review the information contained herein. It is also important that the arborist meet with the site foreman or supervisor before any demolition, site clearing or other construction activity occurs.

Please do not hesitate to call us at (250) 479-8733 should you have any further questions. Thank You.

Yours truly,
Talbot Mackenzie & Associates

Tom Talbot & Graham Mackenzie
ISA Certified, & Consulting Arborists
Encl. 1-page site plan with tree numbers, 3-page tree resource, key to headings in resource table, Barrier fencing specifications.

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are professionals who examine trees and use their training, knowledge and experience to recommend techniques and procedures that will improve their health and structure or to mitigate associated risks.

Trees are living organisms, whose health and structure change, and are influenced by age, continued growth, climate, weather conditions, and insect and disease pathogens. Indicators of structural weakness and disease are often hidden within the tree structure or beneath the ground. It is not possible for an Arborist to identify every flaw or condition that could result in failure or can he/she guarantee that the tree will remain healthy and free of risk.

Remedial care and mitigation measures recommended are based on the visible and detectable indicators present at the time of the examination and cannot be guaranteed to alleviate all symptoms or to mitigate all risk posed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree ID</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Crown Spread (m)</th>
<th>CRZ (m)</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Relative Tolerance</th>
<th>Bylaw Status</th>
<th>Remarks and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT1</td>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus *</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 4m from road, 2m from sidewalk. Wounds and cracks on main stem and limbs. Y-pruned for line clearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT2</td>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus *</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 2m from road and sidewalk. 2.5m from walkway. Large cavity from limb failure at 4m above ground level (50 x 30cm). Epicormic growth on main stem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT3</td>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus *</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 2m from road and sidewalk. 3.5m from driveway. Crack on main stem (1.5m in length). Wounds with possible decay on 3 limbs on west side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT4</td>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus *</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 2m from road and sidewalk. 6m from driveway. Minor deadwood and defoliation. Interfering with utility lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT5</td>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus *</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 2m from road and sidewalk. 1.5m from #517 Quadra St. driveway. Small crack and reaction wood on underside of limb overhanging driveway. Interfering with utility lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT6</td>
<td>Horsechestnut</td>
<td>Aesculus *</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 2m from road and sidewalk. Insect defoliation and minor epicormic growth on main limbs. Minor deadwood. Interfering with utility lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT7</td>
<td>Flowering Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus spp.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 1m from road and sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT8</td>
<td>Flowering Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus spp.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal tree. 1m from road and sidewalk. Competing with cedar (NT9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT9</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's. 1.5m from property line. 2m from sidewalk. Overhanging property line 5m at 3m above ground level. Ivy at base. Minor deadwood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree ID</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>DBH (cm) * over Ivy</th>
<th>Crown Spread (m)</th>
<th>CRZ (m)</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Relative Tolerance</th>
<th>Bylaw Status</th>
<th>Remarks and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT10</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>34, 28, 24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair/Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 2m from property line. 4m from sidewalk. Codominant union at 1m above ground level. 34cm and 24cm stems crossing and rubbing. Overhanging property line 2m at 4m above ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT11</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 1.5m from property line. Ivy at base. Competing with surrounding cedars and oak. Minor deadwood. Overhanging property line 4m at 2m above ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT12</td>
<td>Vine Maple</td>
<td>Acer circinatum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 1.5m from property line. Overhanging property line 1m at 4m above ground level. Roots protected at surface level by retaining wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT13</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
<td>Quercus palustris</td>
<td>53*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 2m from property line. Ivy at base. Overhanging property line over carport at 6m above ground level. Minor deadwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT14</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar</td>
<td>Thuja plicata</td>
<td>3, 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 1m from property line. Roots protected by retaining wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT15</td>
<td>Western Red Cedar</td>
<td>Thuja plicata</td>
<td>5, 3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 2m from property line. Roots protected by retaining wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT16</td>
<td>Lilac</td>
<td>Syringa vulgaris</td>
<td>2, 2, 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 1m from property line. Roots protected by retaining wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT17</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>Chamaecyparis sp.</td>
<td>Multi-stem (5 individuals)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 0.5m from property line. Roots protected by retaining wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT18</td>
<td>Pyramidal Yew</td>
<td>Taxus sp.</td>
<td>Multi-stem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's, 0.5m from #933 Convent Pl. driveway. 3m from #931 Convent Pl. driveway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT19</td>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>Tilia spp.</td>
<td>Multi-stem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Possible shared tree (#931 and #933 Convent Pl.). Extends over #931 Convent Pl. driveway by 1m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree ID</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Crown Spread (m)</th>
<th>CRZ (m)</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Relative Tolerance</th>
<th>Bylaw Status</th>
<th>Remarks and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT20</td>
<td>Monkey Puzzle</td>
<td><em>Araucaria</em> araucana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's. 0.5m from property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT21</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td><em>Malus</em> spp.</td>
<td>13, 13, 10, 8, 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's. 2m from property line. Overhangs #931 Convent Pl. backyard by 1m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT22</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td><em>Malus</em> spp.</td>
<td>Multi-stem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Possible shared tree (#931 and #933 Convent Pl.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT23</td>
<td>Apple</td>
<td><em>Malus</em> spp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Not protected</td>
<td>Neighbour's. 2m from property line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by:
Talbot Mackenzie & Associates
ISA Certified, and Consulting Arborists
Phone: (250) 479-8738
Fax: (250) 479-7050
email: Treehelp@telus.net
Key to Headings in Resource Table

d.b.h. – **diameter at breast height** - diameter of trunk, measured in centimetres at 1.4 metres above ground level

CRZ – **critical root zone** - estimated optimal size of tree protection zone based on tree species, condition and age of specimen and the species tolerance to root disturbance. Indicates the radial distance from the trunk, measured in metres.

Crown spread – indicates the diameter of the crown spread measured in metres to the dripline of the longest limbs.

Condition health/structure –
- Good – no visible or minor health or structural flaw
- Fair – health or structural flaw present that can be corrected through normal arboricultural or horticultural care.
- Poor – significant health or structural defects that compromise the long-term survival or retention of the specimen.

Bylaw status – status of trees on the property and frontage
- Protected - tree that is protected under the current tree protection bylaw.
- Not protected - tree that is not protected under the current tree protection bylaw.
- Municipal - Tree that is located on the municipal frontage.

Relative Tolerance – relative tolerance of the selected species to development impacts.
TREE PROTECTION FENCING
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PROJECT NAME/ADDRESS: 505 Quadra Street
Victoria, BC
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Graham Mackenzie
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Farmer Construction
Cats Eye Contracting
Talbot Mackenzie & Associates

Noah Borges
ISA #: PN-8409A

PURPOSE OF SITE VISIT
We supervised an exploratory excavation along the east property line to evaluate impacts to four trees on the adjacent property: Deodar Cedars NT9-NT11 and Pin Oak NT13, previously inventoried for the Tree Preservation Plan we prepared for Wensley Architecture Ltd. in August 2017. None of the trees are by-law protected.

• NT9 Deodar Cedar: 64cm DBH, 1.5m from property line
• NT10 Deodar Cedar: 34, 28, 24cm DBH, 3m from property line
• NT11 Deodar Cedar: 51cm DBH, 1.5m from property line
• NT13 Pin Oak: 53cm DBH (measured over ivy), 2m from property line

OBSERVATIONS
A 60cm wide trench, 90cm in depth, was excavated 60cm from the concrete retaining wall demarcating the property boundary. The site is an at-grade parking area and driveway with asphalt pavement. The trees are on neighbouring property, at a slightly elevated grade (30-60cm). Areas of uplifting pavement are visible in the parking area near the trees, particularly along the retaining wall.

FINDINGS
A small area of uplifting pavement was removed immediately adjacent to the retaining wall, directly west of Cedar NT9. We encountered a 5-6cm diameter Cedrus root beneath the pavement. The root sustained minor bark damage during pavement removal but was retained.
Excavation of the trench started from the south, at the municipal sidewalk. One root, 2-3cm in diameter and oriented vertically, was encountered at the east end of the trench. A trench was excavated north up to approximately 0.5m south of the hydro pole. Only small roots, 1cm or less in diameter, were encountered. They were all located within the upper 60cm of soil.

We resumed excavation north of the hydro pole, immediately south of an area of uplifting pavement. Two 3cm diameter roots, which we identified as from one of the Cedrus trees, were encountered just below the pavement. There is a discontinuous path of cracking and uplifting pavement that traces back to the retaining wall. These two roots may have been from the 5-6cm diameter root we encountered near Cedar NT9. Excavation stopped approximately 4-5m north of Oak NT13. Eight additional roots were encountered, all 1cm or less in diameter, all within the upper 60cm of soil.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Given the size of the trees and the distance from the trench, fewer roots were encountered than we anticipated. The concrete retaining wall and/or the asphalt pavement is likely restricting root growth onto the subject property. We anticipate that there will be a higher density of roots located on the neighbour’s side and possibly directly below the existing retaining wall.

We anticipate construction of the proposed underground parking will likely require additional excavation closer to the property line, potentially up to the retaining wall. Based on the number and size of roots we encountered, we do not believe that the neighbour’s trees will be significantly impacted by the proposed construction. To mitigate additional impacts, we recommend not excavating beyond the existing retaining wall location, if possible, leaving a 30cm strip west of the retaining wall undisturbed to preserve any roots growing along the wall.

We further recommend the project arborist be on site to supervise any additional excavation within the trees’ critical root zones and, if required, removal of the retaining wall. As noted in our Tree Preservation Plan, we recommend shoring and blind-forming techniques be used to minimize the extent of excavation. This may also require that any proposed services such as perimeter drains be located inside the parking structure on this side of the building.
Photo #1: Three Deodar Cedars (NT9-NT11) and one Pin Oak (NT13) are located within 3m of the property line.
Picture #2: A small area of uplifting pavement was removed west of Deodar Cedar NT9. A 5-6cm diameter root was encountered directly underneath the pavement.
A 60cm wide trench, 90cm in depth, was excavated 60cm west of the retaining wall.
Picture #4: Several small roots, 1 cm or less in diameter, were encountered up to the hydro pole.
Picture #5: 50-75cm south and north of the hydropole were undisturbed. Excavation proceeded north to 4-5m north of Pin Oak NT13.
Two 3cm Cedrus roots were pruned 1m north of the hydro pole. An additional eight 1cm diameter roots were encountered north of the hydro pole.

Please do not hesitate to call us at (250) 479-8733 should you have any further questions. Thank you.
Yours truly.

Talbot Mackenzie & Associates
ISA Certified Consulting Arborists

Disclosure Statement
Arborists are professionals who examine trees and use their training, knowledge and experience to recommend techniques and procedures that will improve their health and structure or to mitigate associated risks.
Trees are living organisms whose health and structure change, and are influenced by age, continued growth, climate, weather conditions, and insect and disease pathogens. Indicators of structural weakness and disease are often hidden within the tree structure or beneath the ground. It is not possible for an Arborist to identify every flaw or condition that could result in failure or can be/sic guarantee that the tree will remain healthy and free of risk.
Remedial care and mitigation measures recommended are based on the visible and detectable indicators present at the time of the examination and cannot be guaranteed to alleviate all symptoms or to mitigate all risk posed.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Surfside Holdings (Beacon) Limited is proposing to develop the properties at 505-521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place. The three properties currently have a total of 38 residential units. The development will result in a total of 87 residential units, or a net increase of 49 units. The development is located on Quadra Street, between Southgate Street and Convent Place in the Fairfield neighbourhood.

The development includes 95 vehicle parking spaces which meets the proposed update to the Zoning Bylaw minimum requirement. The current Bylaw and proposed update require buildings to allocate a minimum of 10% of vehicle parking for visitors. The proposed development will be allocating 8% of the parking spaces for visitors, which is anticipated to meet visitor parking demand given the site’s walkability, transit access and proximity to short term on-street parking.

The development will be exceeding the minimum bicycle parking requirements outlined in the current Zoning Bylaw and proposed updated.

There are currently approximately 400 to 450 two-way vehicles driving on Quadra Street adjacent to the proposed development during the PM peak hour. The development is expected to add 30 to 40 two-way vehicle trips during the PM peak hour which is approximately one vehicle every two minutes.

Vehicle access to the site will be provided on Convent Place, this is consistent with the Highway Access Bylaw which states that access must be on the most minor adjacent roadway. This access location is also supported as it will result in the least amount of pedestrians crossing the site’s access.

The traffic operations of the three nearest intersections on Quadra Street (Southgate Street, Convent Place and Humbolt Street) were analyzed using the existing vehicle volumes as well as the future volumes which account for the proposed development. There are no traffic operation concerns with either the existing or future scenarios.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Study Scope and Objectives

Surfside Holdings (Beacon) Ltd. is proposing to develop the properties at 505-521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place in Victoria BC. The location of the site is at the southern end of Quadra Street, between Southgate Street and Convent Place, immediately north of Beacon Hill Park (see Exhibit 1.1).

The development is located in the Fairfield neighbourhood. The three lots currently have a total of 34 apartment units, two houses and one duplex for a total of 38 dwelling units.

The proposed development will be providing a total of 87 dwellings on the site, 49 more than there are currently.

The purpose of this study is to:

- Review the development's parking, access and loading strategies; and
- Evaluate the transportation impacts of the proposed development on the nearby road network.

1.2 Development Details

The development will have a total of 87 residential units. As seen in Exhibit 1.2, a multi-family apartment building will be located on the southern portion of the site, fronting onto Quadra Street and Southgate Street. Four townhouses as well as the sole underground parkade entry will be on Convent Place.

In the multi-family apartment building there will be 42 one-bedroom apartments ranging from 539 to 650 square feet and 41 two-bedroom apartments ranging from 833 to 1,008 square feet. Each of the four townhouses will have three bedrooms and are 1,459 square feet.

The development includes 95 vehicle parking spaces as well as secure and public bicycle parking.

Vehicle access to the site will be provided on Convent Place, this is consistent with the Highway Access Bylaw which states that access must be on the most minor adjacent roadway. This access location also offers the least amount of pedestrian / vehicle conflict as the pedestrian volumes on Convent Place are lower than the Quadra Street and Southgate Street frontages.
Exhibit 1.2
Site Plan
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2. LOCAL CONTEXT

2.1 Land Use

The site is located at the southern end of Quadra Street in the Fairfield neighbourhood. The three properties are currently zoned R3A1, RSAM1 and RK but will be rezoned during the development process. Nearby the site, there are multi-family buildings on Southgate Street and Quadra Street as well as a mix of multi-family and single-family buildings on Convent Place. The site is adjacent to Beacon Hill Park and 300 metres east of South Park Elementary School.

2.2 Street Network

Quadra Street and Southgate Street are classified as Secondary Arterial Roads whereas Convent Place is classified as a Local Road. The site is centrally located, near Victoria's downtown core and has several key regional road connections. Neither Quadra Street, Southgate Street nor Convent Place are truck routes.

The three study intersections for this assessment are as follows:

- The Quadra Street and Humbolt Street intersection is signalized and has crosswalks on all four legs. The northbound direction has two travel lanes whereas all other directions have one travel lane. The southbound direction has a channelized right-turn from Quadra Street onto Humbolt Street. There are no cycling facilities at the intersection.

- The Quadra Street and Convent Place intersection is stop-controlled on the Convent Place leg only. The intersection has two travel lanes in northbound direction and one travel lane in the southbound direction on Quadra Street. There is one approach lane from Convent Place. There are no crosswalks or cycling facilities at the intersection.

- The Quadra Street and Southgate Street intersection stop-controlled on the Quadra Street leg only. Arbutus Way is located on the south side of the intersection (within Beacon Hill Park) and only allows vehicles to travel southbound, away from the intersection. There are zebra pedestrian crosswalks across the north and east legs of the intersection. There are no crosswalks of cycling facilities at the intersection.

2.3 Walking and Cycling

The majority of the nearby streets have sidewalks on both sides. There are crosswalks at all of the major intersections on Quadra Street in the vicinity of the site. The unsignalized Quadra Street and Southgate Street intersection has crosswalks on its north and east legs but not on the west leg. The signalized Quadra Street and Humbolt Street intersection has crosswalks on all four legs.

The nearest designated bike route is located on Vancouver Street. Vancouver Street is classified as a local street bikeway which means that it is a comfortable route for people cycling however it does not have any
dedicated cycling infrastructure. The Vancouver Street bike route extends north/south through the entire City of Victoria.

2.4 Transit

The site is well served by transit. There are numerous busses which stop within a 400 metre walk of the site which provide service to the majority of Greater Victoria. A listing of the nearby bus routes are shown in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE NUMBER</th>
<th>KEY DESTINATIONS</th>
<th>DISTANCE FROM SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (east and westbound)</td>
<td>Downtown, Oak Bay</td>
<td>100 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (east and westbound)</td>
<td>Downtown, Fairfield Village, Oak Bay Avenue, Royal Jubilee Hospital, UVic</td>
<td>240 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 27, 28, 30, 31, 50, 61, 70, 71, 72, 75 (northbound)</td>
<td>Downtown, Hillside Mall, Gordon Head, Shelbourne Valley, James Bay, Westshore, Saanich Peninsula</td>
<td>400 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 27, 28, 30, 31 (southbound)</td>
<td>James Bay</td>
<td>550 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Vehicle Travel and Parking

Vehicle travel on Quadra Street and Southgate Street is limited to 40 kilometres per hour. Although vehicle travel on Convent Place is limited to 50 kilometres per hour it is not anticipated that this speed will be reached very often. Since Convent Place is less than 8 metres wide (including on-street parking on the north side) it is anticipated that the majority of vehicles would be travelling less than 40 kilometres per hour.

Curb side vehicle parking is available on the majority of the nearby streets including Quadra Street and Convent Place. On-street parking is free but is either limited to “Residential Parking Only” or to “two-hours 9am to 6pm, Monday to Saturday for non-residential uses”. Residents as well as their guests and contractors are allowed to park in “Residential Parking Only” zones fronting the property.

The site is well served by car share service. Modo has a vehicle located on Convent Place, three buildings away from the development site and a total of four vehicles within a 400 metre walk of the site.

2.6 Relevant Plans and Policies

2.6.1 Off-street Parking Review

The City of Victoria is currently reviewing the Off-street Parking regulations for vehicles and bicycles in order to support and encourage development, investment and affordable housing. Although the recommendations from this project have not yet been implemented into the Zoning Bylaw, the project’s key recommendations that are related to the proposed development are that parking requirements should be based on:
- **Geographic area:** Parking requirements should be lowest in the "core area" and highest in the "other areas". The development is located in "other areas" geographic area however it is only 300 metres from the "core area".

- **Tenure type:** Parking requirements should be different for private ownership, market rental and non-market rental.

- **Unit size:** Parking requirements should be proportional to the dwelling size.

### 2.6.2 Bike Network Planning

The City of Victoria is currently implementing a network of All Ages and Abilities (AAA) bike routes around the central city. The first phase of implementation includes the construction of an AAA bike route on Humbolt Street which is 60 metres north of the development site. The project schedule includes consultation on the design concept in 2017 and construction occurring during the spring / summer of 2018.
3. OFF-STREET PARKING

3.1 Vehicle Parking

3.1.1 Bylaw Requirements and Proposed Supply

The Victoria Zoning Bylaw requires 1.3 parking spaces per apartment and 1.4 spaces per attached dwelling (townhouses) for residents. The Bylaw requires that at least 10% of those parking spaces be for visitors. Buildings that provide more than 50 parking spaces need to provide parking spaces for persons with disabilities in the ratio of 1 for every 100 total parking spaces. The proposed parking requirements from the City of Victoria’s Off-street Parking Review are lower than the current Bylaw requirements.

Table 3.1 summarizes the Bylaw requirement, requirement based on the proposed changes recommend in the Off-street Parking Review and the proposed parking supply. The Off-street Parking Review recommends that parking requirements for multi-family residential buildings be dependent on the building’s geographic area. The development site is located in the "other areas" region which has the highest parking requirement.

Table 3.1: Parking Requirements and Proposed Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>CURRENT BYLAW MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PROPOSED BYLAW MINIMUMS</th>
<th>PROPOSED SUPPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>RATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-bedroom Apartments</td>
<td>40 m² to 70 m²</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-bedroom Apartments</td>
<td>&gt; 70 m²</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% of total</td>
<td>10% of sub-total</td>
<td>Additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Assumes the building is located in the "other areas" region.

The development plan meets the proposed Bylaw requirements for total parking supply but does not meet the current Bylaw requirements. Two barrier free parking spaces are provided which meets both the current and proposed Bylaw requirements.

The following section provides an analysis of the anticipated parking demand at the site.

3.1.2 Parking Demand Analysis

In order to better understand the proposed development’s anticipated parking demands, an analysis of similar nearby rental apartment buildings was conducted. Data was obtained from similar (just off downtown core area) buildings during an extensive parking survey conducted by Bunt in 2012. The data was derived from three key sources of information:
Vehicle ownership information acquired from ICBC;
Data collected in the field during resident and visitor peak parking periods (i.e. Wednesdays 10-11pm, Fridays 6-8pm, Saturdays 6-8pm, Sundays 9-11pm); and,
Information gathered from building manager interviews.

The parking data collected in the field and via building manager interviews and questionnaires was used to verify the accuracy of the ICBC information and were aimed towards understanding how the available on and off-street parking supply was utilized and as to whether there was sufficient supply for residents and visitors at their respective rental apartment complexes. This information provided data in determining the unit mix of the buildings, how many units were currently occupied, how many off-street parking stalls are provided for residents and visitors, and whether there is a monthly charge for the on-site parking stalls.

Exhibit 3.1 displays the locations of the apartment buildings included in the study. Table 3.2 on the following page, supplements the map, identifying (with the associated reference numbers in Exhibit 3.1) and summarizes the vehicle parking demand data collected from ICBC, on-site surveys, and building managers.
Exhibit 3.1
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### Table 3.2: Summary of Rental Apartments Included in 2012 Parking Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP</th>
<th>NAME AND ADDRESS</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS OCCUPANT AVAILABLE</th>
<th># OF 1 BD UNITS</th>
<th># OF 2 BD UNITS</th>
<th># OF 3 BD UNITS</th>
<th># OF IN-SITE PARKING STALLS</th>
<th># OF VISITOR PARKING STALLS</th>
<th>PARKING STALL COST (MONTHLY)</th>
<th>VEHICLE OWNERSHIP RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>805 Academy Close</td>
<td>9 / 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>360 Douglas Street, Goodacre Towers N. &amp; S.</td>
<td>194 / 197</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$15 - $20</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>240 Douglas Street, Beacon Tower Apartments</td>
<td>58 / 60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>151 St. Andrews, Beacon Park Apartments</td>
<td>75 / 75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>575 Marfield Ave, Kirkcaldy Apartments</td>
<td>43 / 43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>562 / 566 Simcoe Street</td>
<td>104 / 108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>576 Simcoe Street, Park Plaza</td>
<td>37 / 37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>160 Government Street, Weybridge Manor</td>
<td>33 / 33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>890 Academy Close</td>
<td>54 / 55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$10 - $15</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>505 Quadra Street, Beacon Arms</td>
<td>34 / 34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15 - $30</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>955 Humbolt Street</td>
<td>43 / 43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>976 Humbolt Street</td>
<td>23 / 23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS AND AVERAGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 indicates that on average the approximate vehicle ownership rate (i.e. residential parking demand) of the 13 rental apartment buildings is 0.66 vehicles per unit. This data correlates with the field observation counts and manager surveys. The table data reveals a range of vehicle ownership rates as low as 0.52 and as high as 0.81 vehicles per unit. It also illustrates the impact of unit size as the highest vehicle occupant buildings also have a higher proportion of 2 bedroom units (i.e. the Beacon Park Apartments). The proposed apartments at 505 Quadra Street will have an even split of one bedroom and two bedroom apartments with a small number of three bedroom townhouses. The buildings in the 2012 study which had a higher percentage of two bedroom apartments had a maximum vehicle ownership ratio of 0.81 vehicles per dwelling.

Based on this data we conservatively anticipate that the proposed parking supply of 95 spaces will be able to accommodate the parking demand from 87 residential units.

3.2 Bicycle Parking

Well managed, secure, accessible and covered bicycle parking will be provided as part of the development plan. Class 1 bicycle parking spaces are defined as a secure, weather-protected bicycle parking facility used to accommodate long-term parking. Class 2 bicycle parking spaces is defined as a short-term bicycle parking typically located in a publicly accessible location. The current Zoning Bylaw requires 1 Class 1 space per residential unit plus a 6-space rack the entrance of the building. The Off-street Parking Review recommends increasing the Class 1 requirement to 1.25 spaces per residential unit.

The development will exceed the bylaw requirements and Off-street Parking Review recommendations by supplying 125 Class 1 spaces and at least 6 Class 2 spaces. The Class 1 - Long Term parking spaces will be located in a convenient location in the underground parkade. The Class 2 - Short Term parking will be provided in a publicly accessible area near the building entrance in a well lit and highly visible area. Bunt recommends that electric outlets be installed in the bicycle storage room for electric-assisted bicycles.
4. TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

4.1 Traffic Operations Assessment Methodology

The traffic operations were assessed at the three study intersections on Quadra Street (Humbolt Street, Convent Place and Southgate Street) during the PM peak hour. The analysis was completed with and without the proposed development.

The operations of study intersections were assessed using the methods outlined in the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), using the Synchro 9 analysis software. The traffic operations were assessed using the performance measures of Level of Service (LOS) and volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio.

The LOS rating is based on average vehicle delay and ranges from "A" to "F" based on the quality of operation at the intersection. LOS "A" represents optimal, minimal delay conditions while a LOS "F" represents an over-capacity condition with considerable congestion and/or delay. Delay is calculated in seconds and is based on the average intersection delay per vehicle. A delay of less than 10 seconds receive an LOS A whereas delays greater than 50 seconds receive and LOS F. In downtown and Town Centre contexts, during peak demand periods, delays greater than 50 seconds (LOS F) are common.

The volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of an intersection represents the ratio between the demand volume and the available capacity. A V/C ratio less than 0.85 indicates that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate demands and generally represents reasonable traffic conditions in suburban settings. A V/C value between 0.85 and 0.95 indicates an intersection is approaching practical capacity; a V/C ratio over 0.95 indicates that traffic demands are close to exceeding the available capacity, resulting in saturated conditions. A V/C ratio over 1.0 Indicates a very congested intersection where drivers may have to wait through several signal cycles. In downtown and Town Centre contexts, during peak demand periods, V/C ratios over 0.90 and even 1.0 are common.

4.2 Existing Conditions

Bunt conducted traffic counts at the three study intersections on Thursday May 25th and Thursday June 1, 2017. During this time period, 4:15PM to 5:15PM was identified as the peak hour.

Bunt observed approximately 400 to 450 vehicles during the PM peak hour on Quadra Street adjacent to the development site. The existing vehicle volumes are shown in Exhibit 4.1 and the associated traffic operations is shown in Exhibit 4.2.

As shown in Exhibit 4.2, there are minimal traffic operations concerns with the existing conditions. The one location where noticeable queuing occurred is the southbound through/left turn movement at the Quadra Street / Southgate Street intersection. During the PM peak hour queues reached up to four vehicles at this location and had queuing times up to approximately 35 seconds. This degree of queuing is considered reasonable given the urban nature of the intersection and that this degree of queuing is only achieved during the busiest hour of the day.
4.3 Future Conditions

The future vehicle volumes were estimated by summing the existing vehicle volumes with the estimated vehicle trips generated by the proposed development.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition) was used to estimate the number of vehicle trips generated from the proposed building. The trips rates from the manual typically come from suburban locations which likely overestimates the number of vehicle trips generated by the proposed development. The vehicle trips rates and trip generation are presented in Table 4.1 for PM peak hour.

Table 4.1: PM Peak Hour Vehicle Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Rise Apartment</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Townhouse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.1, the ITE trip rate results in approximately 30 to 40 total two-way vehicle trips during peak periods which is approximately one vehicle entering or exiting the site every two minutes. Furthermore, the ITE trip rates are typically obtained from suburban locations with almost all travel completed by vehicle. It is anticipated that a number of residents and visitors of the proposed development will walk, bike or use transit. Thus the trip volumes shown in Table 4.1 are likely an overestimation of the actual vehicle trips generated by the proposed development.

The new vehicle trips were assigned to the network based on the existing travel patterns at the three study intersections.

As shown in Exhibit 4.3, the proposed development is anticipated to have minimal impact on the traffic operations of the three study intersections. The vehicle queuing times and volume/capacity ratios remain relatively unchanged compared to the existing traffic operations.
Exhibit 4.2
Existing Traffic Operations - PM Peak Hour
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5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

- The proposed residential development at 505 Quadra Street proposes a total of 87 residential units.
- The site is well serviced with transit and is within walking range to a wide variety of commercial and service amenities.
- The current Zoning Bylaw requires a minimum of 114 parking spaces for this project. Proposed (but not approved) changes to the Bylaw would reduce the requirement to 95 parking spaces.
- The development offers 95 vehicle spaces which meets the proposed Bylaw requirements. The development is providing 8 spaces for visitors (8.4% of 95 spaces or 0.09 visitor spaces per unit) however the Bylaw requires that 10% of the 95 spaces be designated for visitors.
- Vehicle access to the site will be provided on Convent Place, this is consistent with the Highway Access Bylaw which states that access must be on the most minor adjacent roadway. This access location is also supported as it will result in the least amount of pedestrians crossing the site’s access.
- The development offers 125 Class 1 and at least 6 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. This meets or exceeds the minimum requirements in both the current and proposed changes to the Zoning Bylaw.
- The site is expected to generate approximately 20 to 30 total two-way vehicle trips per weekday AM peak hour and 30 to 40 per weekday PM peak hour. This is considered to be a near indiscernible increase in vehicle traffic considering the adjacent Quadra Street currently has 400 to 450 two-way volumes during the PM peak hour.
- The proposed development is anticipated to have minimal impact to vehicle operations at the three study intersections on Quadra Street. Vehicle queuing time for the southbound through/right movement at the Quadra Street/Southgate Street is estimated to reach up to 35 seconds with or without the proposed development.

5.2 Recommendations

- Bunt's analysis indicates that 95 vehicle parking spaces will meet peak period parking demands and proposed Bylaw requirements. We therefore recommend that the vehicle parking supply is appropriate for the proposed development.
- Bunt recommends that the visitor vehicle parking supply of 8 spaces (8.4% of total or 0.09 visitor spaces per unit) be deemed appropriate given the multi-modal connectivity of the site.
- If residential parking demand proves to be less than the proposed resident supply we recommend the building consider converting 1-4 resident spaces to visitor spaces if the proposed visitor supply is frequency occupied.

- We recommend electric charging ability be provided in the Class 1 bicycle parking rooms.
July 26th, 2018

City of Victoria
No. 1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC
V8W 1P6

Attn.: Mayor & Council

Re: Tenant Assistance Plan
Rezoning and Development Permit Applications REZ00610 and DP00511
505, 517, 519, 521 Quadra Street & 931 Convent Place, Victoria, BC

Recently, the City of Victoria has developed a Tenant Assistance Policy for tenants displaced as a result of development applications. The policy is set to take effect in September 2018. While we have previously committed to many of the prescribed actions set out in this policy, we’d like to take this opportunity to bring our plan and the policy into alignment. As a result, we are pleased to present the following plan that not only meets but significantly exceeds the measures laid out in the City’s Tenant Assistance Policy. They are as follows:

**TENANT ASSISTANCE PLAN**

**A. Notice**

In February 2017, we initiated meetings with all of the tenants to inform them of our intention to redevelop the properties. We have been providing the tenants with monthly updates as to our progress through the process. The updates are e-mailed as well as posted in the laundry room of the apartment building.

Upon receipt of the necessary permits required to commence reconstruction, we will provide all of our tenants with 4-months written notice to vacate as per the policy.

**B. Compensation**

Compensation has and will be given to the tenants in the following ways:

1. As of February 1st, 2017, we froze all of the tenants’ rents to their current levels. Therefore, we have foregone the 3.7% (2017) and 4.0% (2018) allowable rent increases during this process. There will also be the undetermined allowable rent increase for 2019; which is yet to be determined. This is in excess of the policy and could result in a savings of as much as $150 per month for each tenant depending on their rent level and length of tenure.

2. As of February 1st, 2017, we waived liquidated damages per our Residential Tenancy Agreements for any tenants that needed to break their lease in order to find alternative accommodation. This fee ranges from $300 - $500 depending on the tenancy. This is also in excess of the policy.

3. Going forward, tenants will be provided with financial compensation based on their length of tenure as per the policy:
   - Up to 5 years: 3 months rent
   - 5 to 9 years: 4 months rent
   - 10 - 19 years: 5 months rent
   - 20+ years: 6 months rent
The compensation will be given in the form of free rent for tenancies of 9 years or earlier. For tenancies in excess of 10 years, the compensation will be given as a combination of 4 months free rent plus cash payment pursuant to the guidelines above.

C. Moving Expenses

To compensate the tenants for their out-of-pocket moving expenses, we will be providing a cash subsidy pursuant to the policy. The subsidy will be based on the size of the tenant’s suite: $500 for 1 bedrooms or less; and $750 for 2 bedrooms or more. Additional assistance can be provided tenants who may have difficulty making their own arrangements.

D. Relocation Assistance

Since February 2017, we have been providing our tenants with regular monthly updates as to our progress and the impact on our overall schedule. For the last couple of months, a staff member has been appointed as our Tenant Relocation Coordinator. Their role is to continue to communicate the monthly progress updates as well as update the tenants on all of the vacancies in our portfolio.

When we receive our approvals and are ready to give the tenants the 4-month notice to vacate, the Tenant Relocation Coordinator will begin searching for units based on each tenant’s criteria including rent, location, size, etc. The coordinator will give each tenant 3 options based on their criteria assuming that criteria is reasonable.

E. Right of First Refusal

We are fortunate to have a portfolio of an additional 277 units within the Fairfield and James Bay neighbourhoods. As part of our February 2017 commitments to our tenants, we have been giving them first priority to rent these units as they come available. Availability within the portfolio is communicated to our tenants on a monthly basis as part of our ongoing project updates. This is in excess of the policy.

Any tenants that remain at the time we distribute the 4-month notice to vacate will be given first right to rent a unit in the newly rebuilt apartment building at 10% below market rental rates.

Conclusion

As a family that has owned and operated apartment buildings in Victoria for almost 40 years, we take pride in our reputation as honest and fair providers of rental housing. We believe that our first obligation is to our existing tenants who will be directly affected by this redevelopment. From the very beginning, we have been focused on providing our tenants with the information and the resources needed to ease their transition.

We are pleased to be able to not only meet, but exceed the City’s Tenant Assistance Policy and feel that this represents a fair and reasonable contribution to those who have been fortunate to call the Beacon Arms their home.

Sincerely,
ANAOGUE PROJECTS LTD.

Stuart Kerr
Principal
3.2 Rezoning Application No. 00810 and Development Permit No. 000511 for 505, 517, 519 / 521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place

The City is considering a Rezoning and Development Permit Application to allow a six-storey multi-unit residential building at the corner of Quadra Street and Southgate Street, and for four townhouse units fronting onto Convent Place.

Applicant meeting attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUART KERR</td>
<td>ANALOGUE PROJECTS LTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER KERR</td>
<td>ANALOGUE PROJECTS LTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID MCGRATH</td>
<td>WENSLEY ARCHITECTURE LTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLIN HARPER</td>
<td>WENSLEY ARCHITECTURE LTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES PARTLOW</td>
<td>LOMBARD NORTH GROUP INC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Johnston provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the Application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- building massing
- landscaping along the Quadra Street frontage
- exposed parkade walls.

David McGrath provided the Panel with a detailed presentation of the site and context of the proposal, and James Partlow provided the Panel with details of the proposed landscape plan.

Questions of clarification were asked by the Panel on the following:

- what is the inspiration behind the mix of warehouse-industrial aesthetic and the modern top?
  - stemming from an awareness of the size of the building
  - desire to capture a traditional architectural form for the corner with modern elements
  - visually too large when all in brick; modulation of the four levels with brick elements gives a streetscape within building itself
- were pedestrian entrances off Southgate Street considered?
  - initially there was a courtyard entrance on the south corner, but for security this was reduced to one access point off Quadra Street
- do the units off Southgate Street have entrances to the street?
  - yes, all ground-floor units have street-facing engagement with a sunken patio
- were other uses considered for the ground level, such as café or personal services?
  - the site will be zoned for residential use
- why is there a fence on the parkade exit wall at the northeastern corner? How will this present to the neighbours?
  - the fence is there for safety purposes and to prevent overlook into neighbours’ back gardens, and has been pushed back as much as possible
  - substantial trees and lower-level ground cover are proposed for this area to address the impact of the 12’ wall
- will there be any other fencing?
  - no, the fencing will only go to where there is daylighting
• the fence goes along the property line and there is a guardrail on top of the structure
• is the gathering space open to the adjacent yard?
  o yes, to reduce the height along the wall
• what kinds of trees are proposed?
  o large deciduous trees, perhaps maples
  o there is a continuous 5’ wide strip along the east property line, and by borrowing on the neighbour’s property the roots will not be restricted by the slab
• are the major existing trees at the southeast corner on the adjacent property?
  o yes; they will not be impacted by this project
  o an arborist was consulted and the construction impact has been assessed
• how does the bicycle access work?
  o there are two access points; one requiring a fob from the parkade entrance and another on Quadra Street
• A200 shows stairs to the bicycle access – is this correct?
  o yes, and there is a ramp beside the stairs that isn’t shown on the plans
• what properties to the east have higher density, as referenced in the presentation?
  o there is one four-storey and one three-storey building to the east along Southgate Street. Although this is lower density than the proposal, they are nearby examples of multi-storey buildings
• is the only taller development in the area Academy Close?
  o yes
• what are the materials and colours of the base and top?
  o the base is made to resemble a light stone element correlating to the cornice structure, which terminates the brick elements
• is there a green wall by the bicycle entrance off Quadra Street?
  o this is a trellis with vines
  o there will also be windows placed on this wall to bring in natural light to the bicycle parking area
• is the lack of massing variation due to zoning requirements?
  o Mr. Johnston clarified that there is a concurrent Rezoning application to create a site-specific zone. For this reason, there will not likely be variances for height, as the required height could be written into the new zone
• could the new zone accommodate elements with more varied height?
  o Mr. Johnson confirmed that this would be possible
• on the east elevation, are the claddings actually articulating the mass of building or is this just a visual effect?
  o the renderings use shadow lines to accentuate a 8”- 1’ articulation, and separations indicate balcony locations
  o designed to have structure and plumbing stacked while maintaining cost-efficiency
• will there be roof access?
  o it will not be accessible to the public
• was anything besides façade treatment considered to introduce massing variation?
  o further reducing the setback on the top floors was considered, but challenges arise from the wood frame structure
  o a specific unit count has to be met to make project feasible
• what materials are used for the balcony guards?
  o glass rails with extruded aluminum frame
lower units with brick element will have a partial pony wall with articulated glass guardrail to meet the height requirement

- does the brick turn in to the balconies?
  - this is not shown, likely no

- is the side material of the balcony the same as on the upper floors?
  - yes

the description of the project notes metal siding on the upper levels; is this still the case?
  - no; the corrugated metal is now hardie-panel with reveal

- is the building at the northeast for garbage and recycling?
  - yes, and the top will have a garden shed

- what types of uses would be supported for this site?
  - Mr. Johnston noted that the OCP designation is Urban Residential, which envisions low- to mid-rise residential uses or low to mid-rise mixed uses along arterial or secondary arterial roads
  - policy would support mixed-use for this site.

Panel members discussed:

- the proposal’s proximity to Southgate Street compared to the existing building
- south setback could be justified in terms of pedestrian safety, and there is no relaxation requested for the setback
- shifts in massing and patios on the south elevation could be misconstrued as an entrance to the building, whereas the entry is marked only by a large canopy
- appreciation for the opportunity to overlook the park
- height on Southgate Street is not objectionable in itself, but the proposal has an abrupt, sheer verticality and a façade decorating a flat mass
- desire to see top floor set back, especially at the corner of Quadra and Southgate Streets
- opportunity to explore methods of reworking massing
- wood frame construction can allow for variation without over-complexity
- successful modulation of townhouses and how they meet the sky
- architectural language introduced in the townhouses could be successful if worked into the larger building to achieve variation
- questioning what is being referenced in the design; the surrounding context is modernism, with three to four storeys
- the need to take into consideration surrounding amenities and vista onto the site from St. Anne’s Academy and Beacon Hill Park
- opportunity for a café at the corner
- the need to reconsider the façade and massing
- replicating a late 19th century warehouse aesthetic and merging with a contemporary expression gives the impression of a renovation, without the quality of an existing building of that nature
- lack of authenticity in detailing
- elevated brick supported by stucco reveals that this is just an application to break down the perception of height
- having the brick drop down further emphasizes the height of the multi-unit building in relation to the townhouses
- no need to build heritage buildings from the ground up without architectural reference or significance in the area or on-site
- townhouse design presents a much more subtle integration of brick and contemporary materials
- landscaping is very limited, everything is in a straight line with no articulation
- need for landscaping enhancement along the Quadra Street frontage to better integrate the townhouses, parkade, staircase and plaza
- severe massing at north end abuts neighbouring properties
- need to resolve overlook issue on northeast corner with parkade structure
- concern for exhaust fumes with the proximity of the eastern townhouse's entry door and the parkade entrance
- desire to see revised application if possible.

**Motion:**

It was moved by Paul Hammond, seconded by Carl-Jan Rupp, that the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Rezoning Application No. 00610 and Development Permit No. 000511 for 505, 517, 519 / 521 Quadra Street and 931 Convent Place does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined with reconsideration of the architectural language and massing in building design, materials and detailing, particularly on the six storey building, to be more authentic to the nature of new development on this site.

*Carried Unanimously*

### 3.3 Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application No. 00005 for 603-607 Pandora Avenue

The City is considering a Heritage Alteration Permit with Variances Application for a comprehensive development that would include adaptive reuse of the Plaza Hotel into a residential development with ground-level commercial use, and new additions above the Plaza Hotel building and to the north that would replace an existing one-storey addition facing Pandora Avenue.

Applicant meeting attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERIC BARKER</th>
<th>ERIC BARKER ARCHITECT INC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NICK ASKEW</td>
<td>OCEAN GATE DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE ROSSELL</td>
<td>SMALL &amp; ROSSELL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Conley provided the Panel with a brief introduction of the Application and the areas that Council is seeking advice on, including the following:

- compatibility, distinguishability, and subordination of the contemporary additions to the heritage-designated Plaza Hotel
- retaining the prominence of the Plaza Hotel
- integration of the character of the historic streetscape into the general expression, such as expressed concrete window sills
- contextual expression of the façade that is more sympathetic to the Old Town context and the Chinatown National Historic District
- diversity of built form
- massing and design of the building additions
- finishing materials
- clarification of exterior lighting location and style for the public plaza.
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.
Kip Johl
Hello Mayor Helps and Victoria Mayor and Council:

About a year ago I wrote to you regarding the concerns that we, the owners, of 906 Southgate have regarding our neighbour's 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 rooftop structure which essentially moves it to 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 overpowering 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
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 increasingly 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
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
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
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

Sent from Samsung tablet
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
Noraye Fjeldstad

From: SLOAN, Catherine (VICTORIA)
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!
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.
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
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
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 accommodate 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
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 Helps
May 10 '17
Re 505 Quadra St Application for Rezoning.

This building has had a new roof, new balconies, repairs to the elevator, and renovations to the 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 long-time 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 secretive huge profits to the developer but it is my 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
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
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
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 it 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
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
From: Valerie Lewis
Email: 
Daytime Phone: 

Dear Mayor and City Council,

As a resident of 912 Southgate St I would like to voice my concern about the proposed development at the corner of Quadra St, Southgate St, and Convent Place. It is my understanding that the owner/developer would like to demolish the existing apartment and 3 houses with 80 suite rental building and 4 townhouses.

In my opinion, a greener and more profitable solution would be to maintain existing 34 suite building with a basic refit to keep affordability and build 80 upscale rental units at Quadra and Convent Place side with 4-8 penthouse suites on top 2 floors in lieu of 4 townhouses. The net gain would be 80 suites instead of 44 with the current proposal and it would maintain 34 affordable suites for the working poor.

The advantage of penthouses vs townhouses:
- city and water views from 6 & 7th floors larger suits for working urban families privacy and security for families (dedicated elevator might be an option)
- larger patio garden
- better central city land use

On a personal note, I moved to Victoria 31 years ago to be near my sister who lives in James Bay and access family for support to raise my daughter. I have lived and worked in the James Bay and Fairfield for 25 years. I have just retired a year ago with a modest pension.

I have a modest 1 bedroom suite that suits my needs but rents under 1000-1200$ are rapidly disappearing. It saddens me that pensioners and working poor are being edged out of the neighborhood.

I supported the community by fundraising for PECSF and personally donated 1000$ plus for the community project but face the prospect of renoviction. We are an important part of a healthy community.

IE 3 chefs were renovicted from the apartment on Heywood and now local restaurants are suffering from lack of chefs and having to cut hours.

sincerely,

Valerie Lewis
103-912 Southgate Street, Victoria, BC

P.S.
Bravo for the development of dedicated bike lanes and infrastructure.
What a boost to rider safety and eco tourism!!!
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