



Mayor and Council
City of Victoria
No.1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC
V8W 1P6

August 30, 2019

Re: Rezoning Application – 1309, 1315 Cook Street, 1100, 1102 & 1130 Yates Street, 1109, 1115 Johnson Street Rezoning and OCP Amendment

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

This application fronts the Cook Street boundary of the Downtown-Harris Green neighbourhood and is situated within the Fernwood neighbourhood. DRA LUC policy provides us the opportunity to comment on applications outside of neighbourhood boundaries when requested to do so by the CALUC holding jurisdiction. The DRA LUC received a request from the Fernwood CALUC to attend CALUC meetings and provide input for this application. DRA LUC representatives attended three CALUC meetings and have reviewed the application for the proposed rezoning and OCP amendment.

The site has two distinct densities prescribed by the OCP with the boundary between them at the approximate midpoint of the site. The western half of the site is designated "Core Residential" with a maximum density of 3.5:1 and the eastern half designated "Urban Residential" with a maximum density of 2:1. Proposed Parcels B and C straddle this boundary. The building on Parcel B has been significantly pulled back from the western boundary in order to facilitate the future development of the remaining lots at the corner of Cook and Johnson that are not part of this application. This applicant will retain the benefits from the future development of this excess property and the advantage of leverage over the undeveloped neighbouring property when development does take place in the future.

Based on the information presented by the applicant, the purpose of the OCP amendment is to increase the density specifically prescribed by the OCP for two of the 3 proposed property parcels.

Comments and concerns raised by DRA LUC Committee members are as follows:

- The proposed daycare was promoted as a community amenity at the CALUC meeting and in correspondence to Council. It was acknowledged that there were no guarantees that a daycare would occupy the proposed development. While the proposed daycare would provide a needed service, it is a "for profit" commercial enterprise and should not be considered a community amenity. Commercial space provided at no cost to the community and operated by a non-profit as an affordable daycare would be an amenity but is apparently not on offer in this particular case.
- It was questioned why the City Planner was requiring a setback on this application to facilitate the future development of the neighbouring property at the corner of Cook and

Johnson. It was pointed out that this will provide this applicant with exclusive leverage over the future development of this property. Orphan lots are not a bad thing as they provide pockets of less densely developed land in high density neighbourhoods that may become our desperately needed future "pocket parks".

- Parcel A is a Market Condo building that proposes a 57% increase in density over the prescribed OCP density. This building requires a significant height variance to attain these densities. There has been no compelling rationale provided in support of increased density.
- Parcel B is an Affordable Condo building that states a proposed density of 2.55:1 for the parcel. Most of the proposed density is however located on the eastern portions of the site at a density of 3.5:1 where 2:1 is the OCP designation.
- The proposed density when (ignoring the urban place designation boundaries) averaged over the entire site still represents an 8% increase over OCP maximums.
- The applicant has referenced the Pacific Mazda site and the resulting asymmetry of OCP prescribed heights across Cook Street to rationalize the density and height variances sought for this project. It was pointed out that the Pacific Mazda application grossly exceeds prescribed density and building massing maximums of the OCP and DCAP and has yet to be approved by Council.
- Objections to exceeding the prescribed OCP density maximums for the development proposed by this application were clearly expressed directly to Mr. Chard at both the pre-CALUC and the CALUC meetings. There has been no amendment to the application in response to these concerns, in fact the proposed Floor Area appears to have been raised from the original 18,857.2 m² to 19,082.54 m².

The DRA LUC has a long history of supporting the densification of the Downtown area and over the past decade has facilitated public input on the majority of development that has taken place in the region. This support is conditional on respect for the prescriptions of the Official Community Plan. All of Victoria's Community Associations are unanimous in requesting that Council not approve OCP amendments without a detailed rationale responding to the policy directions contained in the OCP. In this particular case, the application fails to provide a compelling rationale to support the requested amendments.

Council approval of OCP amendments without accompanying proof of public good provides strong precedence for other applicants to follow in kind. Approvals that represent significant additional profit for the applicants will serve only the interests of existing property owners by inflating future expectations and in turn the price of land with no net positive effect on affordability or livability.

Sincerely,



Ian Sutherland
Chair Land Use Committee
Downtown Residents Association

cc COV Planning

Devon Cownden

From: Sara Stallard [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 21, 2018 4:24 PM
To: fernwoodlanduse@gmail.com; Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Community Meeting re development proposal Cook/Yates/Johnson

Hello Mayor and Council and Mr. Maxwell, Community Association Land Use Committee,

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting concerning the proposed development at Cook/Johnson/Yates because I have a steering committee meeting that overlaps (7-9 pm).

Given the floors (height) and density proposed I have these thoughts that I would like to be considered:

- After the hours/days of the community members voicing their distress and concerns over the BOSA development on Pandora/Vancouver, a number of Victoria council members specifically cited the OCP as the reason that their hands were tied and they felt they had to support the proposal (because the floor allowance was within the OCP).
- But when the proposed development exceeds the OCP, we are expected to accede to it and change our OCP.
- These towers will dwarf our neighbourhood.
- The four block radius from the Cook/Pandora intersection has seen an incredible (and extremely disruptive) amount of intense construction, all involving deep excavation, blasting, high cranes beeping across the skyline, multiple towers, years of construction, heavy truck traffic, blocking of lanes of roadway, and detrimental effects of sedimentation on water quality in the harbour. In our neighbourhood this started in the last 6-7 years and has been ongoing.
- Smart development is a good thing, and providing housing (affordable to the average person) is a needed and good thing. But the intensity and un-mitigating duration of the current boom has an added stress on those who live here. This is especially so for these towers with extremely deep excavations and blasting.

As we know, there are more large developments currently being proposed for our immediate neighbourhood. A map showing all the large construction projects in our neighbourhood in the last 7 years would be very revealing and would allow council to understand (in a small degree) what the impacts have been. At what point do we slow down and let people live/work in their homes without daily disruption?

Thank you for your time,
Sincerely,
Sara Stallard
1149 Mason Street
Victoria, BC V8T 1A5

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Melanie and Morgan Finley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2019 10:59 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed development at Yates and Cook

I am writing in opposition to the proposed 13 story development at Yates and Cook.

I am opposed for the following reasons:

- There are no other buildings this tall anywhere near this location.
- There are no buildings even close to this height east of Cook st.
- The east side of Cook st. needs to have a gentle density approach to transition to nearby residential neighbourhoods.

In my opinion there is no rational for allowing developers to build to this density and height in this area. The size of the City of Victoria does not require this much density. Population growth projections do not indicate we have to allow developers to build this tall (and dense).

We have already transitioned away from the "rental crisis" that council has used to justify these types of developments in the past few years. Vacancy rates are back at historical levels. We are now in danger of entering a period where the loss of the City's character is becoming its own crisis. Please consider how to preserve the character of the City and how to transition from downtown density to surrounding residential neighbourhoods.

Thank you, Morgan Finley

I do not give permission for my email to be used to solicit my vote or support for future elections.

Heather McIntyre

From: IslandGirl [REDACTED]
Sent: September 18, 2019 6:21 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; info@charddevelopment.com
Subject: Chard Affordable Housing - Cook and Yates

Mayor Helps and Council,

I am writing today to let you know that I am very much in support of a proposed new development on Cook and Yates that would offer an affordable ownership opportunity. I can't tell you how much we need "affordable" in a very unaffordable city and it's projects like this that are helping people become homeowners.

Last year my son was able to purchase his first home at the Vivid on Yates, another affordable ownership opportunity project by Chard Development. We were thrilled that Chard Developments was offering this and we are very proud of our son as he is 28 years old and worked very hard to save money for a down payment. Being able to proudly own home is a HUGE step for a young person (or any person for that matter), and without out this "affordable option" it would certainly be a lot harder.

Please consider this option proposed by Chard and let others enjoy a home of their own.

Warm regards,

Patty Castello
[REDACTED]