



CITY OF VICTORIA

Mayor

Lisa Helps
T 250.361.0200
E mayor@victoria.ca

Councillors

Marianne Alto
T 250.361.0216
E malto@victoria.ca

Chris Coleman
T 250.361.0223
E ccoleman@victoria.ca

Ben Isitt
T 250.882.9302
E bisitt@victoria.ca

Jeremy Loveday
T 250.634.2327
E jloveday@victoria.ca

Margaret Lucas
T 250.361.0217
E mlucas@victoria.ca

Pamela Madoff
T 250.361.0221
E pmadoff@victoria.ca

Charlayne Thornton-Joe
T 250.361.0219
E cthorne-ton-joe@victoria.ca

Geoff Young
T 250.361.0220
E gyoung@victoria.ca

1 Centennial Square
Victoria, British Columbia
Canada V8W 1P6

www.victoria.ca

October 28, 2018

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Community Support for New Childcare Spaces

I am writing in support of the application of Gillian Fehr of Gillybird Nature Schools Ltd. for funding from the New Spaces Fund to create new childcare spaces in the City of Victoria.

Expanding access to affordable childcare and early childhood education is a strategic priority for the City of Victoria, contributing toward a more inclusive and cohesive community.

Victoria's municipal council has recognized the need of families in the municipality to have more childcare options, and has supported efforts to expand childcare options in several Victoria neighbourhoods. Provincial support through the New Spaces Fund now provides financial capacity to support the establishment of new childcare facilities and the expansion of existing facilities.

Gillybird Nature Academy and Big Tree Nature School has operated successfully in our municipality for a number of years. With support from the New Spaces Fund, more children will have access to education in the outdoors, particularly infants as well as children older than 30 months, addressing gaps in existing childcare services.

For these reasons, I encourage you to support this application for support for the New Spaces Fund.

All the best,

Ben Isitt
Victoria City Councillor and Capital Regional District Director

Lucas De Amaral

From: Rob Sherman [REDACTED]
Sent: May 1, 2019 10:20 AM
To: landuse@oaklandsca.com; Victoria Mayor and Council;
[REDACTED]
Subject: 1661 Burton Ave proposed development application
Categories: Need to file in S Drive

To Whom it May Concern,

On April 26th I attended the Community Meeting for Proposed Development to allow for a kindergarten at 1661 Burton Ave. as I am a resident on Burton Ave that received one of the notices sent out for the hearing.

First let me start by stating that the notice that was sent out appeared to be an avenue of input from the residents in the immediate area to voice support or concern about a business being opened up in our residential neighborhood. Finding out that this was not the case was to say the least, disconcerting.

The applicant Gillian made it very clear that her daycare or adventure centre (I cannot remember what her wording was) is opening June 1st and that we (the notice recipients) were only there to approve her application to increase her capacity for the centre from 8 to 12.

I have concerns about the amount of traffic that this business could potentially bring onto Burton Ave. While the applicant will down play this by stating that she will ask her clients to come down roads other than Burton Ave, she has absolutely no ability to control what her clients do or how they do it.

My concerns are about the increased traffic volume and with it, the impact to the limited parking on Burton Ave as well as a likely hood of people speeding (going faster than they safely should be) to get out of the area to get to work on time. The traffic volumes will increase during peak times of people leaving for work and coming home from work, so the likely hood of there being a negative impact is high.

The applicant will tell you that she will ask her clients to park in the Hillside Mall parking lot, but she does not really have a say in how the mall lot will be used and the mall could easily shut that down. And with Wal-mart going into the old Sears store, there will be construction going on which will impact the ability for her clients to park in that area which she is expecting them to. Of course, this is speculation at this time, but are very real scenarios that will again impact the local residents if her ideal situations are not able to be met.

The applicant has suggested that a loading zone could be put on Shakespeare Rd (around the corner from Burton Ave, but this would at best accommodate two cars, so where would the others park? The clients would still have to drive in and out of the area increasing the local traffic.

The applicant had support at the meeting, but from what I can tell, they were from another area of the Oaklands Community and not one of the local residents that received this notification because they live within 100 meters of the address asking for the rezoning change. While I appreciate their right to have a voice, their input should be limited as they will not be impacted by the potential increase of traffic.

If the applicant is allowed to open her business with 8 clients for June 1st without consideration from the neighborhood, so be it, but what I ask is that the application to increase capacity from 8 clients to 12 be put on

hold and reviewed with the residents again in 6 months so that we can assess if there are any negative impacts to the potential increase in the local traffic. It will be easier to grant permission in 6 months rather than try and take it away if the business does impact the area negatively.

I am not against quality daycare as I understand how hard it is to find, I am concerned about the potential impacts to the area that I have lived in for over 20 years by increasing the traffic in a small area that is already heavily saturated with vehicles.

I am happy to have a conversation with anyone about this, but I think another application to increase the capacity of the applicants kindergarten in 6 months is a reasonable compromise for everyone.

Rob Sherman

Sent from my iPhone

Lucas De Amaral

From: Rob Sherman [REDACTED]
Sent: May 1, 2019 4:55 PM
To: gillian fehr
Cc: landuse@oaklandsca.com; Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Re: 1661 Burton Ave proposed development application

Categories: Need to file in S Drive

Hi Gillian, please see my responses below in italics.

You probably won't want to or might not see the need to, but I am up for an open and constructive conversation – not a debate (as it will serve no purpose) and so much can be lost in translation when using email.

So, if you would like to or feel the need to respond, please address me directly as I am sure that the council has better things to do than to be part of a dialogue where you are apt to malign me (through hearsay). By labelling me a fear monger, aggressive, and that I bulldoze and scare people.

Rob

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: gillian fehr [REDACTED]
Date: May 1, 2019 at 1:05:55 PM PDT
To: Rob Sherman [REDACTED]
Cc: landuse@oaklandsca.com, mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Re: 1661 Burton Ave proposed development application

Thank you for your comments,

With respect, families can not wait for 6 months.

There are little (to no) Infant Toddler spots in our community and opening 12 new ones is not a negative, but a huge positive for everyone in Oaklands.

Let's be honest while this is not a negative, this is not a positive for EVERYONE in regards to daycare (not the location). I believe there is a shortage of quality daycare and there always has been, even when my kids were young. But this is really only huge positive for those that will use your service while serving the greater good in a peripheral manner. And for you to maximize your profit per square foot of space. I tried to not overstate the negatives or use fear mongering (as you put it) but paint a realistic picture of possibilities.

I DO have support from immediate neighbours, but they were elderly women who felt bulldozed by the way you were speaking so aggressively at the community meeting, and felt scared to voice how happy they were at the prospect of seeing new little faces in the area that they have

been residing for more than 30 years. I know this because they told my husband outside that they were scared to speak against you.

The ladies you speak of – one of them did speak about how happy she would be to see the little faces, so please, let us be truthful about what did and did not happen. Please do not try and paint a picture that is not true. As for the other lady, she is my direct neighbor and has been for twenty years, we are very friendly and have never had a harsh word between us so I find that you lumping her into being scared to speak is an alternate fact; a stretch of the truth.

Stating how someone else felt is complete hearsay and does not make for a productive conversation but rather serves your agenda of making me out to be the “bad guy” to your self-perceived role as a savior of the community. I spoke and let others speak; I did not disparage anyone or say they were wrong or not let anyone have an opportunity to add the voice to the dialogue. But let me say this - I felt it was you who set the aggressive tone by stating in your opening statement to the group that you “are not changing the property by adding a new building to the lot which is within your right to do” like you are doing us a favor and in some ways felt like a veiled threat that if this doesn’t happen for you that you may do that. You and your husband several times throughout the conversation brought up scenarios that “could be worse” for the neighborhood continuing the tone you set.

If anything, I felt as if I was outnumbered and bullied as it seemed that you brought support (residents on Roseberry I believe) from outside of the 100 meter radius that was invited to the meeting to voice support or concern for your request.

I am not applying to turn the lot into a huge development, and I was surprised that you wouldn’t be excited that the building would not be demolished, with a large duplex/4 plexus built in place.

I think this is moot point as this proposal is not on the table, but if it were, I would have the same concerns about the increase of vehicles. Plus I am pretty certain that bylaws state that there needs to be a certain number of parking spaces for each residence.

My families ARE respectful drivers and will not (nor have they ever) speed on a street threat their own children will be attending care at. To suggest parents will be speeding on streets where the Center will be located is total speculation, and fear mongering. If there is concern for speeding cars, it would not be coming from people dropping off and picking up small children.

I am not pointing a finger at “your families”, I do not know them so I cannot say how they behave one way or the other; all I am stating is that the increase of vehicles will impact parking and when people (all people) are in a rush, they tend to go faster in areas they shouldn’t. You can’t be so naive to think that this is not the case and that people jockeying to get past each other is not going to happen ever. So while “your people” might not speed, the presence of their vehicles could contribute to others doing so. All I am pointing out is that the increase of vehicles contributes even indirectly to my concerns.

Furthermore, being a nature based center, I attract families that walk and bike when ever they are able.

And when they aren’t, they could possibly drive to the center and increasing traffic to the area at peak hours, thereby supporting my concern.

Immediate neighbours have agreed that changing the no stopping zone on Shakespeare to residential parking and a drop off zone would eliminate virtually everyone's reservations, except yours. Singularly, yours.

Concerns about what? Traffic or parking. This would help address the parking, but not the amount of increased traffic on the road. You would have to agree with that statement.

I found your vehemence to be disproportionate to the nature of the meeting, and many others stated the same after you left. Just because your voice was the loudest, doesn't mean it is the most prevalent.

Perhaps it was disproportionate, however, in the moment (after finding out that this was not about opening a kindergarten, but rather to approve an increase in your clientele) and how I feel you set the tone, by stating what you could do with the property, I feel like none of us had a voice in the matter and I was quite upset by that fact. I thought a community was about being able to talk about things and come to an understanding or agreement after facts and opinions had been brought forward. I don't feel that there was in this case as you were opening your business on June 1st and you seemingly were expecting unanimous support for the additional 4 spots. If you could look at it from my point of view instead you might be able to understand where I am coming from.

Being a home owner, I too dislike the ever shrinking parking spaces available for my own vehicles at my homes. But densification means that that is not going to stop. In fact, if we suited the Burton home, there would be potentially 4 new cars parked on the street. In this case, only drop off and pick up at 8-9 and 4-5 would be an issue. Zero cars parked over night or on weekends, when I would assume most residents would like to be parking their own cars.

Again, to my point, trying to paint a picture of it could be worse. I say it could be better if a single person who only rode their bike moved in. That didn't happen so it is just a valid a statement as yours which is moot - as that is not the situation we are dealing with. And also as you stated, the traffic impact would be at peak hours when people are trying to leave for work and come home. Those are the hours of impact. If the hours were between 11 am and 2 pm, then I would still have some concern, but the impact to traffic flow would not be as likely as it is in the hours you have noted.

I very much hope that when we open for 8 children you will see that your concerns will be mitigated.

I would very much like my concerns to be mitigated, that is why I am suggesting a 6 month review; if there is little to no impact, I would gladly support the increase to 12. I do not think that is unreasonable at all. I like to err on the side of caution and until the impacts are known, I think reviewing the impact to the neighbor is the prudent thing to do. Neither you nor I can state for certain what will happen either way and without that certainty, taking a cautious approach is the best and fair course of action for all parties.

My ask from the council is simple, even though I may be the only voice against the increase, I ask that the application be put on hold for 6 months so that we can actually see what impact the increased traffic will have in the area. What works in one area may not work in another, and only time will tell if there are or are not issues. If the application is granted and there are issues, it will be much harder to restrict the center back down to 8 spaces; and this would create a

much larger burden on the families that could no longer attend if that decision was made. Once the genie is out of the bottle, you can't put it back in.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 1, 2019, at 1:05 PM, gillian fehr [REDACTED] wrote:

Thank you for your comments,

With respect, families can not wait for 6 months.

There are little (to no) Infant Toddler spots in our community and opening 12 new ones is not a negative, but a huge positive for everyone in Oaklands.

I DO have support from immediate neighbours, but they were elderly women who felt bulldozed by the way you were speaking so aggressively at the community meeting, and felt scared to voice how happy they were at the prospect of seeing new little faces in the area that they have been residing for more than 30 years. I know this because they told my husband outside that they were scared to speak against you.

I am not applying to turn the lot into a huge development, and I was surprised that you wouldn't be excited that the building would not be demolished, with a large duplex/4 plexus built in place.

My families ARE respectful drivers and will not (nor have they ever) speed on a street threat their own children will be attending care at. To suggest parents will be speeding on streets where the Center will be located is total speculation, and fear mongering. If there is concern for speeding cars, it would not be coming from people dropping off and picking up small children.

Furthermore, being a nature based center, I attract families that walk and bike when ever they are able.

Immediate neighbours have agreed that changing the no stopping zone on Shakespeare to residential parking and a drop off zone would eliminate virtually everyone's reservations, except yours. Singularly, yours.

I found your vehemence to be disproportionate to the nature of the meeting, and many others stated the same after you left. Just because your voice was the loudest, doesn't mean it is the most prevalent.

Being a home owner, I too dislike the ever shrinking parking spaces available for my own vehicles at my homes. But densification means that that is not going to stop. In fact, if we suited the Burton home, there would be potentially 4 new cars parked on the street. In this case, only drop off and pick up at 8-9 and 4-5 would be an issue. Zero cars parked over night or on weekends, when I would assume most residents would like to be parking their own cars.

I very much hope that when we open for 8 children you will see that your concerns will be mitigated.

Gillian



On May 1, 2019, at 10:19 AM, Rob Sherman [REDACTED] wrote:

To Whom it May Concern,

On April 26th I attended the Community Meeting for Proposed Development to allow for a kindergarten at 1661 Burton Ave. as I am a resident on Burton Ave that received one of the notices sent out for the hearing.

First let me start by stating that the notice that was sent out appeared to be an avenue of input from the residents in the immediate area to voice support or concern about a business being opened up in our residential neighborhood. Finding out that this was not the case was to say the least, disconcerting.

The applicant Gillian made it very clear that her daycare or adventure centre (I cannot remember what her wording was) is opening June 1st and that we (the notice recipients) were only there to approve her application to increase her capacity for the centre from 8 to 12.

I have concerns about the amount of traffic that this business could potentially bring onto Burton Ave. While the applicant will down play this by stating that she will ask her clients to come down roads other than Burton Ave, she has absolutely no ability to control what her clients do or how they do it.

My concerns are about the increased traffic volume and with it, the impact to the limited parking on Burton Ave as well as a likely hood of people speeding (going faster than they safely should be) to get out of the area to get to work on time. The traffic volumes will increase during peak times of people leaving for work and coming home from work, so the likely hood of there being a negative impact is high.

The applicant will tell you that she will ask her clients to park in the Hillside Mall parking lot, but she does not really have a say in how the mall lot will be used and the mall could easily shut that down. And with Wal-mart going into the old Sears store, there will be construction going on which will impact the ability for her clients to park in that area which she is expecting them to. Of course, this is speculation at this time, but are very real scenarios that will again impact the local residents if her ideal situations are not able to be met.

The applicant has suggested that a loading zone could be put on Shakespeare Rd (around the corner from Burton Ave, but this would at best accommodate two cars, so where would the others park? The clients would still have to drive in and out of the area increasing the local traffic.

The applicant had support at the meeting, but from what I can tell, they were from another area of the Oaklands Community and not one of the local residents that received this notification because they live within 100 meters of the address asking for the rezoning change. While I appreciate their right to have a voice, their input should be limited as they will not be impacted by the potential increase of traffic.

If the applicant is allowed to open her business with 8 clients for June 1st without consideration from the neighborhood, so be it, but what I ask is that the application to increase capacity from 8 clients to 12 be put on hold and reviewed with the residents again in 6 months so that we can assess if there are any negative impacts to the potential increase in the local traffic. It will be easier to grant permission in 6 months rather than try and take it away if the business does impact the area negatively.

I am not against quality daycare as I understand how hard it is to find, I am concerned about the potential impacts to the area that I have lived in for over 20 years by increasing the traffic in a small area that is already heavily saturated with vehicles.

I am happy to have a conversation with anyone about this, but I think another application to increase the capacity of the applicant's kindergarten in 6 months is a reasonable compromise for everyone.

Rob Sherman

Sent from my iPhone

From: Bridey Morrison Morgan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2019 10:51 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: RE: Mayor and Council email RE: Community Meeting - Proposed Development - 1661 Burton Avenue

Greetings Monica:

Thank you for the acknowledgement of my letter / email regarding re: re-zoning. Please forward these comments to the appropriate individuals.

I appreciate the information about the Community Care and Assisted Living act.

My big concern is that no notification (as a courtesy / transparency) about this legislation was given to the community as to what was happening to the property in question.

Furthermore, before the day care is up and running, we have the owner / operator applying for re-zoning to accommodate more children and the neighbourhood has not had time to adjust to the new traffic patterns we will be dealing with.

The application (which I will point out again – talked about re-zoning for a kindergarten – not an increase to the number of children attending the day care).

I think for the sake of the community / neighbourhood no change to the zoning should take place for at least 6 months. If Ms. Fehr's day care operation doesn't cause a problem / have negative impact in our neighbourhood, she could then re-apply and I am sure the neighbourhood would fully support her application for re-zoning.

Sincerely,
bridey morrison morgan

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 9:47:50 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Mayor and Council email RE: Community Meeting - Proposed Development - 1661 Burton Avenue

Dear Bridey,

Thank you for your email regarding a rezoning application for 1661 Burton Avenue, it has been shared with Mayor and Council.

I have also filed your email with this address, to be shared with Mayor and Council again once this application comes before them for consideration at a Committee of the Whole meeting. More information on this application can also be found on the City's Development Tracker.

To provide some clarification on the process, the Community Care and Assisted Living Act permits daycares for up to 8 children within single family dwellings; this is provincial legislation which overrules a city's zoning regulations. However to have any more than 8 children, Island Health would then require the building be zoned for this use, by the municipality. Such an application has been received by the City to rezone 1661 Burton.

Thank you for your sharing your feedback with Mayor, Council and the City of Victoria.

Sincerely,

Monica Dhawan
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor / City Manager's Office
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

From: Bridey Morrison Morgan [REDACTED]
Sent: May 4, 2019 1:37 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Ben Isitt (Councillor)
Subject: Community Meeting - Proposed Development - 1661 Burton Avenue

Please see the attachment – letter from resident re: 1661 Burton Ave.

Thank you.

bridey morrison morgan
[REDACTED]

Sent from Mail for Windows 10