

27 April 2018

To: Land Use Committee, North Jubilee Neighbourhood Association

From: Gerald Harris, 1829 Fern Street

Subject: Proposed development of 1900 Richmond Road

Thank you for hosting a public meeting regarding the development proposal. I regret that I was unable to attend, but I hope that this letter may be included in the response from North Jubilee residents.

1900 Richmond Road is at the very centre of the City's proposed Jubilee Urban Village, as introduced in the Official Community Plan. As such, the treatment of the 1900 Richmond Road property relates directly and intrinsically to creation of the Jubilee Urban Village concept. It relates also to the nature of the central intersection of the proposed Urban Village, Fort and Richmond.

The words "Urban Village" suggest a commercial and community hub that serves and attracts people of the neighbourhoods around it. They suggest a place where local people go to engage everyday activities: commercial, social, recreational and wellness-related. Local people would expect an "Urban Village" to be a place where they like to go, and which is useful to them. It would have the amenities of a small town such as: grocery store, library branch, medical clinic and lab, pharmacy, cafes, pub and community centre. People would expect an "Urban Village" to feel pedestrian-friendly, and welcoming at street-level, particularly at its central intersection.

The present proposal would move in the opposite direction. It would remove services already valued by local people. It would withdraw the property from participation in street-level participation in the life of the local community. It would thus directly oppose the concept of "Urban Village" the city hopes to create, and it would impoverish the community life of local people.

The Fort/Richmond intersection is already an unpleasant place for pedestrians and does not feel particularly safe. An "Urban Village" would make its central intersection more safe and attractive – a people place. Sidewalk would widen into plaza. Amenities would draw people to it. We would want to spend time there, and we would feel entirely comfortable crossing the intersection. When 1900 Richmond is redeveloped, as a corner of the central intersection of an "Urban Village", local people would expect it to become more useful, pleasant and pedestrian-friendly for us.

Does the term "Urban Village" carry the same positive meanings for the City as it would for local residents? The outcomes at 1900 Richmond Road may be a good indicator of what the City intends for Jubilee Urban Village.

Sincerely,
Gerald Harris

Monica Dhawan

From: Betty Honsinger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 6:26 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed Development 1900, 1908, 1912 Richmond Road

Hello my fellow Victorians, I write today about the proposed development at 1900, 1908, 1912 Richmond Road – a 139 unit retirement home to be built by Miliken Developments and run by Amica Retirement.

The 5 storey building spans 7 city lots. It is massive. I hope that you will take 10 minutes out of your busy days to see what kind of impact that will have on the homes behind it and the streets around it. 5 storeys all the way down Birch Street is too high.

Kind regards,

Betty Honsinger
Ashgrove Street

Monica Dhawan

From: Brian McKee <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 8:59 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Rezoning applications REZ00500 and REZ00651

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed development applications in North Jubilee relating to building out the "large urban village" area at the corner of Fort St. and Richmond Rd. The two proposals that concern me are REZ00500 and REZ00651 – If both of these proposals go forward in a form similar to those proposed an existing difficult traffic situation will only be exacerbated. The neighbourhood was laid out sometime in the late 1800's or early 1900's when traffic was scarce and vehicles were slower and much smaller.

I have lived in the neighbourhood since 1980. Since I moved here the vibrancy of the Birch St. corridor area has stagnated due to the neglect of former landowners. Lots 202/08 Richmond Rd., 1903/1909 Birch St. and 1769 Pembroke all were neglected by the previous owners to the extent that houses on the latter two were demolished after being rendered uninhabitable by that neglect. The remaining structure on Richmond Rd. Known as the Turner building has also suffered the same neglect, but is only barely standing due to some feeble attempt to secure it in the hopes that it can be incorporated into a new building – this effort is being made only to maintain the lack of setback on Richmond Rd. which is required by current city by-laws. The other two Birch St. lots have, in my tenure, been held by various landlords for speculative purposes and have shared somewhat similar decay. In my almost 40 years in the neighbourhood, Birch Street has only served as a parking lot for users of the surrounding services

We are faced now with the challenge of developing these properties in a way suitable to today's conditions and the community's needs.

It is my opinion that Birch Street has outlived its usefulness as a traffic carrying artery. Access to the street is achieved by very obtuse angled turns and egress is either by an almost blind (vision obscured by steepness of the angle and the lack of setback on the existing Turner building) turn onto extremely busy Richmond Rd, or by an obtuse turn onto Pembroke St. to exit onto Richmond – not too bad if you are turning right, but quite difficult if you wish to turn left as the traffic flow is usually quite heavy mid-day).

I would suggest to the city that before acting on any of the proposed applications that a proper traffic study be undertaken to determine if the existing road configuration can support the proposals. I would also like to suggest that the City explore the possibility of eliminating Birch Street and amalgamating the land with either or both of the current proponents to create a more viable parcel to house the community's needs in this area.

Yours Sincerely

Brian McKee

1956 Ashgrove St.

Katie Lauriston

From: Rob Bateman <rbateman@victoria.ca>
Sent: October 25, 2018 4:56 PM
To: Gerald Harris
Cc: dmilliken@millikendevlopments.com; NJNA Community; Michael Angrove
Subject: RE: 1900 Richmond Road

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Mr. Harris,

I am cc'ing my colleague who is handling this file to respond to your email: Michael Angrove, Planner, mangrove@victoria.ca.

Thanks,

Rob Bateman, MCIP, RPP
Senior Process Planner
Sustainable Planning and Community Development
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

T 250.361.0292 F 250.361.0557



From: Gerald Harris [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 4:50 PM
To: Rob Bateman <rbateman@victoria.ca>
Cc: dmilliken@millikendevlopments.com; NJNA Community <njnacommunity@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: 1900 Richmond Road



October 25, 1018

To:

Rob Bateman, MCIP, RPP
Senior Process Planner
Sustainable Planning and Community Development
City of Victoria

Cc:

D. Milliken, Milliken Developments
North Jubilee Neighbourhood Association

From:

Gerald Harris
Director, Friends of Bowker Creek

Subject:

Watershed-wise development at 1900 Richmond Road

Dear Mr. Bateman

This letter is to inquire as to Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development measures relevant to the Bowker Creek watershed in the current proposal for development at 1900 Richmond Road.

The property is part of the Bowker Creek watershed. The City of Victoria has endorsed the Bowker Creek Blueprint, a guiding document for managing and restoring the watershed and creek. Appropriate measures for developers are summarized in the Bowker Creek Developer's Guide <https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/initiatives-pdf/bci-pdf/brochures/bci-developers-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

We, Friends of Bowker Creek, were encouraged by the May 17, 2018 submission to Mayor and Council by NORR Architects, Engineers and Planners. In that initial Rezoning and Development Permit Application, NORR expressed commitment to reviewing all aspects of sustainability and providing building systems in line with industry best practices. To quote the NORR document:

"Sustainable items may include:

- Photovoltaic panels
- Increased mechanical and electrical efficiencies
- Increased building envelope systems and thermal performance
- Acoustic considerations
- Waste water reduction
- Storm water retention
- Passive solar systems
- Indigenous, low-water landscaping
- Decreased construction waste"

From the list quoted above, the items most relevant to Victoria's commitment to the Bowker Creek watershed may be "Storm water retention" and "Indigenous low-water landscaping". We hope in particular that any design accepted for development at 1900 Richmond Road will contain strong measures for "Storm water retention".

Fulfilling the Bowker Creek Blueprint's 100-year action plan to restore the Bowker Creek watershed most essentially demands "Storm water retention" at all developments in the watershed. The term covers various measures for slowing and cleaning stormwater on its way to the creek. Rather than channeling the water immediately into storm drains, the Bowker Creek Developer's Guidelines list several stormwater management features such as:

- **Harvesting and storing rainwater** to supply the property with its landscape watering needs
- **Raingarden** landscaping to hold stormwater while it sinks into the ground
- **Infiltration basins and tree wells** also to get stormwater into the ground, while providing water for trees
- **Plant and maintain trees**
- **Pervious pavement**
- **Green roofs**

The measures listed here are becoming increasingly common features in developments in the Bowker Creek watershed. Beautiful examples are easy to find. Friends of Bowker Creek hopes to see a strong mixture of these measures in any successful proposal for development at a large property such as 1900 Richmond Road.

We hope that the current proposal for development includes features that advance Victoria's watershed rehabilitation commitment, and we trust that the City will require such features in any successful proposal.

Yours truly,

Gerald Harris
for Friends of Bowker Creek

Date: November 7, 2018

From: South Jubilee Neighbourhood Association residents

To: Mayor and Council
City of Victoria

Re: Proposed 1900 Richmond Redevelopment

1900 Richmond is in North Jubilee Neighbourhood, and borders on South Jubilee Neighbourhood.

As, residents of South Jubilee, we have reviewed the applicant's plans for redevelopment of 1900 Richmond. Our comments, cut and pasted from emails, are on the next page (Appendix...). The comments were collected prior to the October 24 revised plans, submitted by the developer. At this time, though we have not fully digested the revisions, it appears our concerns remain, on large, unaddressed.

Our pros/cons for the proposed 1900 Richmond redevelopment are summarized as follows:

Pros (for planned development)

- Seniors housing
- Density increase

Cons (against planned development)

- Excessive size/density over OCP recommendations
- Poor transition to residential areas
- Doesn't align with numerous OCP objectives for Large Urban Villages
- Minimal commercial space proposed
- Displaces community medical services
- Private and expensive – beyond reach of almost all who live in the neighbourhood

Please take these comments into consideration in your deliberations on the merits of the 1900 Richmond redevelopment application.

Best,

Julie Brown, South Jubilee Neighbourhood
Liz Hoar, South Jubilee Neighbourhood
Gail Anthony, South Jubilee Neighbourhood
Ben Ziegler, South Jubilee Neighbourhood

.cc North Jubilee Neighbourhood Association CALUC

Appendix – South Jubilee Neighbourhood resident commentary re: 1900 Richmond application

Comments from Julie Brown, South Jubilee resident

"They are asking for a lot of density (more than 2.5 FSR) which isn't supported in large urban villages without advancement of 'plan objectives'. And the token commercial space is extremely small - about 1% of the total floor area - and it doesn't even extend the full length of Fort Street. I appreciate that seniors/assisted housing is needed, and I am not outright opposed to the density. However, I think the project could do a much better job of incorporating community needs and services, in light of the fact that the development is displacing numerous community medical services. Aren't medical services a natural fit for this project?"

Comments from Liz Hoar, South Jubilee resident

Too much density:

"Too high - they present the building as 5 storeys but really overall height is more important. The height is 20.72 metres. I looked at 1811 Oak Bay, also pitched as 5 storeys and it's 16.8 metres so 4 metres difference which is huge given the length of this building. I also looked at UVIC's Broad Street project which is 7 storeys with commercial on the main floor and it's 21.57m so less than a metre higher but two more storeys. So I think saying it's 5 storeys is going to mislead a lot of people about how tall this building really is - closer to 6 1/2 storeys if it was a normal commercial/residential building

Too long - I couldn't find lengths of the building anywhere, just overall square footage so I looked at the width of the facing lots on Ashgrove and came up with a lot length of about 380 ft or 116m and the building setback is 2.7 m (north + south) so that means the building is about 113m long if I have everything correct. That's longer than a football field (101metres). Yikes.

This building will loom high over those poor guys living on Ashgrove hardly reflecting the OCP statement about the Jubilee Large Urban Village DPA5 (g) *"Revitalization is needed to ensure sensitive transitions between the Royal Jubilee Hospital expansion including its associated commercial uses and flanking Traditional Residential areas. Portions of Fort Street that lie within this designation are also in need of beautification and human-scaled urban design."*

In the OCP description of a large Urban village it says "One to three storey building facades define the street wall" - I don't see anything like that in this design.

Here's their Calgary facility which, although long, is not so tall, stepping down from 4 storeys to 3 and has some breathing space around it...



Use and exclusivity

Well, I don't have a problem with a seniors' facility but given that this is PRIVATE and EXPENSIVE, it will not likely serve anyone within the adjacent community. So we are losing a medical clinic and assorted medical services that our whole community uses and replacing it with a private facility that most of us will never use. Doesn't meet any of these OCP objectives:

DPA5 item 3. (a) Large Urban Villages are nodes of commercial and community services that primarily support adjacent Traditional and Urban Residential areas, with some also serving nearby General Employment areas.

DPA5 item 4 4. The objectives that justify this designation include:

(a) To accommodate 40% of Victoria's anticipated population growth in the Town Centres and Large Urban Villages to encourage and support a mix of commercial and community services primarily serving the surrounding residential areas.

(b) To revitalize areas of commercial use into complete Large Urban Villages through human-scale design of buildings, streets, squares and other public spaces to increase vibrancy and strengthen commercial viability.

(c) To achieve a high quality of architecture, landscape and urban design in all Large Urban Villages to enhance their appearance and identify villages as important neighbourhood centres.

(d) To achieve a unique character and sense of place in the design of each Large Urban Village, with consideration for potential new landmarks.

(e) To establish gateways along prominent corridors to signal and celebrate arrival into the City and neighbourhoods within Humber Green Village, Jubilee Village and Stadacona Village.

(f) To design all Large Urban Villages in a manner that encourages pedestrian and cycling use and enhances the experience of pedestrians and cyclists.

(h) To revitalize Jubilee Village through beautification of East Fort Street, urban design that integrates and improves the experience of pedestrians and cyclists throughout the village, and ensure sensitive transitions between the Royal Jubilee Hospital site, particularly its commercial uses with adjacent residential areas.

Commercial space

1200 sq ft. - Sounds like another coffee shop to me. How many of those do we need? But we do need more doctors and to at least be able to keep the medical clinics we have. The whole region is chronically short of medical services. The current medical clinic apparently leases 3500 sq ft. and they are having trouble finding new space so what does that mean? They move out of the city? I don't see how this project benefits either North or South Jubilee."

Comments from Gail Anthony, South Jubilee resident

"The project has asked for numerous variances to increase its footprint and height. There is no room left for any green space. If they do get approval from the City Planning Department and Council, at the very least I would like to see the developer required, as an example, to create and maintain an urban garden rest area with seating for seniors and hospital staff in the small parklike area on the NE corner of Richmond and Fort."

Comments from Ben Ziegler, South Jubilee resident

"I support any movement to mixed-use, mixed-income neighbourhoods (including ours) – unfortunately, this application shows no movement at all in that direction. Few Jubilee seniors wanting to downsize will be able to afford a place in the new development, and will likely have to leave the neighbourhood, and local relationships they've developed, over time.

Aside: there is an irony to me in how Oak Bay United Church (Oak Bay) is proposing a new 90+ unit development on their site, comprised of mostly affordable units, while the 1900 Richmond application (Victoria) proposes a high-end seniors complex... How many of tenants of the OB Church development will be Victorians, and 1900 Richmond tenants be from Oak Bay?"

1752 Davie St
January 22, 2019

To Mayor and Council:

Re: 1900 Richmond Rd development

I am a resident of South Jubilee and am not in favour of the proposed use and design for 1900 Richmond. Here are my thoughts:

- The proposed facility is a VERY high end private care facility for the privileged few. The architect for the developer stated in his letter accompanying the proposal that *"The proposed development will provide a continuum of care for the North Jubilee community; a unique and much-needed housing typology within the area."* 2015 Stats Can figures indicate average income in Victoria is \$34,000 a year. About 60% of Jubilee residents rent their home. How could any of these people (myself included) afford the services of this facility?
- Removes valuable medical services that are available to ALL. The medical clinic currently on this site is home to family doctors for many residents of North and South Jubilee (myself included). With the current shortage of family doctors and the high cost of office space we will lose yet another neighbourhood amenity.
- The building is HUGE, both in height and length. It will loom over houses directly behind the building site. In his letter, the architect says *"While the OCP permits 6 storey construction, our preliminary discussion with the North Jubilee Neighbourhood Association (NJNA) indicated a preference for a lower building typology. As such, we are proposing a 5 storey design to accommodate this request."* This is a bit of smoke and mirrors. The proposed height of this building is 20.64 metres. It is the height of at least a 6 storey building. For example, a proposal for 1811 Oak Bay avenue is for 5 storeys, the height of which is 16.8 metres. The massive 1002 Pandora project on the corner of Pandora and Vancouver with commercial on the main floor is 6 storeys and is 21.8 metres high, only slightly higher than the 1900 Richmond proposal.
- The setbacks are miniscule. Directly to the west of the building site are houses, most of them built in the early 20th century that will now have a 20.64 metre wall (68ft) at most 20 ft from their property line.
- Lack of green space. Architect's letter says *"Overall public open space is minimal, however residents can access small parks and play areas such as the open park space along Fort Street at the Royal Jubilee Hospital. Begbie Green is located one block to the northwest."* This project is relying on existing green spaces without supplying any new green space in its public spaces. I recently walked by the publicly funded Summit seniors' residence on Hillside off Blanshard. The first thing I noticed was the generous setbacks that give breathing room for the building and possibilities for green spaces.

This will be a massive disruptive intrusion into the Jubilee neighbourhood with no attempts at human scale.

Sincerely
Raymond St. Arnaud