

**From:** Nicole Chaland <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 2, 2018 10:53 AM  
**To:** CALUC chair  
**Subject:** new CALUC required for Aragon Proposal

Dear CALUC,

I'm writing to request a new CALUC be scheduled for the Aragon Proposal on Cook and Pendergast which is scheduled to be discussed at this Thursday's committee of the whole meeting.

The proposal and information available about this proposal has changed since the previous CALUC.

There are three reports available which are now available and were not available at the CALUC.

- The traffic report is now available [here](#).
- The arborist report is now available [here](#).
- The parking study is now available [here](#).

It also appears that the number of units has increased from 46 units to 48 units.

### **PARKING**

Of note, **88 parking spots** are proposed to be included in this project, while the city's policy requires 72 parking spots! Why include 16 more parking spaces than required by our bylaws? Furthermore, the study states that 80 parking spaces are appropriate for this site. Eight of the parking spaces proposed in this project are surface parking, and it appears (although the reports make it difficult to determine) that some of the parking will be on-street parking. The neighbourhood has a right to be informed that the proposal intends to transform publicly-owned green boulevards into surface parking.

### **IMPACTS OF PARKING**

- Without any logical opposing argument, the city should be actively discouraging parking as a key strategy to reduce carbon emissions by making individual car ownership inconvenient for those who do not rely on it for work or to overcome mobility barriers.
- No affordable housing provided. Underground parking is estimated to cost around \$40,000 per stall, which can be associated with the lack of provision of affordable housing.
- Over-provision of parking in this project means a loss of significant, large trees which would provide flood mitigation services in our future warmer climate, as well as storm water management, not to mention habitat loss (do we not want the next generation to be able to listen to bird song in the future?) as well as the great mental health benefits associated with a healthy urban forest.

Please consider requesting another CALUC. We also would benefit from professional facilitation to ensure that the technical information about the project is presented accurately and transparently.

The project as currently proposed works against key housing objectives in the OCP. See below.

### **OCP HOUSING OBJECTIVES: NO NET LOSS OF RENTAL HOUSING & DIVERSE NEIGHBOURHOODS**

This project, as currently proposed will result in the loss of 4 low-cost rental housing units.

- OCP objective 13 (c) is that the existing supply of rental housing be expanded through regeneration.
- OCP objective 13 (d) is that a wide range of housing choice be provided *within neighbourhoods to support diverse, inclusive and multigenerational community.*

According to CMHC, the number of rental housing units in the Cook Street Area has decreased by 31 units from October 2016 – October 2017. The only way to replace these units is through publicly subsidized social housing at a great cost to the taxpayer. Additionally, two of the families who currently reside in the rental housing slated to be torn down have courageously spoken up. They have young children and will likely have to move to another city. **This proposal works against OCP objective 13 (d).**

Furthermore, the intent of OCP bylaw 13.23 is to ensure that there is no net loss of rental housing in the city. It only applies to buildings of 4 units or more, but the intent of the bylaw was to regulate projects that remove 4 units or more of rental housing.

#### OCP bylaws

13.23 Support the retention of existing rental units in buildings of four units or more by considering higher density redevelopment proposals on these sites only if, as a voluntary amenity:

13.23.1 The same number of rental self-contained dwelling units is maintained on-site, and the general rent level identified, through a housing agreement; or,

13.23.2 An equivalent cash in-lieu contribution is made to the City's Housing Fund.

**In sum, if the parking was reduced by 40 stalls, the city could insist that the cost savings of approximately \$1.6 million be tied to an affordable housing agreement in this project.**

With much appreciation,  
Nicole Chaland

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Jane Ramin <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 04, 2018 5:49 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Pendergaast at Cook

**Dear Mayor and Council, I am disturbed to hear this development proposes to meet the commercial parking requirement by transforming grassy boulevards into on-street parking.** The idea of turning boulevards into parking was never discussed during the local area planning process, and it is not part of the official community plan or CSV design guidelines. This is contrary to our vision of the neighbourhood which retains its leafy green characteristic to maintain a sharp distinction from downtown.

I am also concerned that affordable family friendly rental housing is being lost to this proposal with no replacement considered in this development.

Finally it is disturbing that this development is pitched as a 4 storey development when in fact it has a fifth storey of living space which the developer calls a mezzanine.

Sincerely, Jane Ramin 1023 Oliphant Ave.

**Christine Havelka**

---

**Subject:**

FW: Pendergast and Cook Street development project

---

**From:** Anne Russo <

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 4, 2018 3:54 AM

**To:** Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Laurel Collins (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor)

**Subject:** Pendergast and Cook Street development project

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors:

The development project at Cook & Pendergast, on the agenda for review at the Dec 6th Committee of the Whole, appears to **propose meeting the commercial parking requirement by transforming grassy boulevards into on-street parking**. The idea of turning boulevards into parking was never discussed during the local area planning process, and it is not part of the official community plan or CSV design guidelines.

It is my hope that council will not pass this forward to public hearing and instead direct staff to remove that element from the project.

With thanks for your consideration,

Anne Russo  
1017 Oliphant Avenue  
Victoria V8V 2T9

## Christine Havelka

---

**Subject:** FW: Pendergast project: parking proposal

---

**From:** linda macnayr <

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 5, 2018 9:43 AM

**To:** Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Laurel Collins (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor)

**Subject:** Pendergast project: parking proposal

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to request your assistance in strongly rejecting the Pendergast developer's proposal to accommodate commercial parking requirements by means of street parking and the destruction of highly valued grass boulevards.

This was never discussed in the local community plan nor is it in CSV design guidelines and would further erode the distinction between City and Neighbourhood.

The Pendergast project is already problematic, exacerbating, as it does, the need for affordable housing in Fairfield. Please support initiatives promoting social inclusiveness (Gentle Density) and environmental sustainability.

Thank you for your attention and action.

Best regards,

Linda MacNayr