

received
City of Victoria

JUL 2 2017

Planning & Development Department
Development Services Division**NORTH PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION****Minutes of Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) Meeting**
July 5, 2017**Present:**

Board members: Pam Hartling, Christopher Fleming, Penny Bond, Jenny Farkas, Daniel Ferguson, Jessie Rucker, Katie Fillion

Members: Lorna Rennie, Alex Kerr, Julie Poskitt

Guests: Heather Spinney, Robert Rocheleau (Praxis Architects); Anup Grewal, Mark Whitney, (Novus Properties); Jahnava Moore, Dawn Goodwin, Liz Inch, Robert Lyall, John Berry, Donald Lines, Jason Carver, Philip O'Neill, Christine Terry, Don Grier, Lance Moran

Call to Order: Pam Hartling, CALUC Co-chair, called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

Process:

This is a community meeting for a development application for two neighbouring properties at 919 and 923 Caledonia Ave. The architect will present the proposed development, then the floor will be opened for questions and discussion. Following the meeting, the NPNA will forward minutes to the City and the minutes will become part of the development application. Should they wish to proceed, the developer will continue to work with the City on development plans for this property. Individuals who have particular opinions about the development proposal may send their own letters to the City. The meeting minutes also will be sent to all NPNA members and to those who attended the meeting and provided contact information.

Presentation - Heather Spinney:**919 - 923 Caledonia Ave. - Praxis Architects Inc.; Novus Properties**

- The properties currently are zoned R2. The proponent is seeking re-zoning to allow for multi-residential housing, with 1.3 - 1 density.
- The proposal is for 19 rental units: 12 one-bedroom; 4 two-bedroom; one three-bedroom. Two loft-style units would have separate entrances from the east side of the building.
- The intention is to rehabilitate the one heritage house remaining on the property, hereafter referred to as the "blue house", and re-locate it to the other side of the property to retain the heritage streetscape.
- The mixture of the blue house and the new construction behind and next to it would act as a transition to the larger and smaller buildings nearby.

- There would be a downslope to the parking on the east side on the property.
- Building materials would be horizontal siding to match the blue house. Fibre cement panel and stucco would be included.
- Water conservation measures would be used.
- Landscaping would include tree plantings, possibly including fruit trees.
- There would be a car share stall on site and car share membership would be provided to the tenants.

Discussion Summary:

- Privacy concerns
 - Residents next door are concerned that they will lose privacy with tenants able to look directly into their yards and houses. There was a question of who is the owner of the hedge bordering the property.
 - 1.6 meter has been allowed on the east side of the building for the driveway. Some setback and the driveway will help to maintain privacy.
- Parking
 - The plan proposes 13 parking stalls. The proponents are working with the City on parking requirements.
 - Neighbours are concerned that the amount of parking that is proposed is inadequate. They would prefer more, such as one stall/unit.
 - It was clarified that this is a new zone, so there is no parking variance.
 - There already is a shortage of parking on the street.
- Massing/Density
 - The proposed density is in response to the City's priority to have more rental housing.
 - The applicants decided not to propose a higher building.
 - Some neighbours feel that the massing is out of scale with structures that are next to it. Preference is for retention of the height of the next door houses and the blue house.
- Rental
 - There were questions about whether or not the rental housing will be affordable.
 - Initially the plan was for affordable housing. Plans had to be changed according to what the City wants.
 - There will be some affordable housing but there are many variables influencing this.
 - Neighbours want assurance that formulas for affordable housing be used.
 - There was disappointment that this will not be affordable rental housing.
 - No short term rental of units (e.g. Air B&B) will be permitted.

- It is not possible to predict what projected revenues from rent will be.
- Rental management would be done by Novus Properties. They currently manage the rental of the blue house.
- Design
 - The proponents described their work as very traditional. They want to fit in.
 - There were various comments about the design of the proposal:
 - Unusual design.
 - Design looks like stucco boxes, not sympathetic with the neighbourhood.
 - Not good treatment of the heritage house retention.
 - Housing across the street is in a style more sympathetic to the rest of the street.
 - The house next door is heritage designated.
 - It's great that the blue house is being saved. The design of the rest of the proposal transitions into the more modern part of the street.
- Other
 - Storage units for all rental units are included in the plan.
 - Shadow studies have been done but were not available at this meeting.
 - Neighbours asked when was the time to voice opposition to this proposal.
 - It was clarified that this community meeting is an opportunity to voice those opinions.
 - Current tenants of the adjacent property and several other neighbours expressed significant concern about the noise and behaviour of tenants currently occupying the property. There are loud parties and people appear to be camping on the property. It is a big problem for neighbours on both sides, and across the street.
 - The developer acknowledged that they own the site and are responsible for the tenants.
 - There were several requests of the developer to do a better job managing the tenants.
 - The property owners reported that they had been required to demolish the other house that was on the property to produce a clear and safe site, which is now the vacant lot.
 - The property owners indicated that they could discuss these problems with the neighbours.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Recorder: Penny Bond, NPNA Secretary

Summary and Minutes
of the Community Land Use Meeting
Wednesday Aug. 2, 2018, 7pm

RE: 919 and 923 Caledonia, Redevelopment Proposal

Mayor, Council and City Staff

Please find attached a summary of the Community Land Use Meeting regarding the redevelopment proposal for the old house and vacant lot on Caledonia Street.

SUMMARY

About 30 people were in attendance; most were North Park residents and business owners.

Attendees responded favourably to the “front half” or “street-facing” part of the development concept, namely the restoration of the old house and the building of a second small house. Many indicated their appreciation for how this would create the effect of 4 or 5 old-like houses in a row on this section of Caledonia – essentially restoring the look/feel of the street. Comparison was made to the Fernwood side of Caledonia where the look/feel has been maintained for the whole length of the street.

Conversely, attendees did **not** seem to like the design and scale of the back portion of the development.

- Some felt it was a mistake to try to make a dense, 4-story building look like a heritage building
- Some questioned the density of the project as a whole and wondered if there is a need for this many one-bedroom market-rent apartments
- Some felt it wasn't fair to take advantage of neighbouring airspace to the benefit of the 4-story building dwellers
- Some wondered why the developer wouldn't simply put four houses in the two lots (two at the front and two at the back).

Submitted by

Jenny Farkas, Acting President

Minute taker: Mel Groves

MINUTES

PROPONENT

- Anup Grewal, Novus Properties

ARCHITECT:

- Peter Hardcastle, Hillel Architecture

ATTENDANCE

- About 30 people were in attendance; most were North Park residents and business owners.
- Councillor Loveday was also present.

OPENING REMARKS

- The proposal calls for the relocation and heritage restoration of the house currently at 919 Caledonia, plus the construction of a new single-family dwelling beside it and a multi-unit complex in the rear lot.
- The house at 919 Caledonia is a sister building to the sensitively restored heritage home at 925 Caledonia. We will relocate it to 923 Caledonia and restore it to a similar standard with two suites within it. We will seek heritage designation.
- Next door facing Caledonia Street we will build a new single-family dwelling that will be a smaller, contemporary version of the heritage homes, creating a row of three. The new dwelling will be a 2- bedroom/ 2 -bath unit, using similar materials and colours to the heritage home next door.
- A landscaped walkway will lead to a new 4-storey multi-family dwelling behind the heritage houses. It will match the scale of the single-family dwellings due to sloping rooflines.
- A privacy screen consisting of a new fence plus landscaping will be provided between the project and its neighbour at 929 Caledonia.
- The multi-family dwelling will include 4 units per floor, for a total of 16 units and 10,000 square feet. There will be 3 two-bedroom units (61 sm/760.sf) and 15 one-bedroom units (50 sm/540sf).
- There will be a common greenspace on the property, a landscaped area for the birds and bees as well as underground parking, bike parking and an area to charge scooters.

QUESTION PERIOD

Is there a parking variance for this proposal?

No, a parking variance is not required.

Will you save the very old rosebush that is at the rear of the property?

The current cedar hedge will need to be removed during construction. If it's possible to transplant existing plants we will look at doing that.

How high is the proposed fence? We are neighbours at 929 and it looks as though we'll have several units and balconies looking down at us. We'll have no privacy.

It will probably be 5 or 6 feet high. We are happy to work with neighbours on a relandscaping plan. Planting fast growing trees is one possibility for restoring privacy in a relatively short time.

Is a rezoning required?

Yes, the property is currently R2 zoned. It would require variances to be rezoned to R73, which is a special infill zoning. The permitted height for the R73 zone is 13.84 instead of 13.2 for R2. The rear yard setback is 3 metres for R73 instead of 4.8 metres for R2.

Chair's note: Some parts of the North Park Local Area Plan are impacted and overlapped by the Downtown Core Area Plan, which permits higher density. Ideally, the contradictions between the plans would be worked out in advance of proceeding with proposals in overlapping zones.

Will the hard landscaping be permeable? What is the site coverage?

58% site coverage. Yes, there will be permeable paving.

Will there be any affordable housing units? Multiple concerns were raised re the absence of affordable rental units.

The proposal is to create 19 new rental units total, and they are intended to be 20-year rentals. It's possible there may be one or two below-market rentals.

The design has improved since the last iteration we saw. However, the density is too much for the lot. From our house we'll be looking at 8 to 10 balconies. It's out of balance and an intrusion into our back yard. Has a light and shadow study been done?

No, this is still to be done.

It seems that a 4-storey building will actually be much higher than the rendering shows. It seems unbelievable that a 4-storey building will only be that much higher than the houses on the street front.

We've used sloping roof lines to mimic the lines of the heritage houses on Caledonia.

COMMENTS

- I'd prefer this if it mimicked the multi-family dwelling behind 930 North Park St. This looks out of scale compared to the heritage homes.
- From 947 Caledonia it will impact our privacy and view.