

Pamela Martin

From: Barb Landell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 25, 2019 8:59 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: DPV00060-1811 Oak Bay Ave

Dear Mayor Helps and City Council:

I am opposed to this development for these reasons:

-although housing density increases, it is unaffordable and non-rental; -the footprint is too large in relation to the land area; -although the existing building is "tired", I prefer to add on to it, and thus retain some character and avoid throwing away another useable building, and, -this project is not environmentally or socially progressive.

It is time to update our vision. Old buildings can be beautiful and have character. Cookie cutter buildings are going to lead to a bland and soulless community. Let's find a way to reuse 1811!

Sincerely,
Barb Landell
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Pamela Martin

From: Stewart Lucas <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 26, 2019 10:06 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 5-story condo at 1811 Oak Bay Ave

Hello All,

I am unable to attend the public meeting about this matter on Thursday November 28th so I wanted to send an email to express my views.

I live very close to 1811 Oak Bay Ave (2 blocks away) and spend a great deal of time on Oak Bay ave so this condo proposal concerns me.

I have heard many from my community express concerns about this proposed condo. Most of the concerns seem related to traffic on Oak Bay ave, and having an appropriate amount of parking. Some who I have heard from also have concerns about the height of the building.

While I do this the above are valid concerns and hope that they will be addressed I also believe that Victoria and many parts of British Columbia are experiencing an housing crisis. Because I believe working toward a solution to this housing crisis is important (while also keeping in mind issues of traffic, parking and our contribution to climate change) I believe that we should go forward with the proposed condo. I would hope that the condo would be built in a way that would minimize environmental and climate impacts and take traffic and parking into account. I would also not be opposed to the condo being 1 story higher (6-story rather than 5-story) as the increased volume would in a small way reduce the housing crisis occurring in Greater Victoria. I would also like to see some of the units be set up as low-incoming housing so that this development can benefit those at more than one income level.

Thanks you for reading my thoughts on this matter.

Cheers,

Stewart Lucas



Lucas De Amaral

From: Bill Patterson [REDACTED]
Sent: September 16, 2019 4:00 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: 1811 Oak Bay Ave The Radnor
Attachments: 19-0916 RADNOR - Camera 1.jpg



Dear Mayor Helps and Members of Victoria Council

1 Centennial Square,

Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

c/o mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca

RE: 1811 Oak Bay Avenue -Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00060 (Gonzales) By Radnor Properties Ltd

We write to update you on our application for a Development Permit with Variance for our property located at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue. This proposed infill development is consistent with the existing zoning.

Following the July 25th Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting at which our project was reviewed, we took time to consider your important feedback. We wish to clarify our redevelopment intentions and respond to concerns raised during the COW discussions. We appreciate this opportunity and thank you for your valued guidance.

In order to meet Council's objectives to further increase the rental housing stock throughout neighbourhoods in Victoria, our application enables us to replace 5 rental homes with 16 homes governed by two housing agreements registered on title that will ensure that these homes will have rental status in perpetuity. The first agreement legally obligates the project to be a strata building permitting rentals in perpetuity. The second agreement enshrines a 10-year rental-only covenant that will see the building dedicated exclusively as rental homes for the next decade. This approach ensures we are replacing rental homes with rental homes and responds most broadly to the diverse needs of our evolving community. We attach an updated rendering of the design plans dated April 5, 2019 for your convenience and reference.

What follows is a summary of additional concerns raised and our actions in response.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss our application and to answer any further questions you may have in advance of our application formally coming before Council.

We will follow up in this regard next week.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Regards,

Norman Eden

VP [REDACTED]

Bill Patterson

President [REDACTED]

RE: 1811 Oak Bay Avenue -Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00060 (Gonzales)

Concerns/questions raised at COW July 25, 2019		Proponent responses
Relocation of existing tenants	Since purchasing the property in June 2016, four of the five rental homes have been vacated.	<p>2 of the renters purchased 2 of the renters moved to newer properties</p> <p>We have been in dialogue with the remaining tenant who is aware that relocation will be required and is very supportive of the relocation support offered.</p> <p>Letter on file from the remaining tenant acknowledging and accepting the relocation package should redevelopment occur.</p> <p>Relocation package voluntarily exceeds all requirements.</p>
Preservation of protected maple tree	<p>Proponent explored opportunities to preserve the existing maple tree</p> <p>Consulting arborist report indicates that the tree is diseased and has recommended removal.</p> <p>Root structure of the tree has been compromised by encroachment of previous development on adjacent property to the west.</p>	<p>Following consultation with the consultant arborist and the neighbour to the south and west, a new maple tree of large caliper size will be planted on the property of the neighbour to the south in close proximity to the original tree. This done with the agreement of both affected neighbours</p> <p>This is a preferred location for the long-term health of the tree and it will continue to offer privacy and shade.</p> <p>Consulting arborist is Talbot & McKenzie Arborists. Report findings have been provided to City staff.</p> <p>Neighbour to the south and the Strata Council of the building to the west have been consulted and are in agreement with the solution to replace the tree.</p> <p>Corroborating Letters are on file with the City.</p>

Concerns/questions raised at COW July 25, 2019		Proponent responses
Design ? Frontage on Oak Bay Avenue	<p>Design concerns regarding Oak Bay Avenue frontage</p> <p>Concern over absence of Commercial space</p>	<p>Entrance off enhanced Oak Bay Avenue frontage has been incorporated in project plans dated April 5, 2019 as suggested by CALUC (suggestions made in response to plans dated 2017)</p> <p>Suggestion that commercial uses be added is not possible as the property is located in a residential only zone.</p>
Design ? Privacy	<p>Concerns expressed regarding infringement on the privacy of neighbour to the south (single family lot) have been addressed through design setbacks from the south property line.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Building steps back from the south significantly with every storey above the second floor. ? First and second floors are set back approximately 3 times more than a typical single-family side yard. ? Neighbour to the south has been consulted and has raised no objections ? The neighbouring house has its garage and driveway facing the side yard. No main rooms face the side yard. 	<p>Support letter from residents to the south on file with the City</p>
Parking garage wall	Concerns expressed regarding design impacts of accommodating required parking	Lowering the parking garage by 4 feet would greatly impact construction costs which in turn would impact rental costs.

	<p>? Site slope forces parkade structure above grade at southeast corner of the property by approximately 4 feet which is 2 feet less than a normal 6' high side yard fence.</p>	<p>Also the ramp would then be too steep and would not meet City requirements</p> <p>From the south, a low retaining wall will be completely hidden behind a conventional fence and screen of plantings (climbing vines) no more than 6 feet high. The portion of the parkade that will be above grade to the south will be effectively invisible to the neighbour. From Bank Street, a large planter conceals the parkade wall.</p>
CALUC communication	Request that CALUC receive correspondence of change from rental to strata	<p>While our application does not require meeting with the area CALUC, we did so voluntarily and our application reflects design recommendations made to us at the time.</p> <p>We are continuing with rental accommodation which is consistent with our original discussions with the CALUC.</p>

Pamela Martin

From: James Austin <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 27, 2019 11:07 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060: 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

Dear Council,

I live about a block and a half from the proposed development and I read the variance mail-out of Nov.15th. My opinion of the proposed development is:

- a) the site is too small for 5 stories and the development should be reduced to 3 stories.
- b) the city needs to maintain sidewalk/boulevard setback along Oak Bay Avenue for future bike lanes or improved walking width.
- c) the 4-story Maddison on the corner of Richmond and Oak Bay (2017 build) was built over the allowed height variance thereby dwarfing its neighbour to the east (also a four story).
- d) a request to increase lot coverage by more than double is an untenable request that would set an unmanageable precedent. Council should act conservatively and assume that the developer will overbuild on any variances allowed.

The Victoria side of Oak Bay Avenue from Bank Street westwards is currently a major traffic through-corridor which means the traffic moves along above the speed limit. It would be nice if a village atmosphere were expanded to the west side of the avenue with mixed retail and residential thus reducing the need for locals to get in a car to visit another part of town. With Oak Bay Avenue already too congested both on the streets and sidewalks (more so on the Oak Bay side), there is a lot of traffic noise which reverberates off of the buildings along the avenue. Having higher buildings closer together will only cause more noise pollution to the people already living in the suites on Oak Bay Avenue. A noisy, congested neighbourhood ends up being very transient in nature.

Sincerely,

James Austin
1745 Leighton Road
Victoria, BC

Pamela Martin

From: Dorrie Collins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 24, 2019 9:37 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: DPV00060-1811 Oak Bay Ave

To Council,

I live in South Jubilee. I am concerned at the loss of 5 affordable rental units to a structure that now is entirely condo. It seems desirable that these developers be required to offer the same number of affordable units as a minimal requirement of their continuing with this project. I am also saddened to see another loss of a beautiful mature tree in the interests of development.

D. Collins

Pamela Martin

From: Tracey Ruppel <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 26, 2019 9:24 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: Public Comments re: 1811 Oak Bay Ave - for Nov 28th City Council Meeting

Hello,

I'm re-sending these comments to this email address to properly route them to this Thursday's hearing.

Thank you and sorry for the duplication.

Tracey Ruppel

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

From: Tracey Ruppel <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, Nov 26, 2019 at 9:06 PM
Subject: Public Comments re: 1811 Oak Bay Ave - for Nov 28th City Council Meeting
To: <Mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: <ajohnston@victoria.ca>, <[REDACTED]>

Hello,

I'm writing to the City Council as a neighbour of the property at 1811 Oak Bay Ave. I own (and live in) a unit in the Abstract-built Maddison at 1765 Oak Bay Ave. My concerns can be distilled to one main issue. I feel the size of the proposed building is too large for the lot. I believe the granting of the extensive size-related variances will compromise the protections meant by the zoning bylaws and will not result in the expected benefits. As someone living in a building which faced some of the same pre-construction concerns, I'd like to share actual life experiences.

The Maddison is a 22 unit strata building with an average of 1.36 persons living per unit. At least 7 unit owners came from outside of the greater Victoria area. Approximately 4 came from large single family homes in the Victoria area. 2 units have been completely empty for months during the 2 years of the Maddison's existence: One for 6 months and the other for 1.5 years. 4 units in the building have been utilized as rental units. 2 of the rental units have also been empty: One for one year and the other for 1.75 years.

The reality: a significant portion of the people in the Maddison came from out of town or large homes, rather than freeing up "available" housing for existing Victorians. Only half of the units used for rental have been active rentals. And when coupled with two other empty units, the Maddison has experienced an 18% vacancy rate--even with all units being sold.

Parking at the Maddison involves issues. Approximately 5 units have two cars, but are only provided one parking space. Only one unit does not have a car. Parking outside of the Maddison's parkade is challenging for residents and visitors. Spaces closest to the building are restricted to 2 hours. And the parking on Richmond Ave is "Resident Only"-- which according to the City, refers to residents having a Richmond Ave address--NOT an Oak Bay Ave address such as the Maddison's.

The 1811 Oak Bay Ave property plans to have units much larger (1, 2, & 3 BR) than the Maddison (1 & 2 BR). Of the 9 units having 2 adults in the Maddison, only 3 units have a single car. Thus multi-bedroom units tend to result in multiple cars.

As a car owner, I routinely experience congestion on both Oak Bay Ave and Richmond Ave. The traffic light at the intersection can be an advantage and disadvantage. The increased traffic makes it difficult to cross traffic when exiting the Maddison parkade and turning toward Oak Bay Ave. At times, it's safer to turn right onto Richmond Ave and go around the block. Other times it's difficult to turn across traffic on Oak Bay Ave to turn south onto Richmond Ave. The only opportunity to make the turn comes once the light turns red and one car can clear the intersection. The resulting line-up of turning cars usually begins in front of the 1811 Oak Bay property and can take several light cycles to get through.

The increase in traffic from 14 units at 1811 Oak Bay Ave would likely affect Bank St and Brighton, as well as Oak Bay Ave and Richmond Ave. Crossing Oak Bay Ave at Bank St will be challenging without a light. The result will be more traffic onto Brighton, which just underwent construction to calm the intersection and allow for more pedestrian usage. This property's traffic would be in addition to the increased traffic from the already approved residential properties at the Redfern and Oak Bay Ave intersection. (The Jawl 35 unit property and the new 7 unit Blu.)

It's clear Council's main goal is to increase densification of the city. My letter's purpose is to share details relating to life along the Oak Bay Ave Corridor. This way, the Council may consider the effects of increased density on the everyday life of Victorians. The aggressive degree of site coverage variances displays the expectation of the 1811 Oak Bay Ave development to cover nearly every square inch of the property. I also submit that 5 storeys is excessive. Especially since no other building along the Oak Bay Ave Corridor rises to that height. I ask Council to consider seeking a more gentle densification of this specific lot, based upon the amount of densification already approved within the Oak Bay Ave Corridor. Such actions would result in a better living environment for existing and new neighbours.

Thank you,
Tracey Ruppel

Pamela Martin

From: Matt Dell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 26, 2019 8:56 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Input on 1811 Oak Bay Ave - hearing November 28th, 2019

Hello Council,

I'm writing regarding the proposed development at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue. You will probably hear from many residents with concerns over the footprint and height of this building. Community members in South Jubilee and Gonzales, and those that use the Oak Bay Corridor, are very concerned about the scale of development on this very small artery road. Oak Bay Ave is a two lane road, with a significant volume of bike and pedestrian traffic. We need to slow things down on Oak Bay Ave, so it becomes a true community corridor, rather than the next Shelbourne Street or Hillside Avenue. 5 stores is likely too much density for this small corridor. We have already approved similar 4-story buildings that better suite our community (e.g the Garden Works Site).

More importantly, myself and many residents want to establish protected, triple AAA, or all ages/access bike lanes on Oak Bay Avenue in the near future. There are 100s of children, families, seniors that bike on Oak Bay daily. The biggest barrier to this is parking on Oak Bay Ave. Future development CANNOT rely on on-street parking. Oak Bay Ave needs to be saved for sustainable transportation (bikes, pedestrians), not free on street parking for over sized condo developments. This proposed condo has 15 units and 19 parking spaces. This is only one space per unit, plus 4 visitor spaces. THIS IS NOT ENOUGH PARKING. Many families have two cars. Will this further limit the visitor parking? I believe the scale of these development should be reduced, or the underground parking needs to increase. We cannot have these cars on Bank Street or Oak Bay Avenue.

Thank you,

Matt Dell
1525 Fell Street
President, South Jubilee Neighborhood Association.

Pamela Martin

From: Angela Verbrugge <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 27, 2019 9:34 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Oak Bay Av development

Hello Council,

I second the letter of Matt Dell... essentially... lower rise buildings under 4 stories only (and don't let developers use the Vancouver trick of adding huge double height penthouses on last minute), more underground spots, min two per family unit plus visitor parking. I think the street would benefit from more continuous retail.

Angela Verbrugge

1719 Davie St, Victoria, BC V8R4W5

Hello Council, I'm writing regarding the proposed development at 1811 Oak Bay Avenue. You will probably hear from many residents with concerns over the footprint and height of this building. Community members in South Jubilee and Gonzales, and those that use the Oak Bay Corridor, are very concerned about the scale of development on this very small artery road. Oak Bay Ave is a two lane road, with a significant volume of bike and pedestrian traffic. We need to slow things down on Oak Bay Ave, so it becomes a true community corridor, rather than the next Shelbourne Street or Hillside Avenue. 5 stores is likely too much density for this small corridor. We have already approved similar 4-story buildings that better suite our community (e..g the Garden Works Site). More importantly, myself and many residents want to establish protected, triple AAA, or all ages/access bike lanes on Oak Bay Avenue in the near future. There are 100s of children, families, seniors that bike on Oak Bay daily. The biggest barrier to this is parking on Oak Bay Ave. Future development CANNOT rely on on-street parking. Oak Bay Ave needs to be saved for sustainable transportation (bikes, pedestrians), not free on street parking for over sized condo developments. This proposed condo has 15 units and 19 parking spaces. This is only one space per unit, plus 4 visitor spaces. THIS IS NOT ENOUGH PARKING. Many families have two cars. Will this further limit the visitor parking? I believe the scale of these development should be reduced, or the underground parking needs to increase. We cannot have these cars on Bank Street or Oak Bay Avenue. Thank you, -Matt Dell

Kind regards,
Angela

Angela Verbrugge
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

November 24, 2019

Terrance & Carmen Gorgichuk
#402 1807 Oak Bay Avenue
Victoria, British Columbia
V8R 1C1

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

Reference

Project Type: Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060

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 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. Thank you for this opportunity for public comment. We have examined the plans extensively and we know the location extremely well as we live in the Isabella complex as an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development. We are strongly opposed to the Radnor site plans and variances as proposed in the Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00060, 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.

*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 homeowners 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 ²	Proposed 799.62m ²	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?"