

**Lacey Maxwell**

---

**From:** Dorrie Collins [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 5, 2018 2:18 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue Rental Proposal

I live in South Jubilee. These are my concerns.

1. Sidelineing of Community Plan: The City has made changes to density without any formal input from our neighbourhood.
2. Five stories is simply too high and sets a bad precedent. Hardly a "village"!
3. Bland face of building to street. Lack of community amenities.
2. Rental housing is great, but any way to ensure that this remains rental for the longterm.

Thank you for your attention.

Dorrie Collins

## **Lacey Maxwell**

---

**From:** Diana Leeming [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 5, 2018 4:35 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Ave.

Dear Mayor and Council I would just like to register my disagreement with the proposal for the 5 storey building at 1811 Oak Bay Ave. Maybe a 2 storey building to replace what is there but 5 stories??? If this sort of building continues, we won't be able to see the sun anymore!!! I live at the corner of Fell & Leighton & love the fact that this area is not over developed. Hope you can appreciate this. Yours Truly Diana Leeming #1 - 1665 Fell St. Victoria

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Mark Hornell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 5, 2018 3:09 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Proposed Rental Residential Development - 1811 Oak Bay Avenue at Bank Street

Dear Mayor and Council:

I live at 1026 Clare Street and attended the special joint meeting of the Jubilee and Fairfield Gonzales Community Land Use Committees to discuss the proposal to build a 5 storey rental residential apartment building with 15 units, on the site of the existing 5 unit Radnor Apartment. I understand that the developer is not applying for rezoning of the site but rather for a development permit with variances.

In principle I support this application which I think has the potential to make a positive contribution to Oak Bay Avenue as an urban village, and add needed rental housing stock to the city. My concerns are primarily design related and thus suitable for consideration with respect to a development permit with variances application.

My concerns relate primarily to building height and the design of the Oak Bay Avenue frontage, where I think improvements can be made.

1. Height: While I understand that the proposed development at 16.8 metres falls below the 18.5 metres permitted in the R3-2 zone, it nonetheless exceeds the general Official Community Plan (OCP) height guideline of 4 stories for the Oak Bay Avenue urban village. The height set by the new Abstract development at the corner of Oak Bay and Foul Bay Road meets this standard, including brining the building face to the sidewalk, and setting back the 4<sup>th</sup> storey from the street build-to line. A similar deployment of height for the proposed development at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue would better respect the OCP design guidelines than that currently proposed, and present a more consistent height profile along the avenue. I am less concerned if there is a fifth storey set further back from the avenue, as long as a general three storey street wall is maintained, with any upper stories set back from that line.
2. Oak Bay Avenue frontage design treatment: The building as currently proposed presents its primary front façade to Bank Street even though the address is on Oak Bay Avenue. Apartment patios and balconies and secondary door access (which can be used as a front door by the occupants if so desired) give an appearance similar to the Clive development in Oak Bay, further east along Oak Bay Avenue. This takes advantage of the eastern sun exposure and the more residential character of Bank Street. However, the proposed design gives short shrift to the Oak Bay Avenue frontage, effectively turning a blank side wall with just a few side window openings to the principal street. The primary building access is a subdued entrance on the northwestern corner of the proposed building leaving the bulk of the Oak Bay frontage effectively a blank wall with some foundation planting turned to the avenue. This is a significant lost opportunity to enhance the pedestrian experience along this portion of the Oak Bay Avenue public realm, giving little visual interest or interior engagement with the street. The current five unit apartment unit has doors for all five units facing Oak Bay Avenue and while modest in design, and without any appreciable landscaping, nonetheless is successful in presenting a front face of the building to the avenue. A simple design solution would be to turn the façade treatment facing Bank Street to wrap the corner and similarly face Oak Bay Avenue, giving that frontage the visual appearance of a front façade. This treatment could be further enhanced if the first floor apartment had in addition to an interior door to the building lobby, and a door to the Bank Street patio space, a formal front door directly from the sidewalk off Oak Bay Avenue. The windows for the upper storey apartments could be further enhanced by balconies that face onto the avenue, further lending the façade a residential and lived in character. As a final note on this point, undergrounding of overhead services should be a requirement of development for this project, as a contribution to the future undergrounding of all services along the avenue as redevelopment occurs.

I think, with improvements along the lines noted above, the proposed development will markedly improve this portion of Oak Bay Avenue. I like the modern appearance of the building which shows more grace and modelling than many of the existing somewhat slab-like commercial buildings along the avenue, and it is an honest departure from tradition rather than the regrettable faux historicism of the recently completed residential project at the corner of Oak Bay and Richmond, which is a design precedent that should never be followed in future. At the joint CALUC meeting a community member suggested that the proposed perforated metal screens on the balconies tended to give the building an un-necessarily heavy appearance, a point with which I am inclined to agree: the design would be improved if these were deleted.

Finally, I regret that the proposal is going forward before completion of the proposed Oak Bay Avenue Urban Village Plan, which I understand is scheduled to get underway this year. This site would be a worthy location for street level commercial that would extend the Oak Bay Avenue commercial area further towards Richmond. Oak Bay Avenue has become the focus of increased development interest and has the clear potential to become one of Victoria's most attractive and successful urban villages. However, currently, the avenue desperately lacks a coherent urban design vision, public realm plan, and development strategy that would deliver a consistent vision of the street as redevelopment occurs, including I would hope, the undergrounding of overhead services along the entire avenue. If there is any way to anticipate a potential future commercial use for the first floor of the proposed building fronting Oak Bay Avenue, perhaps through the designation of that unit as a live/work unit, or requiring it to be constructed to a retail commercial height up to 5 metres or so, this would enable the space to be adapted at a later time – perhaps in the not too distant future after the completion of the new Oak Bay Avenue Village Plan – to a retail commercial use. A number of people at the community meeting expressed the desire for a bakery at this location, which I think would be a fine thing.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and suggestions.

Yours truly,

Mark Hornell  
1026 Clare Street  
Victoria, BC Canada V8S 4B6

To: Mayor and Council  
From: Raymond St Arnaud

Re: Joint CALUC meeting with Fairfield/Gonzales NA and South Jubilee NA and proponents of project at  
**1811 Oak Bay Avenue.**

I made a presentation following the architects presentation. It contains an extract from the Official Community Plan. It also includes the Oak Bay Avenue Land Use and Design Guidelines where I have highlighted salient points. Link at [http://southjubilee.ca/documents/1811\\_OBA.pdf](http://southjubilee.ca/documents/1811_OBA.pdf)

#### Summary

The following excerpt is from the  
**Official Community Plan, Appendix A, page 209**

(b) In addition to the above guidelines, the following guidelines apply to specific Small Urban Villages:

(i) to Oak Bay Avenue Village:

- Oak Bay Avenue Land Use and Design Guidelines (2001).

---

City of Victoria Official Community Plan 209

The OCP makes special mention of Oak Bay Avenue Village, and the Oak Bay Avenue Land Use and Design Guidelines. Because the Guidelines are embedded in the OCP they are the continuing and current legal definitions of permitted development.

I found myself in conflict with the architect. He advocated the R3-2 designation one sees in VicMaps, while I advocated for the R3-A zoning as in Oak Bay Avenue Land Use and Design Guidelines.

I am not aware of any City Council action that has rescinded the Guidelines cited in the OCP as noted above.

I would expect a review of the Guidelines for the Oak Bay Avenue corridor in the future, but do not see spot re-zoning before the new Guidelines are approved as a good planning initiative.

#### Unintended Consequences

I would draw your attention to two infrastructure issues from large scale development in Fairfield/Gonzales and South Jubilee; traffic and sanitary sewers.



## Traffic

The entrance for underground parking for several active and in progress applications are on the residential streets of Gonzales and South Jubilee.

Tenants of such developments will soon discover the **Left Hand Turn conundrum**. This occurs one tries to make a Left Hand Turn from a residential street onto Oak Bay Avenue or onto Fort Street. At many times of the day this is difficult and at times dangerous.

The Gonzales residents resort to going south to Brighton and then to Richmond. In South Jubilee, residents travel North or South to Leighton and then access Foul Bay or Richmond. Adding large developments is often equal to or greater than the number of houses in a single block. We are aware of multiple proposals in progress and even more attempts at land assembly where development would take place on both corners of a street connected to OBA and Fort Street,

Many of the streets in both neighborhoods are narrow and it is often difficult for cars to pass each other.

I am not aware of any attempts by the city to address these traffic issues when it approves new large developments.

## Sanitary Sewage

The sanitary sewers in our areas date back to the early 1900's and perhaps earlier. The engineers of that era would have assumed a certain volume of effluent from the residential units at that time. Adding the equivalent of another block every time a new large scale project is approved adds stress to that system. As development increases, the capacity is exceeded and large scale renewal of the underground system is required. The city would be forced into a massive capital works program. I really doubt if the developers will come forward and offer financial assistance.

The logical move would be to enhance the sanitary sewers before further development and attach a surcharge to the developers.

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Barb Landell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 7, 2018 8:40 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

I am opposed to 5 storey height for this development proposal It is too high for this neighbourhood and will set a precedent We do need housing but we want to keep our values and vision intact

Barb Landell

Sent from my iPhone

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** David Hill [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 8, 2018 9:04 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Proposed Development at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

Dear Mayor and Council,

As residents of 1018 Bank St we have concerns over the increased traffic that will be generated by the proposed densification of the development on the corner of Bank Street and Oak Bay Avenue at 1811 OBA.

Bank Street is already used as a 'rat-run' for drivers attempting to avoid the lights at OBA and Richmond, and as the parents of 2 school-age girls who either walk or cycle around the neighbourhood, this gives us great cause for concern.

We believe that the development should only proceed if there are associated traffic calming measures put in place, perhaps similar to those on neighbouring streets such as Clare or Leighton.

The junction of Bank and OBA already sees many drivers parking and turning to use facilities on OBA and due to the speed of vehicles on OBA this is another cause for concern - particularly if the development is 5 storeys and presents a 'monolithic wall' to the OBA side. Traffic management during construction will need to be carefully managed.

We are not anti-development per se, indeed we support any development which adds life and interest to the neighbourhood. We feel we could only support this development if it was accompanied by appropriate traffic calming measures.

David & Romaine Hill  
1018 Bank Street  
Victoria  
V8S 4B4



## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Denise Weber [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 8, 2018 1:04 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Denise Weber" [REDACTED]  
Date: 3 Jan 2018 17:02  
Subject: Re: Five Storeys on Oak Bay Ave- the new norm? Meeting reminder  
To: "Liz Hoar" [REDACTED]  
Cc:

Hi Liz,

I am in favour of more height only if it's with a different design that creates more green space at the sidewalk level. I hate the building at the corner of Richmond and Oak Bay with concrete right up to the sidewalk and a narrow strip of green beside the road. This looks like the same kind of design. More height without expansion of green space will create a concrete jungle. Can't be at the meeting but that's my 2 cents worth. Cheers, Denise

On Wed, Jan 3, 2018 at 4:52 PM, Liz Hoar [REDACTED] wrote:



Just a reminder about the meeting tomorrow Thursday, Jan 4, 2018 - 7:00pm at Victoria College of Art regarding this proposal for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue. More information about the proposal is available on the City of Victoria site at <https://tender.victoria.ca/tempestprod/ourcity/Prospero/Details.aspx?folderNumber=DPV00060> . There are two PDF files under the 'Documents' section that describe the project in more detail.

**NOTE** We're hearing that Phil Ballam, owner of the GardenWorks, Frame Up and Phil Ballam plumbing property has similar 5 storey redevelopment ideas for that property. Is this what we, as a neighbourhood, want along Oak Bay Avenue? There are lots of properties ripe for redevelopment along this strip so is 5

storeys what we think is appropriate? If you can't come to the meeting about [1811 Oak Bay](#), please consider sending an email to mayor and council with your views about this development and the future of Oak Bay Avenue.

--

Liz Hoar



## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Liz Hoar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 8, 2018 3:01 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Development of 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

### Development of 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

I am feeling discouraged and somewhat disenfranchised by the process revealed by this project.

Prior to this development application being made (and this is a year and a half after the developer started talking to City planners), our neighbourhood had no idea five or six storeys on Oak Bay Avenue were an option. Now we find out that by applying for a number of variances, a developer can initiate a project that is a radical departure from the previous plans for Oak Bay Avenue with no neighbourhood discussion. The neighbourhoods get a "courtesy" meeting if we can arrange it (and in this case the application was filed conveniently close to Christmas making it a real scramble to organize a "courtesy" meeting within the allotted time for comments to be filed). I assume this process is a result of the OCP, an arcane, confusing and unrefined document that made wide sweeping changes to our city zonings.

Sometime in the future South Jubilee will have an opportunity to develop our neighbourhood plan and the Oak Bay Avenue Corridor plan but really, what is left for neighbourhood input? Other than what other areas in our neighbourhood we would like densified?

My objections to this project are as follows:

- Height of 5 storeys and lack of setback
- Five storeys on a narrow artery such as Oak Bay Avenue dwarfs the street and pedestrians. The Oak Bay Oak Bay Avenue Land Use and Design Guidelines (2001), referenced in the OCP (see footnote[i]) says "*New buildings will be a maximum of three storeys.*" Since there has been no update to this document and it is referenced in the current OCP, I assume it is still relevant. Given that each of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> storeys of this proposal contain only 2 apartments on each floor, elimination of a floor is not a great loss to rental stock.

We already see with the addition of the Abstract monument on Richmond and Oak Bay, how claustrophobic a four storey building massing so close to the sidewalk can be. This feeling will be even worse with the additional of another storey and not even a boulevard to separate sidewalk from the street. Given the number of properties ripe for development along Oak Bay Avenue (including the GardenWorks site where I have heard another 5 storey building is planned), the street could soon be reduced to a dark uninviting tunnel.

- Bland façade facing Oak Bay Avenue

This design basically ignores Oak Bay Avenue. The building is oriented towards Bank street and presents a bland, unattractive wall crowding Oak Bay Avenue

- Building entrance not oriented to either Bank St or Oak Bay Avenue

The building entrance is halfway down the building on the west side, not visible from Oak Bay Avenue. This goes against OCP Guideline 5.a.iii (see footnote turquoise highlight ).

A final comment – This project, while potentially providing 15 new apartments, eliminates 5 affordable apartments. The developer would not estimate rents, but given the size of the units, they will certainly not be anyone's idea of affordable. We continue to allow our affordable housing stock to be eaten up for more profitable ventures. Not the developer's issue I guess but surely ours.

Liz Hoar

1752 Davie Street

--

Liz Hoar

Phone: [REDACTED]

i[i] the Official Community Plan (updated July 2017) on page 209 of the document under DPA 6A: SMALL URBAN VILLAGES :

#### *"5. Guidelines*

*These Guidelines are to be considered and applied for Development Permits:*

*(a) Guidelines for all Small Urban Villages:*

*(i) Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (1981).*

*(ii) Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010).*

*(iii) Buildings are encouraged to have shop windows and building entrances that are oriented towards the street.*

*(b) In addition to the above guidelines, the following guidelines apply to specific Small Urban Villages:*

*(i) to Oak Bay Avenue Village: Oak Bay Avenue Land Use and Design Guidelines (2001)"*



**Lacey Maxwell**

---

**From:** Lisa Leighton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 8, 2018 1:56 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Proposed redevelopment: 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

Dear Mayor and Council,

We are writing to provide some feedback with respect to the proposed redevelopment of 1811 Oak Bay Avenue. We live a few blocks away from that property, on Amphion Street, and Oak Bay is one of our key streets.

We attended the Fairfield Gonzales Community Meeting last week about this redevelopment, and would like to reiterate some of the points we felt were most important.

**1. The proposed design is too high and too bulky for the lot and the surrounding area.**

Although the architects in many of their renderings managed to magically make the building appear to be surrounded by greenery and near-empty lots, this is of course not the case. Wedging in another too-tall and too-big building degrades the entire liveability of the neighbourhood for existing and future residents.

We understand that the City is encouraging density, but at what cost? That part of Oak Bay Avenue, heading east from Richmond, is quickly becoming a tunnel because of over-building. The prime (and most recent) example is the hulking "Maddison" that has obliterated the southwest corner of Oak Bay and Richmond. Vehicle traffic speeds up through there, because the perceived scale is no longer human, it's solid mass. This is incredibly dangerous. Students from Glenlyon Norfolk School regularly walk in that area -- we all do, along with people in wheelchairs and on electric scooters.

**2. The design of the building is completely out of step with the neighbourhood.**

The proposed design is a stack of boxes with punched-out balcony 'screens' that would look at home in East Berlin, but would be ghastly on Oak Bay Avenue. We will have to live with this for the next 40 or 50 years.

One of the best things about Victoria is the character of its many vibrant neighbourhoods and villages. Dumping a pile of concrete boxes into this one would be a huge step in the wrong direction -- and not just for the residents. We wonder what visitors to Oak Bay would think about an ugly, faceless stack that towers above everything around it ... perhaps that someone at the City should have put people ahead of development.

The proposed design has a blank wall facing Oak Bay Avenue; the entrances are at the sides of the building. A number of suggestions were given to the architects at the meeting to change that, because putting up a huge, faceless wall will do absolutely nothing to contribute to the neighbourhood. Quite the opposite: it will dehumanize that property and that stretch of Oak Bay even further.

There was also some concern expressed about personal safety, especially for women on foot at night, whether they are residents of the building or just walking by. A lighted entrance is a safety zone; a blank, dark wall facing the sidewalk is not.

**3. The increase in traffic congestion, visitor parking, and services for renters concerns many of us.**

The recent building at Oak Bay and Foul Bay and the opening of the Red Barn have both increased traffic between Foul Bay and Richmond. Some days, it's nearly impossible to make turns onto side streets. In 17 years of living here, we have never seen this much traffic and at all hours of the day. Adding another 15 apartments in place of the existing five will increase the traffic by another magnitude.

The proposed design calls for 20 resident parking spaces beneath the building, and that's fine if most of the residents have one vehicle, but some will have two, they will have guests who will need to park on the streets,

and they will receive services, such as delivery trucks. What we heard at the meeting is that residents on Bank Street in particular are concerned about increased traffic and parking, but we are all concerned about both of those things on Oak Bay and other side streets.

We will follow the progress of this redevelopment very closely. We urge you to please give very careful thought and consideration to keeping Oak Bay Avenue alive, human-scaled and thriving, rather than simply giving carte blanche to another developer to cram another ugly box into too-small a property, no matter what it means for those of us who live here.

Thank you.

Lisa Leighton & Mark Heine  
1627 Amphion Street  
Victoria, BC V8R 4Z5



## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Terry Moen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 8, 2018 8:33 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** Planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue - New Development

Dear Mayor and Council,

We attended the Fairfield and Gonzales Community Land Use Committee meeting January 4/18 regarding the proposed new rental complex at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue. As residents of 1007 Bank Street, we appreciated the opportunity to hear the developer's proposal, have questions answered, and voice both opposition and support of the project.

We would like to follow up with our concerns:

1. Increase in density with no traffic calming measures:

There are no traffic calming measures indicated. Traffic concerns on Bank Street have already been reported to the City Planning Dept. Planning has advised that a traffic plan for the area was under study and that with priority and funding issues it may take some time to have the issue addressed. This is a prime opportunity to request that the City require the Developer to include "bump outs" on both Oak Bay Avenue and Bank Street to slow traffic, support flow of pedestrian traffic, and provide driveway design that guides vehicles from underground parking to use Oak Bay Avenue. With a crosswalk included, this would be the same concept as what was provided as implemented for the Fiori Building (South West corner of Oak Bay & Clare Street) when it was developed. The aim is to manage traffic in the area, support safe pedestrian movement, and have the developer pay costs rather than taxpayers.

2. Building Height exceeds existing community plan restrictions:

The proposed building changes from an existing 5 unit 2 story structure to a 15 unit 5 story structure. One of the citizens who spoke referred to the last community plan on record (from 1982) establishes that any new building on this section of Oak Bay Avenue will not be higher than 3-1/2 stories. The zoning that the developer contemplates appears to contradict the community plan. The explanation was that the community plan presented was out of date (this needs to be verified), although it seems that it would only be out of date if superseded by a new plan. Apparently the community plan is scheduled to be updated shortly. The concern is that if approved as a 5 story structure, the project won't adhere to the last developed community plan, may not adhere to the community plan under development, and that if a significantly higher structure is permitted now it sets a precedent for future projects to ignore the community plan.

3. No noticeable consideration to the Oak Bay Ave aesthetic:

The building is quite plain and nondescript on the Oak Bay Avenue side. It projects as a large side wall, without design features to make it attractive and engaging to Oak Bay Avenue. The "signature" face of the building fronts Bank Street, but without taking any of this aesthetic away from Bank Street, needs to also address the Avenue side. This lack of people oriented design does not reinforce that this is a residential zone and sends a signal to drivers that they do not need to slow down for this section of the the Avenue.



In summary, we would not be supportive of the design as presented. We are very familiar with the last 30+ year history of this section of Oak Bay Avenue between Richmond and Foul Bay and approving this development as presented would be a setback.

Regards,

Terry Moen and Milaine Moen

1007 Bank Street

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Julie Brown [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 10, 2018 2:17 PM  
**To:** Pam Madoff (Councillor)  
**Cc:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue proposal

Hello Pam,

Following the neighbourhood CALUC meeting for 1811 Oak Bay Avenue (DP with variances) last week and I wanted to pass on my thoughts regarding the project:

While I do support the density, height and the modern design of the building, I see 2 significant issues with the project as presented. The first is the way the building fronts onto Oak Bay Avenue. The facade ignores the street, the pedestrians and the neighbourhood. By pulling the lobby into the centre of the building and excluding ground floor patios and upper storey balconies, opportunities to animate the street are completely lost and a less safe entrance is created. The second issue is the exterior circulation core (corridor, stairwells, elevator). From my understanding, this has been designed to be exterior to allow more residential floor area (because exterior circulation is allowed to be excluded from floor area calculations). I think the result is out of scale and simply unpleasant. It creates issues such as light spillover to the neighbours, and no tempering of residential unit air. I believe that this building is a compromise. It is a compromise because the existing zoning is not really appropriate for this parcel size (with regard to setbacks, open space, no commercial space). The proponent is trying to maximize floor area within the current zoning but is requesting significant variances to achieve that density. I think that rezoning this site would produce the best outcome for the neighbourhood, the developer and the future residents. At the very least, the Oak Bay Avenue facade should have a lobby/ residential unit doors/ and patios that are accessed from Oak Bay Avenue.

Thank you,

Julie Brown

1739 Lee Avenue, Victoria

**Lacey Maxwell**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 11, 2018 1:28 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** RE: Five Storey Rental Apartment, 1811 Oak Bay

Lisa Helps told me to send this email to the above address.

D

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 11, 2018 1:10 PM  
**To:** board@southjubilee.ca; Lisa Helps <mayor@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Five Storey Rental Apartment, 1811 Oak Bay

Hi South Jubilee/Lisa Helps

I didn't come to the meeting on Jan 4 as I have Chronic Fatigue Syndrome and it is too difficult for me to go out in the evening. I live on Davie St, and bought my property almost 35 years ago.

But I wanted you to know that I am against any more development on Oak Bay.

It has gotten to the point, about two years ago, that it is almost impossible to turn left onto Oak Bay from any street between Richmond and Foul Bay. The traffic has gotten so bad – from both directions.

Added to this, we now have an Abstract development on both Foul Bay and Richmond, which simply puts money in their pockets and leaves us with the problems of their increased density. And they move on to stiff another district – Oak Bay on Cadboro Bay Road.

I am also told that Phil Ballum is intending on buying the rest of his block end and doing something similar. I am against that, too – three doors from me. And the block with the dental office across the street from him is apparently in someone else's sights. I am against that, too. Enough is enough.

We are tired of people using Davie as a way of cutting through the neighbourhood at high speed. There are lots of kids on this block now. We'd like to see Davie closed off at Oak Bay.

And the intended bike route makes it even more difficult – takes away parking – to run a business on Oak Bay than it already is. Ask yourself how many businesses have gone belly up on this stretch of Oak Bay Ave over the last 30 years.

Thanks

DC Reid

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Gail [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 30, 2018 6:00 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council; Councillors  
**Subject:** RE: DVP for 1811 Oak Bay Ave., Victoria

Dear Mayor and Council:

My family is a resident of this neighbourhood and have to express our dismay at the proposed project.

Vancouver was my home from 1969 to 2010. During this time I watched my charming and friendly city become a city of impersonal high rises and rampant development. Our neighbourhoods and unique streetscapes became uniform and impersonal bastions of 'progress'.

The proposed project at 1811 Oak Bay Ave will be a full story (plus the underground parking rise) taller than almost every building along Oak Bay Ave which are all three to four stories high. The large footprint on the property with minimal setbacks further contributes to the concretization of our landscape. And while I appreciate rental accommodation is desperately needed in Victoria, I am guessing that the units proposed here will be available at premium rents and not accessible to the majority of Victoria residents.

I would strongly encourage the City of Victoria to be wary of becoming Vancouver. Please ensure that our streets remain user friendly and intimate.

I would like to see this project scaled back to a maximum of 4 stories with a larger setback on the north side and south side. As it is, there appears to not be enough room for shrubs much less a tree or two on any side of this project.

Approval of this project will set a dangerous precedent for future development along Oak Bay Avenue on the Victoria side. Please, consider our future. Scale this project back.

Gail Anthony

1535 Davie St., Victoria, BC, V8R 4W4

**Lacey Maxwell**

---

**From:** RAYMOND ST ARNAUD [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** February 12, 2018 11:53 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

**Categories:** Planning

To: Mayor and Council  
Victoria, BC

Re: 1811 Oak Bay Avenue Community Meeting Report

From: South Jubilee Neighborhood Land Use Committee

The SJNA LUC received the joint Jan 4 SJ and F/G Community Meeting Report prepared by the Fairfield/Gonzales CALUC. SJ received the report in the week of Feb 4 and it was presented to a SJNA meeting on Feb 6. It was determined that the report represents a reasonable representation of the views and opinions expressed by those in attendance.

Raymond St Arnaud

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** RAYMOND ST ARNAUD <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 21, 2018 10:12 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** David Biltek; landuse@southjubilee.ca  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Ave. Invasive Argentine Ants

Mayor and Council  
Victoria, BC  
1811 Oak Bay Avenue.

I bring to your attention the following links dealing with the invasive Argentine Ant on Oak Bay Avenue.

The first is the BC Government Invasive Species Alert

[https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hra/invasive-species/Publications/SpeciesAlerts/Argentine\\_ant.pdf](https://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hra/invasive-species/Publications/SpeciesAlerts/Argentine_ant.pdf)

The second is an article in the Times-Colonist, July 21, 2013

<https://www.timescolonist.com/news/local/tiny-argentine-ants-invade-victoria-poised-to-bug-you-like-crazy-1.545639>

The third is from the Invasive Species Council of BC, which mirrors the Times Colonist article.

<https://bcinvasives.ca/news-events/recent-highlights/tiny-argentine-ants-invade-victoria-poised-to-bug-you-like-crazy>

This species has been mostly ignored as attention has focused on the Fire Ant. The services of a qualified Entomologist should be mandated before any attempts at massive digging anywhere on Oak Bay Avenue. Because this species has multiple queens, it is very easy to transport queens and a few workers to other locations with excavated material.

Having multiple queens makes this a difficult species to control, a trait they share with Fire Ants.

The community at large deserves assurance that development of 1811 Oak Bay Avenue will not spread the species to other locations.

Raymond St Arnaud  
South Jubilee  
[REDACTED]

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** RAYMOND ST ARNAUD <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 21, 2018 11:50 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** David Biltek; landuse@southjubilee.ca  
**Subject:** 1811 OBA - Silo Development

Mayor and Council  
Victoria, BC  
1811 Oak Bay Avenue.

### **Silo Development**

1811 Oak Bay Avenue represents an example of Silo Development. Silo Development considers the immediate environment.

In presented plans it considers the project from the usual four points of view and the shadows cast by the project. It may show

some interaction with immediate adjacent properties, but ignores the impact on the greater physical, social environment and networks.

1811 OBA will have impacts on;

1. Oak Bay Avenue corridor
2. Bank Street from OBA south to Brighton
3. Gonzales neighbourhood
4. South Jubilee neighbourhood

Both the GN and the SJN have streets that were laid out at the turn of the previous century. The concept of families having multiple cars would have been inconceivable 120 years ago, and obviously streets were never designed to accommodate the current level of car, truck and bicycle traffic.

Before further development on Oak Bay Avenue, the Oak Bay Corridor and the GN and SJN need a traffic plan that addresses the increase in population and vehicle use within two blocks North and South of Oak Bay Avenue.

Silo Development doesn't care for or address traffic management.

Silo Development does not address the addition of new parks for population increase.

Silo Development does not address increased pedestrian movement.

Silo Development does not address the consequences of multiple projects on Oak Bay Avenue and Fort Street.

I am aware of the following projects in various stages.

- #1. 1928 OBA: Approved,
- #2. 1811 OBA: On the development tracker,
- #3. 1908-1920 OBA: Preliminary discussion between Jawl Residence and SJNA,
- #4 1906-1912 Duchess: Scheduled presentation to SJNA by developer,
- #5 North East corner of Davie and Fort: Land Assembly,



#6 North West corner of Davie and Fort: Attempting a Land Assembly.

There are additional potential sites on Oak Bay Avenue and Fort Street.

The sum of all these potential projects presents an enormous increase in people, cars and traffic and the subsequent pressure on Oak Bay Avenue and the Gonzales and South Jubilee Neighborhoods.

Some future thinking is indicated for a seamless transition. First consideration, a Traffic Plan.

Raymond St Arnaud  
South Jubilee



April 6, 2019

Re: 1811 Oak Bay Avenue –Proposed Development

Dear Mayor and Council -

We are writing to express our full support for the proposed development at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue by Radnor Properties. We own the property right next door to the proposed development (1068 Bank Street).

Although we stand to experience significant disruption during the building process, we support the long term vision of the project and the value it will bring to our neighbourhood once completed. The proposed development is thoughtfully designed to minimize impact on existing neighbours. We appreciate that the building will be stepped away from our little house and that effort will be made to create privacy screens and modern landscaping to add to everyone's enjoyment of the property.

We have lived in our home for over five years and feel that the current structure at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue is rundown, an eyesore, and is a poor use of the parcel of land. The proposed development will revitalize the corner of Oak Bay Avenue and Bank Street, adding new energy, responsible density, modern design, and landscaping. We look forward to meeting our new neighbours!

Regards,  
Megan and Don Landels

**Monica Dhawan**

---

**From:** HARRY'S FLOWERS Lai [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 12, 2019 3:53 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** proposed development at 1811 oak bay av

Dear Mayor and Council:

we want to express our full support for the proposed development at 1811 Oak bay av by RADNOR PROPERTIES.

we own Harry's flowers and we are at 1718 Oak bay av. just at the corner of 1811 oak bay av.

The building at 1811 is very old , and the proposed development is to build at least 15 units for rental and this is what the city needs since

we have a shortage of rental spaces. specially around this area since is very close to hospital schools and the university of victoria/

i am looking forward for this new development.

the town of oak bay is very old and we need something fresh and new and hope it will attract new young people or families to live in oak bay/

regards

Tim and Eugenia Lai

April 24, 2019

Mayor and Council  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, BC

Re: The Radnor development at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue, application for development permit with variances

I am writing as President of the council for Strata 1700 at 1807 Oak Bay Avenue – a 16-unit four-storey building called The Isabella, immediately west of the development site.

Our owners are generally in support of this proposal and the variances as requested. The developer has been sensitive to our expressed concerns about privacy, intrusive lighting, noise and setbacks, and we appreciate that changes have been made to improve the design.

However, we are concerned about the impact of this project on some significant trees on our property and the loss of those trees. We understand this redevelopment will result in the removal of two large trees on our eastern property line – a mature Big Leaf Maple (which predates our 30-year-old condominium by several decades) and a large Western Red Cedar.

Our owners are saddened at the prospect of losing these mature trees, and are requesting that the developer replace both with trees of substantial size. Additionally, there are two ginkgo trees just inside our property line. We are requesting that those trees be protected during construction so that they will remain healthy and growing.

Sincerely,



Thomas Adams  
President, Strata VIS 1700  
1807 Oak Bay Avenue  
Victoria, BC V8R 1C1

cc Alec Johnston, Senior Planner - Development Services  
Norm Eden, developer, Radnor Properties

April 29, 2019

Terrance & Carmen Gorgichuk  
#402 1807 Oak Bay Avenue  
Victoria, British Columbia  
[REDACTED]

Mayor and Council  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, British Columbia  
mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca

**Reference**

**Project Type:** Development Permit with Variance  
**Folder Number:** DPV00060  
**Civic Address:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

Proposed building of a new 5-storey, 14-unit rental apartment building with an underground parking garage. The property is located in the Development Permit Area 7A: Corridors with the applicable design guidelines- Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (1981) as well as Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010).

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

We are writing you in connection with the above development permit and variance. We have examined the plans extensively and we know the location extremely well as we live in the Isabella complex (1807 Oak Bay Avenue – Unit 402 South East Unit) as an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development. At some point in the relatively near future, the application will be brought to a future Committee of the Whole (COTW) where you will be asked to approve those plans and grant the variances the developer requires from the City's residential zoning code. We are strongly opposed to the Radnor site plans as proposed, and we urge you to keep our concerns in mind when it comes time for you to review the situation. The following is a summary of our concerns and objections for the development of this apartment complex on 1811 Oak Bay Avenue:

**Reference One:**

In the document published by the City of Victoria, Buildings Signs and Awnings Advisory Design Guidelines

**Under A. Advisory Design Guidelines -For Buildings, Signs and Awnings – An Acceptable application will include these considerations: A 3. k – Landscaping Plan**

With the request from the developer of the Radnor site to remove trees in preparation of construction, we object to this. Victoria's urban forest, green spaces, tree-lined streets and parks

contribute enormously to Victoria's livability. We feel that trees are an important asset for the City of Victoria and provide many benefits to our community including and not limited to:

- \*Reducing air pollution and our carbon footprint in an efficient and cost-effective way.
- \*Contributing to neighborhood character and positively impacting on streetscape amenity.
- \*Habitat for native wildlife (a pair of crows is building a nest in the spruce tree on the Radnor site).
- \*Providing needed shade in urban areas.

A new study (April 02/19), commissioned by Environment and Climate Change Canada (Federal Government), revealed that Canada is warming at twice the global rate. Why then would we want to cut down trees if every tree makes a difference towards climate change? The City of Victoria's Tree Preservation Bylaw sole purpose is to provide for the protection and preservation of trees. We are perplexed as to why then a developer would be allowed to cut down trees. Trees and gardens and respect for nature are a defining part of Victoria. It seems to us that this development is oddly dissonant with City Hall's professed credo as it has an adverse impact on trees.

As well, trees on or near the property line of the Isabella are of significant size. Large trees have large roots – will the proposed development impact the root stock of these trees, either during or after construction?

Reference Two:

In the document published by the City of Victoria, Buildings Signs and Awnings Advisory Design Guidelines

**Under A. Advisory Design Guidelines For Buildings, Signs and Awnings – An Acceptable application will include these considerations: A 3. e. Massing & f. Scale**

In the **Description of Proposal** by the developer that adjoined the letter of October 31, 2017. It states in **section 1.2** when talking about the property – *"The existing unit is a 5-unit apartment... .. It does have a small footprint and a large amount of open site space ... .. Redevelopment of the site at this small scale is not financially feasible. The approach to this project has been to find a design solution that best responds appropriately to its neighbours and the context, while following the zoning criteria as much as possible. The subject site is below the R3-2 minimum lot size requirement, requiring a variance. Setbacks on all lot lines are large and render the site undevelopable without setback variances. We believe that the designed setbacks are appropriate and respectful of the neighbours."*

Setbacks are in place for the protection of existing home owners and neighbours. If the design is unable to fit into the present setbacks, then it is the wrong design for that property as common sense would dictate. Allowing variances is not a solution as this takes away from our rights as homeowners. It is our belief that the developer wants to maximize his rental profits on the expense of the neighbours with the request for variances. Nearly tripling from 5 apartments to 14 apartments does indeed maximize profit dollars but that is a 280% increase. Why not go to 10

apartments which is still a 100% increase from the present Radnor apartments (5). Lower from 5 stories to 3 stories. This would be a reduction of only 4 apartments from the present proposed plan.

As well if the variances are approved on the setbacks the sun studies indicate a significant impact in terms of sun and daylight access to the Isabella. The proposed physical spacing between the new development and existing buildings have significant overshadowing issues to be considered. The shadows from the sun studies show that the location and height of the proposed building will cause undue shade on surrounding residential dwellings and sidewalks. Converse to this in the evening, with the proposed building so close and its lit stairways, which are facing west towards the Isabella, causes us to question the impact of the various sources of intrusive light that will fall inside our rooms from outside at night, especially from the lit stairwells. A very simple solution to the above problems is to reduce the design down by 2 stories, which would be a loss of only 4 apartments as mentioned above. This is only a 28% reduction in apartments for the developer. It should be noted that the Fairfield Gonzales Community Association's Land Use Committee, in the minutes from a special neighbourhood meeting for the purpose of neighbourhood feedback, dated January 04, 2018 (see appendix 1) states: *"Too many storeys; 1 or 2 storeys too high. too tall." There were concerns this would create a precedent for the street at 5 stories.*"

The variance adjustments requests are significant from the R3-2 Zone Standard, which the property is.

|                                      |                               |                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Site Area From 920.00 m <sup>2</sup> | Proposed 799.62m <sup>2</sup> | Difference (13%)    |
| Site Coverage From 32%               | Proposed 74.24%               | Difference (42.24%) |
| Open Site Space from 60.02 %         | Proposed 21.95%               | Difference (38.07%) |
| Building Setbacks                    |                               |                     |
| Bank Street from minimum 7.5 m       | Proposed 3.58m                | Difference (52.26%) |
| Oak Bay Ave from minimum 7.5 m       | Proposed 1.99m                | Difference (73.47%) |
| Rear (south) from 7.5 m              | Proposed 0.00 m               | Difference (100%)   |
| Side (west) from 7.5 m               | Proposed 0.00                 | Difference (100%)   |

We are unable to comprehend what the reasoning would be to approve such variances once you see the percentage differences above, the sun study and the minutes from the Fairfield Gonzales Community Association's Land Use Committee meeting. Overall the scale of the plan violates the current R3-2 Zone Standard.

Reference Three:

In the document published by the City of Victoria, Buildings Signs and Awnings Advisory Design Guidelines

**Under A. Advisory Design Guidelines For Buildings, Signs and Awnings – A. Introduction**  
**These guidelines are meant to assist developers to achieve a design compatible with the characteristics of the neighbourhood.....**

**An Acceptable application will include these considerations: A 3. f. Scale**

Presently immediate existing multi-unit buildings adjacent to the proposed development site are two, three or four stories. Having a 5-story building is incongruent amongst the complexes of the Oak Bay corridor. How is this similar in scale to the present buildings? Yes, the design is



very modern with numerous architectural features but does the aesthetics, height and architectural style fit in the neighbourhood? As well, does the proposed development contribute to the cohesion, visual identity and the quality of streetscapes, particularly when adjacent and nearby buildings are similar in scale, proportion, rhythm, and pattern?

Mayor Helps and Council, please take our objections and concerns into consideration when deciding the application. We feel the present proposal does not meet the necessary criteria as stated above for a development of this kind. The proposed apartment complex with its request for variances and the number of stories proposed we believe would ruin what made this neighbourhood attractive. What has protected the neighbourhood over the years has largely been the intelligent zoning laws written to prevent just the kind of project that the developer has planned. You have it in your power to keep the zoning in place with the appropriate setbacks, to protect us, your taxpayers. We hope you will recognize the issues this present development request poses to a uniquely Oak Bay Avenue life and do what you can to prevent its present realization as proposed (Revisions date April 05, 2019). We urge you to reject this non-compliant development application and send it back for more revisions.

Thank you for your patience, and your hard work on our behalf.



Terrance Gorgichuk and Carmen Gorgichuk

#### Appendix 1: Fairfield Gonzales Community Association's Land Use Committee

### **CALUC Meeting Report Thursday January 4th, 2018. 1811 Oak Bay Ave**

Developer: Radnor Properties  
Architect: Lowe, Hammond and Row Architects

#### **Intro:**

A special neighbourhood meeting hosted by South Jubilee CALUC at the Victoria College of Art and chaired by FGCA CALUC was held for the purpose of neighbourhood feedback re: 1811 Oak Bay Ave Submission For Development Permit With Variances.

39 attended.

**Variances Requested are:**

|                    | R3-2 Zone Standard* | Proposed        |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Site Coverage      | 32% 255.9 m2        | 77.70% 621.5m2  |
| Open Site Space    | 60% 479.9 m2        | 28.24% 225.9m2  |
| Building Setbacks  |                     |                 |
| Front (Bank St)    | Min 7.5M Max 12.0m  | 2.270m minimum  |
| Side (Oak Bay Ave) | Min 7.5M Max 12.0m  | 1.990 m minimum |
| Rear               | 7.5m                | 0.000 minimum   |
| West               | 7.5m                | 0.000 minimum   |

**Key Neighbourhood Feedback on development proposal: (In no particular order.)**

**From South Jubilee CALUC:**

\* Is the zoning R3-2 Zone Standard or is the zoning R3A? The South Jubilee CALUC presentation said that the zoning re: current OCP is R3A. The architect and developer say the zoning is R3-2 Zone Standard. This needs to be clarified before any approval for development.

**Design of the building**

• The architect can do better to improve the appearance of the building. In particular, the front of the building facing Oak Bay Avenue could be made more attractive; it currently is dull and uninteresting. The stark frontage should be more welcoming and interesting with a neighbourhood feel. A mosaic was one suggestion to make the building front more interesting.

- Too many storeys; 1 or 2 storeys too high, too tall. (Referencing the new building on Richmond & Oak Bay Ave as too much too tall. Don't want that.) There were concerns this would create a precedent for the street at 5 stories.
- Some liked the modern look. More opinions on the building were towards wanting a building which would reflect more of the surrounding residential neighbourhood. They are asking the architect to make a better effort to "fit the building into the community."—to have more engagement with traditional Oak Bay Ave heritage.
- Sun and shadow studies were presented by showing moving shade graphic. This was helpful for residents to get a clear picture of the building's impact on sun and shade.

**Rental Building**

- Neighbours accepted and mostly approved that it will be a rental building.

- 
- CALUC member feedback: a covenant should be in place to ensure the building remains a rental building for a set period of time and will not be converted to strata during this time.

#### **Parking**

- Consensus was there is adequate parking provided in the plan.
- There are no plans for parking for scooters. This should be included.

#### **Traffic**

- As the parking garage is on Bank St. (required by City), concerns were raised about more traffic on Bank St. created from the building. Neighbours are asking: "Could there be some traffic mitigation put in place?"
-

## Katie Lauriston

---

**From:** Alec Johnston  
**Sent:** July 11, 2019 12:30 PM  
**To:** Katie Lauriston  
**Subject:** FW: 1811 Oak Bay Ave

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

For the correspondence folder

Thanks,  
Alec

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** June 21, 2019 12:24 PM  
**To:** Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Ave

Hi Victoria

I live on Davie St.

This development is too high, it needs to be fewer stories.

Furthermore, we have already been saddled with those two Abstract buildings on the corners of Richmond and Oak Bay, as well as Foul Bay and Oak Bay.

And the traffic has been so bad that I gave up trying to turn left from Davie onto Oak Bay two years ago. Instead I go down Leighton, immediately cross Foul Bay into Oak Bay. I shouldn't have to do this.

I have seen backed up traffic from Richmond all the way to Davie. We don't need more density, more cars. And each of the four traffic lanes at the Richmond/Oak Bay intersection need left hand turning lanes as turners prevent other cars who want to go straight through, particularly the Richmond streets (the Oak Bay street entrances have left hand turning lanes).

And Davie should have speed bumps to prevent cut-through drivers going down at high speed to turn onto Oak Bay. And there are kids on this block.

Also, that 1908-1920 development is too big, too high. And we don't need all the extra traffic it will cause.

There is already enough of this with those Abstract guys, who I see have moved on to Oak Bay to make money by saddling homeowners with big, ugly developments.

DC (Dennis) Reid