

## **H.1 Committee of the Whole**

### **H.1.a Report from the June 7, 2018 COTW Meeting**

*Councillor Young withdrew from the meeting at 9:56 p.m. due to a pecuniary conflict of interest with the following item, as the applicant is a client of his consulting firm.*

#### **H.1.a.e Rezoning Application No. 000598 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road (North Park)**

**Moved By** Councillor Thornton-Joe

**Seconded By** Councillor Lucas

That Council postpone consideration of the following motion for 2 months and request the applicant to meet with the adjoining neighbours to explore possible consolidation of the adjoining lots:

That Council decline Rezoning Application No. 00598 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00506 for the property located at 953 Balmoral Road.

**Moved By** Councillor Loveday

**Seconded By** Councillor Madoff

That Council allow Councillor Isitt to speak for a second time.

#### **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

*Council discussed the following:*

- *Whether the motion to postpone consideration is the right action at this time.*

#### **On the main motion:**

FOR (7): Mayor Helps, Councillor Alto, Councillor Isitt, Councillor Lucas, Councillor Madoff, and Councillor Thornton-Joe

OPPOSED (1): Councillor Loveday

#### **CARRIED (6 to 1)**

*Councillor Young returned to the meeting at 10:05 p.m.*

## **F. LAND USE MATTERS**

### **F.1 953 Balmoral Road - Rezoning Application No. 000598 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 (North Park)**

Committee received a report dated May 24, 2018 from the Director of Sustainable Planning and Community Development regarding a proposal to rezone the property to a new zone to allow for the construction of a four-storey, multi-unit building on the property located at 953 Balmoral Road. The application was first heard at the April 18, 2018 Committee of the Whole Meeting and was sent back to staff to work with the applicant on a better fit with the neighbourhood context.

*Committee discussed:*

- *The potential for the consolidation of the subject lot and the adjacent lot.*
- *What the maximum allowance for the lot size would be.*

**Moved By** Mayor Helps

**Seconded By** Councillor Madoff

That Council decline Rezoning Application No. 00598 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00506 for the property located at 953 Balmoral Road.

*Committee discussed:*

- *Concerns with the cohesiveness of the streetscape on Balmoral Road.*
- *Possibility of postponing the motion to allow for a conversation between the proponent and the CoolAid Society.*

**Motion to Postpone**

**Moved By** Mayor Helps

**Seconded By** Councillor Thornton-Joe

Postpone consideration of the application and request the applicant to meet with the adjoining neighbours to explore possible consolidation of the adjoining lots.

**Amendment**

**Moved By** Councillor Alto

**Seconded By** Mayor Helps

After “application” add “for 2 months”

**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Motion to Postpone as Amended**

Postpone consideration of the application **for 2 months** and request the applicant to meet with the adjoining neighbours to explore possible consolidation of the adjoining lots.

FOR (4): Mayor Helps, Councillor Alto, Councillor Lucas, and Councillor Thornton-Joe

OPPOSED (1): Councillor Madoff

**CARRIED (4 to 1)**



## Committee of the Whole Report

For the Meeting of June 7, 2018

---

**To:** Committee of the Whole **Date:** May 24, 2018

**From:** Jonathan Tinney, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development

**Subject:** **Rezoning Application No. 000506 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road**

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That Council decline Rezoning Application No. 00598 and Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 for the property located at 953 Balmoral Road.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present Council with an update regarding the Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Applications for the property located at 953 Balmoral Road. The proposal is to rezone the property from the R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District, to a new zone in order to construct a four-storey, multi-unit building with a density of approximately 1.38:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

Council considered both applications at the Committee of the Whole meeting on April 18, 2018 and passed the following motion:

#### **Rezoning Application No. 00598**

*"That Council direct staff to work with the applicant to refine the proposal to encourage a better fit with the current neighbourhood context and to minimize potential negative impacts associated with a piecemeal approach to development in this area."*

#### **Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000506**

*"That Council:*

- 1. Direct staff to work with the applicant to revise the proposal to comply with the design guidelines and*
  - i. minimize the impact of the east side yard setback by reducing the requested variance and by introducing additional design interventions to mitigate potential concerns related to privacy and overlook*
  - ii. reduce the site coverage and increase the open site space in order to provide private open space and high quality soft landscaping.*


- iii. *provide a landscaping strip along the side and rear property lines to screen the parking.*
  - iv. *address Council's issue of the lack of affordability in this application and revisit discussions of entering into a housing agreement.*
2. *Refer the application to the Advisory Design Panel and report back to the Committee of the Whole following a review by the panel."*

## COMMENTS


The applicant has provided a letter dated May 7, 2018 (attached) addressing Council's motion above. The applicant is willing to enter a Housing Agreement ensuring that the proposed 11 dwelling units would remain as rental housing for a 25-year term. In the letter, the applicant has indicated that it is not feasible from their perspective to make any design and onsite landscaping changes to the current proposal as required in Council's motion.

Staff's recommendation is to decline the Rezoning and Development Permit with Variance Applications for the same reasons discussed in the original Committee of the Whole reports (attached). The OCP encourages the logical assembly of development sites to enable the best realization of development potential for the area. Ideally, the subject site would be consolidated with one or both of the properties on either side of it in order to realize a better site plan with fewer impacts to the adjoining properties, while achieving the overall density supported by policy. If developed on its own under the current proposal, it would compromise future redevelopment along this block of Balmoral Road.

Respectfully submitted,




Leanne Taylor  
Senior Planner  
Development Services



Jonathan Tinney, Director  
Sustainable Planning and Community  
Development Department

Report accepted and recommended by the City Manager:

Date:



May 31, 2018

## List of Attachments

- Attachment A: Letter to Mayor and Council
- Attachment B: Committee of the Whole Reports dated April 19, 2018.

07 May 2018

Method Built Homes Ltd.  
The Garage  
4566 Cordova Bay Road  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8X 3V5



**Attn: Mayor and Council**  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8W 1P6

Dear Ms. Mayor and Members of Council,

Re: 953 Balmoral Avenue – 11-unit purpose-built workforce apartment building

Further to my letters of 10 November 2017 and 20 March 2018 (enclosed herein for reference) and the Committee of the Whole meeting of 19 April 2018 and subsequent council meeting, please amend the proposal to include a Housing Agreement to provide rental accommodation for **25 years**.

I understand that a Housing Agreement was a critical issue when council considered this proposal. The vote was 4-4 at COTW and at the subsequent council meeting for this proposal to advance to public hearing. With a commitment now of a Housing Agreement, thereby securing 11 additional and much needed and workforce apartment units at the edge of the downtown core, I trust this proposal will proceed to public hearing.

With respect to the request to refine the proposal to address staff concerns regarding height, setbacks, density, site coverage, and design, please note that although Staff's feedback has evolved over the past five years with ambiguous, subjective and moving goalposts, the following can be distilled from the most recent feedback:

- 1) Reducing the height to 2-3 stories ~ 2.5 stories;
- 2) Increasing the setbacks substantially;
- 3) Decreasing the density;
- 4) Decreasing the site coverage; and
- 5) Proposing a design that retains the character of a single-family residence.

The take-away from this feedback is that Staff would likely support a proposal that looked like a single-family residence, but had increased density from the current duplex zoning; a triplex or, at best, four-plex is the likely outcome of these preferences.

Constructing such a proposal, with the cost of construction where it is in the current market, would force this developer to build stratified townhomes for sale, as opposed to building a purpose-built workforce apartment building. This is not a market that we are interested in catering to.

As a consequence of the above, of the alternatives to develop a stratified triplex (or possibly fourplex) to the satisfaction of Staff and Council, with the related development and enhanced engineering costs versus a stratified modern duplex, which the subject site is currently zoned for, we would build a modern duplex that could be complete for occupancy within six months of today. Ironically, such a duplex would have a site coverage of 0.5:1, which is more than the current proposal. Additionally, such a duplex, with a walk-out basement, would have density that is approximately 70% of the current proposal. The setbacks for such a duplex would be substantially similar, with the exception of the front yard setback, to the current proposal. Finally, depending on the final design, not subject to municipal oversight, the height would be approximately 1-1.5 stories shorter than the current proposal.

I trust the foregoing is of assistance as you consider the revised proposal.

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature consisting of the letters 'R' and 'S' in a stylized, cursive font.

Rajinder S. Sahota

30 May 2018

Method Built Homes Ltd.  
The Garage  
4566 Cordova Bay Road  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8X 3V5

**Attn: Mayor and Council**  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8W 1P6

Dear Ms. Mayor and Members of Council,

Re: 953 Balmoral Avenue – 11-unit purpose-built workforce apartment building

Further to my letter of 07 May 2018 and the amendment to the proposal to include a 25-year Housing Agreement, please note that after further consultation with various stakeholders, the Developer would like to include a commitment to affordability by providing two (2) low end of market (8% below market) units for the duration of the Housing Agreement; this amounts to 18% of the units at below market.

I trust the foregoing is of assistance as you consider the revised proposal.

Yours very truly,



Rajinder S. Sahota



## Committee of the Whole Report For the Meeting of April 19, 2018

---

**To:** Committee of the Whole **Date:** February 22, 2018

**From:** Jonathan Tinney, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development

**Subject:** Rezoning Application No. 00598 for 953 Balmoral Road

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That Council decline Rezoning Application No. 00598 for the property located at 953 Balmoral Road.

### LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In accordance with Section 479 of the *Local Government Act*, Council may regulate within a zone the use of land, buildings and other structures, the density of the use of the land, building and other structures, the siting, size and dimensions of buildings and other structures as well as the uses that are permitted on the land and the location of uses on the land and within buildings and other structures.

In accordance with Section 482 of the *Local Government Act*, a zoning bylaw may establish different density regulations for a zone, one generally applicable for the zone and the others to apply if certain conditions are met.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present Council with information, analysis and recommendations for a Rezoning Application for the property located at 953 Balmoral. The proposal is to rezone from the R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District to a new zone in order to construct a four storey multiple dwelling with a density of approximately 1.38:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

The following points were considered in assessing this application:

- the subject property is designated *Core Residential* in the Official Community Plan (OCP), which supports a diverse range of housing types including low and mid-rise multi-unit residential buildings.
- the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP) identifies this property within the Residential Mixed-Use District, which supports multi-residential development up to six storeys and a floor space ratio up to 2:1.
- The OCP encourages the logical assembly of development sites to enable the best

realization of development envisioned for the area. The proposed site area is approximately 671.5m<sup>2</sup>, which is a standard lot size for a duplex. The property to the west is an existing parking lot tied to a building on a different lot and there is a rooming house to the east. Given the existing neighbourhood context and the site's redevelopment potential, land assembly with the adjacent properties is strongly encouraged.

- the site being only 672m<sup>2</sup> cannot comfortably support a development at this proposed density, size and scale without significantly impacting the development potential of adjacent properties and achieving the densities that are supported in DCAP.
- the applicant is proposing to construct purpose-built rental; however they are unwilling to register a Housing Agreement to ensure that the building remains rental in perpetuity, or for a given time period. Instead the applicant notes that Council approval to strata title the building in the future would be required if the vacancy rate is less than 4%.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Description of Proposal**

This Rezoning Application is to allow a four-storey multi-unit building with a density of approximately 1.38:1 floor space ratio (FSR).

The following differences from the existing R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District, are related to increasing the floor space ratio, floor area, reducing setbacks and open site space requirements, and increasing the site coverage.

### **Affordable Housing Impacts**

The applicant proposes the creation of 11 new residential rental units which would increase the overall supply of housing in the area. The applicant is proposing to construct purpose-built rental; however they are unwilling to register a Housing Agreement to ensure that the building remains rental in perpetuity, or for a given time period. Instead the applicant notes that Council approval to strata title the building in the future would be required if the vacancy rate is less than 4%.

### **Sustainability Features**

The applicant has not identified any sustainability features associated with this proposal.

### **Active Transportation Impacts**

The application proposes 16 Class 1 (secure and enclosed) and seven Class 2 (one bike rack) bicycle parking spaces to support active transportation.

### **Public Realm Improvements**

No public realm improvements are proposed in association with this Rezoning Application.

### **Accessibility Impact Statement**

The British Columbia Building Code regulates accessibility as it pertains to buildings.

## Land Use Context

The area is characterized by a mix of commercial, institutional and residential land uses.

## Existing Site Development and Development Potential

The site is presently a vacant lot. Under the current R-2 Zone, the property could be developed as a duplex.

### Data Table

The following data table compares the proposal with the existing R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District, as well as the R3-1 Zone, Multiple Dwelling District, which is seen as a comparable zone as it anticipates similar uses at a similar density. However, there are still numerous aspects of the proposal that would still not meet this zone's requirement. An asterisk is used to identify where the proposal is less stringent than the R3-1 Zone.

Zoning Criteria	Proposal	Existing R-2 Zone	Zone Standard R3-1 Zone
Site area (m <sup>2</sup> ) - minimum	671.50*	555.00	920.00
Density (Floor Space Ratio) - maximum	1.38:1*	0.50:1	1.20:1
Total floor area (m <sup>2</sup> ) - maximum	929.50*	280.00	805.80
Lot width (m) - minimum	15.48	15.00	n/a
Height (m) - maximum	12.19	7.60	18.50
Storeys - maximum	4.00	2	6
Site coverage % - maximum	43.00*	40.00	30.00
Open site space % - minimum	15.30*	30.00	30.00
<b>Setbacks (m) – minimum:</b>			
Front	2.00*	7.50	10.50
Rear	10.85	15.20	6.10
Side (east)	1.52*	1.55	6.10
Side (west)	3.64*	3.00	6.10
<b>Parking – minimum</b>			
Existing Schedule C	5*	14	12
Proposed Schedule C	5*	8 (7 residential and 1 visitor)	8 (7 residential and 1 visitor)
<b>Bicycle parking stalls - minimum</b>			
Class 1	16	11	11
Class 2	6	6	6

## Community Consultation

Consistent with the *Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) Procedures for Processing Rezoning and Variance Applications*, the applicant has consulted the North Park CALUC at a community meeting held on June 7, 2017. At this meeting, the applicant presented a proposal for a six-storey multi-unit residential building consisting of approximately 17 rental dwelling units. Minutes from the June 7, 2017 CALUC meeting are attached to this report. On June 15, 2017, the applicant submitted a rezoning application for a four-storey multi-unit residential building which caused some confusion; therefore, a second community meeting was held on August 15, 2017 to present the four-storey option. Minutes from the second community meeting are attached to this report.

## ANALYSIS

### Official Community Plan

The subject property is designated Core Residential in the *Official Community Plan, 2012* (OCP), which supports a diverse range of housing types including low and mid-rise multi-unit residential buildings. The subject property is within Development Permit Area 3(HC): Core Mixed-use Residential, which encourages higher density residential development on the edge of the Central Business District.

The OCP also encourages the logical assembly of development sites to enable the best realization of development potential for the area. The site area of the subject property is 671.5m<sup>2</sup>, which is a standard lot size for a duplex. The property to the west (949 Balmoral Road) is an existing parking lot tied to a building on a different lot and there is a rooming house located on the property to the east (959 Balmoral Road). Given the existing neighbourhood context and development potential, land assembly with the adjacent properties is strongly encouraged. All three properties have similar lot areas and lot widths. This approach would avoid mid-block, piecemeal development and achieve higher density residential development more consistent with the policies and objectives in the OCP. The property on the corner of Balmoral Road and Vancouver Street (one property to the east the subject site) is a large site which is occupied by a four-storey apartment building and could easily be redeveloped on its own in the future. Additionally, there are a number of scenarios that could see the lots to the west of the subject site being consolidated and redeveloped. Ideally, the subject site would be consolidated with one or both of the properties on either side of it in order to realize a better site plan with fewer impacts to the adjoining properties while achieving the overall density supported by policy.

If developed on its own, the subject property could handle some additional residential density; however, this would still compromise future redevelopment along this block of Balmoral Road and limit the future redevelopment of the area.

### Density Bonus Policy

In October 2016 Council adopted the *City of Victoria Density Bonus Policy*, which would apply to this proposal. The Policy identifies an amenity contribution target (fixed rate target) for standard rezoning of properties designated "Core Residential (less than 30,000ft<sup>2</sup> of bonus density)" in the OCP of \$129.17 per m<sup>2</sup>. Based on the bonus density calculation, the applicant would be required to provide an amenity contribution in the amount of \$76,694.69 towards the Local Amenities Reserve Fund and to the satisfaction of City Staff.

## **Downtown Core Area Plan**

The subject property is within the Residential Mixed-Use District in the *Downtown Core Area Plan* (DCAP), which supports multi-residential development up to six-storeys and a floor space ratio up to 2:1. The proposal for a four-storey multi-unit residential building with a FSR of 1.38:1 complies with the policies outlined in DCAP; however, staff have concerns with the overall design of the proposal, which will be discussed further in the concurrent report associated with the Development Permit with Variance Application.

## **Tree Preservation Bylaw and Urban Forest Master Plan**

There are no impacts to public trees with this application; however, there is one Horse chestnut tree protected by a Tree Preservation Bylaw on the neighbouring property at 959 Balmoral Road. The applicant provided an arborist report (attached) prepared by Talbot Mackenzie & Associates, which includes a tree assessment and tree impact mitigation measures. The report concluded that the tree may be impacted by the proposed construction; however, the impacts would be minor if floating pavement is installed where the proposed parking spaces overlap with the tree's critical root zone. Pruning would be required to lift the lower canopy above the nearest parking space at the property line and may be required to provide clearance for building construction.

The applicant is not proposing to plant additional trees on the subject property.

## **Statutory Right-of-Way**

A Statutory Right-of-Way (SRW) of 1.22m is required on Balmoral Road in order to achieve the standard width of a secondary collector street of 20.0m in the Highway Access Bylaw. The applicant will provide the SRW and has shown it on the site plan.

## **Regulatory Considerations**

Proposing a four-storey building on a lot with a site area of 671.5m<sup>2</sup> is tight and compromises the site planning with respect to providing sufficient landscaping and open site space, and will also impact the relationship with adjacent properties in the short-term and influence the redevelopment of those lots in the future.

By comparison, the standard R3-1 Zone requires a minimum lot area of 920.00m<sup>2</sup> and allows a maximum FSR of 1.2:1 for a four storey building. The zone also incorporates larger setbacks to allow for some breathing room between neighbouring buildings. If the subject property were consolidated with adjoining lots, the lot area would be approximately 2081.77m<sup>2</sup> which is a similar lot area to the nearby property at 975 Balmoral Road occupied by a four-storey apartment building. A larger site area could easily accommodate a six-storey building with adequate open site space, landscaping, appropriate setbacks, and underground parking. It would also provide more options for site planning and building footprint, and reduce impacts on the Horse chestnut tree. Allowing the subject property to redevelop on its own would limit the redevelopment potential of adjacent lots in the future.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The proposal to construct a four-storey multi-unit building consisting of 11 rental units is consistent with the OCP and DCAP with respect to the proposed land use and density. The subject property is suitable for some additional higher density residential development,

although, preferably through a land assembly with adjacent properties to enable the best realization of development potential. Staff recommend for Council's consideration that this Rezoning Application is declined.

#### **ALTERNATE MOTION 1 (Amend Proposal)**

That Council direct staff to work with the applicant to refine the proposal to encourage a better fit with the current neighbourhood context and to minimize potential negative impacts associated with a piecemeal approach to development in this area.

#### **ALTERNATE MOTION 2 (advance application as presented)**

That Council instruct staff to prepare the necessary Zoning Regulation Bylaw Amendment that would authorize the proposed development outlined in Rezoning Application No. 00598 for 953 Balmoral Road, that first and second reading of the Zoning Regulation Bylaw Amendment be considered by Council, and a Public Hearing date be set once the following conditions are met:

1. Preparation of the following documents, executed by the applicant to the satisfaction of City Staff:
  - a. Statutory Right-of-Way of 1.22m on Balmoral Road.
2. The applicant provide an amenity contribution in the amount of \$76,694.69 toward the Local Amenities Reserve Fund in accordance with the *City of Victoria Density Bonus Policy* to the satisfaction of City Staff.
3. Following consideration of Rezoning Application No. 00487, if approved, that Council authorize staff to prepare and enter into an Encroachment Agreement for a fee of \$750 plus \$25 per m<sup>2</sup> of exposed shored face during construction, to the satisfaction of the City staff.


Respectfully submitted,

  
Leanne Taylor  
Senior Planner  
Development Services Department

  
Jonathan Tinney, Director  
Sustainable Planning and Community  
Development Department

Report accepted and recommended by the City Manager:

Date:

  
March 6, 2018

#### **List of Attachments:**

- Attachment A: Subject Map
- Attachment B: Aerial Map
- Attachment C: Plans date stamped January 18, 2018
- Attachment D: Package from applicant date stamped November 22, 2017 including Letter To Mayor and Council, correspondence, and Parking Study dated October 27, 2017, prepared by Watt Consulting Group
- Attachment E: Community Association Land Use Committee Comments dated June 7, 2017 and August 15, 2017
- Attachment F: Arborist Report prepared by Talbot Mackenzie & Associates.



## Committee of the Whole Report For the Meeting of April 19, 2018

---

**To:** Committee of the Whole **Date:** February 22, 2018

**From:** Jonathan Tinney, Director, Sustainable Planning and Community Development

**Subject:** Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That Council decline Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 for the property located at 953 Balmoral Road.

### LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In accordance with Section 489 of the *Local Government Act*, Council may issue a Development Permit in accordance with the applicable guidelines specified in the *Official Community Plan*. A Development Permit with Variance may vary or supplement the *Zoning Regulation Bylaw* but may not vary the use or density of the land from that specified in the Bylaw.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present Council with information, analysis and recommendations for a Development Permit Application for the property located at 953 Balmoral Road. The proposal is to construct a four-storey multi-unit building consisting of approximately 11 rental units. The variances are related to parking, setbacks, site coverage and open site space.

The following points were considered in assessing this application:

- The subject property is within Development Permit Area 3 (HC): Core Mixed-Use Residential, which supports a *"high-quality of architecture, landscape and urban design that reflects the function of a major residential centre on the edge of a central business district in scale, massing and character."*
- The *Downtown Core Area Plan* designates the subject property as Residential Mixed-Use, which supports multi-residential development appropriate to the context and function of each neighbourhood. The neighbourhood has a mix of low density residential buildings mid-block on the south side of the street; and a mix of commercial, residential and institutional on the north side of the street. To realize the full development potential of the site and to achieve higher density multi-unit residential development as supported in the Plan, land consolidation is strongly encouraged.
- The design guidelines contained in the *Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP)*, *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (1981)* and *Guidelines for Fences*,

*Gates and Shutters (2010)* apply to the proposed building. There are aspects of the proposed contemporary design that are consistent with the design guidelines such as a flat roof, choice of materials, and stepping back the third and fourth storeys; however, staff have concerns with the overall size, scale and massing; window placement; lack of soft landscaping and outdoor open space; the transition between the public and private realm; and the lack of prominent entryways and articulation along the building base.

- A vehicle parking variance is required to facilitate this development. The applicant is requesting to reduce the required number of parking spaces from 12 to 5. Under the new draft Schedule C, only eight parking spaces (seven residential and one visitor) would be required; therefore, the shortfall would only be three parking spaces.
- Given the proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM), the parking variance is supportable. To offset the parking shortfall, the applicant is willing to:
  - purchase a MODO car share vehicle and memberships, and dedicate a MODO car share parking space onsite in case the dedicated parking space on the street is removed in the future
  - provide additional secured and enclosed bicycle parking and purchase one bicycle for each unit
  - provide transit passes for the residents.
- The existing building and parking layout does not allow for a minimum 0.6m landscape strip required under Schedule C. Providing a landscape strip is a bylaw requirement and it will add some soft landscaping and additional screening around the perimeter of the site.
- Should Council support this application, a new zone would likely be created and variances for setbacks, site coverage and open site space would be required rather than entrenching relaxed standards in the zone, which could be applied to future and different development schemes.

## BACKGROUND

### Description of Proposal

The proposal is for a four-storey multi-unit building. Specific details include:

- low-rise building form containing contemporary-style design features, including a flat roofline, larger windows on the third and fourth storeys, and modern finishes
- exterior materials include brick, wood siding, stucco and aluminium privacy screen
- third and fourth storeys stepped back 2m
- one ground floor unit with a front entrance facing the street
- recessed main entrance into the building
- gated entryway into the site and to access the parking in the rear yard
- permeable pavers for driveway and surface parking lot
- no soft landscaping
- a bike room for 16 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and a bicycle rack for six bikes near the front entrance.

The variances that would be required if the R3-1 Zone, Multiple Dwelling District, was adapted to allow a higher density are related to:

- reducing the required number of parking spaces from 12 to 5
- reducing the front yard setback from 10.50m to 2m
- reducing the side (west) yard setback from 6.10m to 3.64m
- reducing the side (east) yard setback from 6.10m to 1.52m
- increasing the site coverage from 30% to 43%

- reducing the open site space from 30% to 15.30%

### **Sustainability Features**

The applicant has not identified any sustainability features associated with this proposal.

### **Active Transportation Impacts**

The application proposes 16 Class 1 (secure and enclosed) and seven Class 2 (one bike rack) bicycle parking spaces to support active transportation.

### **Public Realm Improvements**

No public realm improvements are proposed in association with this Development Permit with Variance Application.

### **Accessibility Impact Statement**

The British Columbia Building Code regulates accessibility as it pertains to buildings.

### **Existing Site Development and Development Potential**

The site is presently a vacant lot. Under the current R-2 Zone, the property could be developed as a duplex.

### **Community Consultation**

Consistent with the *Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC), Procedures for Processing Rezoning and Variance Applications*, the applicant has consulted the North Park CALUC at a Community Meeting held on June 7, 2017. At this meeting, the applicant presented a proposal for a six-storey multi-unit residential building consisting of approximately 17 rental dwelling units. Minutes from the June 7, 2017 CALUC meeting are attached to this report. Following the CALUC meeting, the applicant submitted a rezoning application for a four-storey multi-unit residential building, which caused some confusion; therefore, a second community meeting was held on August 15, 2017 to present the four-storey option. Minutes from the second community meeting are attached to this report.

This application proposes variances; therefore, in accordance with the City's *Land Use Procedures Bylaw*, it requires notice, sign posting and a meeting of Council to consider the variances.

## **ANALYSIS**

### **Development Permit Area and Design Guidelines**

The *Official Community Plan (OCP)* identifies this property within Development Permit Area 3 (HC): Core Mixed Use Residential, which supports a "*high-quality of architecture, landscape and urban design that reflects the function of a major residential centre on the edge of a central business district in scale, massing and character.*" The design guidelines contained in the *Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP), Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (1981)*, and *Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010)*, apply to the proposed building.

There are aspects of the proposed contemporary design that are consistent with the design guidelines such as a flat roof, choice of materials and stepping back the upper storeys. Staff have concerns with the overall size, scale and massing, window placement, lack of soft landscaping and outdoor open space, the transition between the public and private realm, and the lack of prominent entryways and articulation along the building base.

The OCP contains design guidelines that speak to the overall massing of a building and its visual impact on the site and adjacent properties. The site being only 672m<sup>2</sup> cannot comfortably support a development of this size and scale. The building is long and presents a large volume with substantial glazing along the east and west elevations. The side yard setback along the east side is only 1.5m from the property line, which would impact future development, window placement, and access to sunlight on the adjacent property. There are windows on the west elevation of the existing building on the neighbouring property at 959 Balmoral Road, and there is no indication in the proposal if this was taken into consideration when designing window placement on the east elevation of the proposed building to mitigate any concerns of privacy and overlook onto the adjacent property.

The design guidelines encourage *"visually articulated designs and quality architectural materials and detailing in building bases to enhance visual interest for pedestrians."* Staff have expressed concerns to the applicant about the lack of prominent entryways and articulation along the building base. Staff have encouraged the applicant to enhance the ground floor entryways and street relationship of the building by redesigning the building to have two dwelling units facing Balmoral Road with prominent residential entryways. To distinguish between the public and private realm, staff also encouraged the applicant to raise the building slightly to allow for one or two steps at the front entrances.

There is no soft landscaping being proposed onsite. The applicant is proposing hard surface treatment throughout the site with permeable pavers along the driveway and in the surface parking lot in the rear yard. Should Council support this application, staff recommend for Council's consideration that a landscaping strip be provided along the side and rear property lines to screen the parking, and that the applicant incorporate some high quality soft landscaping which may require a reduction in the building footprint to achieve these results.

### **Tree Preservation Bylaw and Urban Forest Master Plan**

There are no impacts to public trees with this application; however, there is one Horse chestnut tree protected by a Tree Preservation Bylaw on the neighbouring property at 959 Balmoral Road. The applicant provided an arborist report (attached) prepared by Talbot Mackenzie & Associates, which includes tree assessment and tree impact mitigation measures. The report concluded that the tree may be impacted by the proposed construction; however, the impacts would be minor if floating pavement is installed where the proposed parking spaces overlap with the tree's critical root zone. Pruning would be required to lift the lower canopy above the nearest parking space at the property line, and may be required to provide clearance for building construction.

The applicant is not proposing to plant additional trees on the subject property.

## **Regulatory Considerations**

### **Parking Variance**

The applicant is requesting a reduction in the required number of parking spaces from 12 to 5. Under the new draft Schedule C, only eight parking spaces (seven residential and one visitor) would be required so the shortfall would only be three parking spaces. A parking study prepared by WATT Consulting Group confirms that the peak site parking demand is expected to be eight vehicles – seven resident vehicles and one visitor vehicle (three more than the proposed parking supply).

To offset this parking shortfall, the applicant is willing to purchase a MODO car-share vehicle and dedicate a MODO car-share parking space onsite; and to purchase car-share memberships for each unit (valued at \$500 each). The applicant is willing to commit funds to fully subsidize one monthly transit pass for each unit over a period of three years (396 monthly passes). According to the parking study, uptake of this type of transit program is typically in the range of 20%, therefore, there will likely be funds available for transit passes beyond the three year term committed by the applicant.

The applicant will also provide additional secured and enclosed bicycle parking and purchase one bicycle for each unit. According to the parking study, the Transportation Demand Management measures being proposed would reduce the resident parking demand by two vehicles (approximately 25%). Parking demand reduction values have not been assigned to the added bike parking, and free bicycles; however, the study states that these initiatives are expected to further encourage multi-modal travel and reduce parking demand. The subject property is also within walking distance to downtown and frequent transit service. Given the above parking justification, the parking variance is recommended as being supportable.

### **Setbacks, Site Coverage and Open Site Space**

Should Council support this application, a new zone would likely be created and variances for setbacks, site coverage and open site space would be required rather than entrenching relaxed standards in the zone, which could be applied to a future and different development proposal.

The regulations in the new zone would be similar to the R3-1 Zone, Multiple Dwelling District, except for the density provisions. The following variances would be required:

- reduce the front yard setback from 10.50m to 2m
- reduce the side (east) yard setback from 6.10m to 1.52m
- reduce the side (west) yard setback from 6.10m to 3.64m
- increase site coverage from 30% to 43%
- reduce open site space from 30% to 15.30%.

Reducing the front yard setback is supportable as it would create a better building and street relationship. Reducing the east side yard setback would impact the future development, window placement, and access to sunlight on the adjacent property. A larger setback on the west side is a result of the proposed driveway and could allow for some breathing room between buildings if the property to the west is redeveloped in the future. The proposed site coverage of 43% and open space of 14.30% are not supportable and result in a lack of soft landscaping and private open space onsite.

## CONCLUSIONS

The proposed four-storey multi-unit building at 953 Balmoral Road is consistent with some of the design guidelines pertaining to the roof, choice of materials and stepping back the upper storeys; however, Staff have concerns with the overall size, scale and massing; window placement; lack of soft landscaping and outdoor open space; the transition between the public and private realm; and the lack of prominent entryways and articulation along the building base. The parking variance is supportable given the TDM measures being proposed to offset the parking shortfall. The front and side yard (west) setbacks are supportable; however, staff have concerns with the proposed site coverage, minimal open site space and small side yard setback on the east property line. Staff recommend for Council's consideration that this application is declined.

## ALTERNATE MOTION 1

That Council:

1. Direct staff to work with the applicant to revise the proposal to comply with the design guidelines and:
  - i. minimize the impact of the east side yard setback by reducing the requested variance and by introducing additional design interventions to mitigate potential concerns related to privacy and overlook
  - ii. reduce the site coverage and increase the open site space in order to provide private open space and high quality soft landscaping
  - iii. provide a landscaping strip along the side and rear property lines to screen the parking.
2. Refer the application to the Advisory Design Panel and report back to the Committee of the Whole following a review by the panel.

## ALTERNATE MOTION 2 (SUPPORT APPLICATION AS PRESENTED)

That, subject to review by the Advisory Design Panel and report back to the Committee of the Whole, that Council, after giving notice and allowing an opportunity for public comment at a meeting of Council, and after the Public Hearing for Rezoning Application No. 00598, if it is approved, consider the following motion:


"That Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road, in accordance with:

1. Plans date stamped January 18, 2018
2. Development meeting all *Zoning Regulation Bylaw* requirements, except for the following variances:
  - i. reduce the required number of parking spaces from 12 to 5
  - ii. Part 3.3(10): reduce the front yard setback from 10.50m to 2.00m
  - iii. Part 3.3 (10): reduce the side (east) yard setback from 6.10m to 1.52m
  - iv. Part 3.3(10): reduce the side (west) yard setback from 6.10m to 3.64m
  - v. Part 3.3(4)(1): increase the site coverage from 30% to 43%
  - vi. Part 3.3(4)(6)(1): reduce the open site space from 30% to 15.30%
3. Registration of legal agreements on the property's title to secure the MODO Car Share Vehicle and parking space, car share memberships, one monthly transit pass for each unit over a period of three years (396 monthly passes), and one bicycle for


each unit to the satisfaction of City Staff.

4. Revise the landscape plan to indicate floating pavement where the proposed parking spaces overlap with the tree's critical root zone in accordance with the arborist report prepared by Talbot Mackenzie & Associates.
5. The Development Permit lapsing two years from the date of this resolution."

Respectfully submitted,




Leanne Taylor  
Senior Planner  
Development Services Division



Jonathan Tinney, Director  
Sustainable Planning and Community  
Development Department

Report accepted and recommended by the City Manager:




Date:

March 6, 2018

**List of Attachments:**

- Attachment A: Subject Map
- Attachment B: Aerial Map
- Attachment C: Plans date stamped January 18, 2018
- Attachment D: Package from applicant date stamped November 22, 2017 including Letter To Mayor And Council, Correspondence, and Parking Study dated October 27, 2017 prepared by Watt Consulting Group
- Attachment E: Community Association Land Use Committee comments dated June 7, 2017 and August 15, 2017
- Attachment F: Arborist Report prepared by Talbot Mackenzie & Associates.




953 Balmoral Road  
Rezoning No. REZ00598 &  
Development Permit No. DP000506






953 Balmoral Road  
Rezoning No. REZ00598 &  
Development Permit No. DP000506





### SITE PLAN



**ROOF PLAN**




# COAST + BEAM


**SITE PLAN & ROOF PLAN** | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | JANUARY 16 2018 | SCALE 1:100

JAN 19 2018


Planning & Development Department  
Community Planning Division




GROUND FLOOR PLAN



SECOND FLOOR PLAN



THIRD FLOOR PLAN




FOURTH FLOOR PLAN




JAN 19 2018

Planning & Development Department  
Community Planning Division



**NORTH ELEVATION**

**WEST ELEVATION**



**SOUTH ELEVATION**


**EAST ELEVATION**

**MATERIALS**

- ① Pink Bricking Bond Channel
- ② Wood Siding above finished ground level (FGL), horizontal siding
- ③ Stone White Smooth Finish
- ④ Glazing/Glass Vinyl Channel
- ⑤ Privacy Screen, Aluminium Channel
- ⑥ Sea Shade/Screen, Aluminium White
- ⑦ All exterior doors and windows are 180° opening
- ⑧ All exterior doors and windows are 180° opening

**COAST  
+ BEAM**


ELEVATIONS | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | JANUARY 16 2018 | SCALE 1:100



Received  
City of Victoria

JAN 19 2018

Planning & Development Department  
Community Planning Division



**COAST  
+ BEAM**

SECTIONS | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | JANUARY 16 2018 | SCALE 1:100



VANCOUVER STREET


MASON STREET

QUADRA STREET

Received  
City of Victoria

JAN 19 2018

Planning & Development Department  
Community Planning Division



KEY PLAN

975

954 950 948 944B 938

942

959

949

945

939

937

925

1970's FOUR STOREY APARTMENT BUILDING

1950's HOUSE/MDP'S SHELTER

953 BALMORAL

PRIVATE PARKING LOT  
(CONNECTION CONNECTED TO GAZZOLA TIRE STORE)

1950's PRIVATE HOUSE

2000's PRIVATE HOUSE

PARKING FOR OPERA CENTRE

PACIFIC OPERA CENTRE

GAZZOLA TIRE

7.47



COAST  
+ BEAM

CONTEXT ELEVATION | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | JANUARY 08 2018 | SCALE NTS

Received  
City of Victoria

JAN 19 2018

Planning & Development  
Community Planning Division  
CANADIAN LIVEN AND UNIFORM  
HOLLIS HEALTH SERVICES

INTER CULTURAL ASSOCIATION OF GREATER VICTORIA

PRIVATE APARTMENT BUILDING



1701

Inter Cultural  
Association of  
Greater Victoria

930

932

934

946

947

968

QUADRA STREET

VANCOUVER STREET

1627

1625

925

937

939

945

949

959

953 BALMORAL

COAST  
+ BEAM

CONTEXT ELEVATION | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | JANUARY 08 2018 | SCALE NTS

<p><b>Handscape-Concrete</b></p> <p>Main Area: 3.977 sq m</p>	<p><b>Handscape-Concrete</b></p> <p>Main Area: 3.093 sq m</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------

JAN 19 2018

Hickmoppe Pavers  
Main Area: 3,066 sq m  
Border Area: 3,035 sq m

Hondurpe Plaza  
Main Area: 1,658 sq m  
Border Area: 2,052 sq m

Handsome Pavers  
Main Area: 13,551 sq. ft.  
Border Area: 10,312 sq. ft.

Hardscape Pavers  
Main Area: 1,636 sq m  
Border Area: 2,055 sq m

Hard-edge Pavers  
Main Area: 4,134 sq m  
Border Area: 3,777 sq m

Main Area: 2 084 sq m  
 Border Area: 9 854 sq m

Hard-cape Pavement  
Main Area: 7.612 sq m  
Border Area: 3.756 sq m

Handscape Pavers  
Main Area 2.763 sq m  
Border Area 2.801 sq m

Hardscape-Pavers  
Main Area: 19,938 sq m  
Border Area: 6,196 sq m

Haze/Lowest Density  
 Main Area: 2.731 sqm  
 Border Area: 2.292 sqm

Main Area: 15,381 sq m  
Border Area: 5,281 sq m

Handwritten Page no.  
Matr. No.: 2745  
Handwritten Page no.

Hardscape Pavement  
Main Area: 10,404 sq. m.  
Flooding Area: 4,108 sq. m.

Hard-cape Pavement  
Main Area: 1.938 sq m  
Border Area: 2.611 sq m

Handsome Pigeons  
Main Area: 6,275 sq m  
Hander Area: 1,481 sq m

Hatchery Comments:  
Main Area: 19,258 sq m

Hardscape Pavers  
Main Area: 150.933 sq  
Hardscape: 11.877

1 Site Plan  
Scale: 1:100

**Fence / Gate - Typical**

Privacy Fence Detail

 Protection Gate

Mendongan Name	Basin Area	Stale Area	Total Area
Mendongan Anyemane	0.55 m	5.19 sq m	5.19 sq m
Mendongan Ceyra	0.55 m	28.76 sq m	49.75 sq m
Mendongan Payas	41.95 sq m	248.47 sq m	328.81 sq m

[illegible]

1. **Permissible Paving Installation** is subject to the City of Victoria Stormwater Utility, **Relevant Stormwater Management Standards**  
**Permissible Addition: June 2015**  
**Permissible Paver** Belgard Aqua Rock 230mm x 114mm x 40mm Grey Running Bond  
**100% Concrete Border Smooth** Trench Fill Finish
2. **Permissible Paving Installation** is subject to the City of Victoria Stormwater Utility, **Relevant Stormwater Management Standards**  
**Permissible Addition: June 2015**  
**Permissible Paver** Belgard Aqua Rock 230mm x 114mm x 40mm Grey Running Bond  
**200mm Concrete Border Smooth** Trench Fill Finish  
**Cast in Place Concrete** - See Concrete Specifications  
**Maximum excavation between sections is 10mm**
3. **Aggregate: 88 Typical**
4. **Severely Gated Vehicle and Pedestrian Entrance**  
**Cast Aluminium and Powder Coated Channel**  
**Outward Facing**  
**Schedule 40 PVC Conduit Slope**  
**Electrical Services Required**  
**Low Voltage Lighting**  
**Maximum Height 1.83m**
5. **Severely Gated Pedestrian Entrance**  
**Cast Aluminium and Powder Coated Channel**  
**Outward Facing**  
**Electrical Services Required**  
**Low Voltage Lighting**  
**Maximum Height 1.3m**
6. **Fence: Cast Aluminium and Powder Coated Channel**  
**Maximum Height 1.83m**  
**Fence Privacy: Southern Perimeter**  
**Fence Cast Aluminium and Powder Coated Channel**  
**Maximum Height 1.83m**  
**Storm Drain 600mm x 80mm**

Concrete Specification

1. ~~Shall be~~ concentrated on a load bearing substrate with a minimum soil capacity of 3000PSI.  
Concrete shall be placed on a suitable granular aggregate, placed in 25mm lifts, rolled and compacted.  
Concrete shall be 4000PSI, 28MPA, (4000PSI / 7 days)  
Concrete shall be a minimum of 140mm thickness  
Shall be reinforced with a minimum of #4 reinforcement bar at 600mm grid spacing or better  
Reinforcement bar shall be placed mid depth of concrete


### Errors and Omissions

**Designer:** We will be responsible for the entire artwork to appear in the Client's final design through printing or online, and all other design and drawing responsibilities. Other than the printing or online artwork, we will not be responsible for any other design or drawing responsibilities.


**Contributor:** Do not act's driving. The contributor's opinion and analysis are those of the contributor and do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher. The publisher is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the content of the contributor's article. The publisher is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the content of the contributor's article. The publisher is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the content of the contributor's article.

This drawing is the intellectual property of the designer and is to be used only for the purpose of the design. It is not to be reproduced in any form without the prior written permission of the artist. The artist is not responsible for any damage or loss of the artwork.

Iss	Date	Appr	Specimen Species
A	18-5-3	Im	Restoration of Upgully / Upgully Gases 6 M Cr. (P. P. 10.5)
B	18-5-3	Im	Restoration of Upgully / Upgully Gases 6 M Cr. (P. P. 10.5)

No.	Date	Issue Notes
<p align="center">  </p>		
Project # 78-550 Parkway Drive Mission Viejo, CA 92690 www.alfrescoliving.com 949-233-8602	Larry Myers 78-550 Parkway Drive Mission Viejo, CA 92690 949-233-8602	
Project #	953 Belmont	
Project Name	Landscape Proposal	
Project Manager Date January 3, 2018	Project # 953 Belmont Date L1R Total Sheets A B	

10 November 2017



Method Built Homes Inc.  
The Garage  
4566 Cordova Bay Road  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8X 3V5

**Attn: Mayor and Council**  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8W 1P6

Dear Ms. Mayor and Members of Council,

Re: 953 Balmoral Road (the "Proposal" or "Site")

Please accept this application for the approval of a rezoning and development permit application for the Site.

The design and development of the Site began over five years ago in late October 2012. At that time, it was recommended by the former Local Area Planner Mr. Mike Wilson that this proposal proceed as a joint rezoning and development permit application and that a site-specific zone would be created for the Site. Mr. Wilson advised the following:

- 1) "[T]he highest-level plan is the Official Community Plan (OCP). The OCP designated the site as Core Residential. This designation generally envisions **multi-unit residential buildings.**" (emphasis added)
- 2) "At a more detailed level, the Downtown Core Area Plan is also relevant to the site. For this site the plan envisions an **FSR of 2:1** (page 37) and a **maximum building height of 20m** (six residential stories) (page 89)." (emphasis added)
- 3) "A new zone for this site would have to contemplate up to **2:1 FSR** as per the guiding policy. It would be best to base your proposal on the guiding policies and design guidelines rather than an existing zone. **We would then craft a zone based on your proposal.**" (emphasis added)

Attached hereto at **Addendum A** is a copy of Mr. Wilson's email of 24 October 2012.

It is with this background and context that we undertook to design and develop a purpose-built **workforce rental apartment**. By way of background, we have worked diligently over the last five years with new Local Area Planner Ms. Leanne Taylor and Assistant Director of Development Services Ms. Allison Meyer on this application package.

We have undertaken three complete redesigns of this Proposal over the course of ongoing consultations and conversations with Ms. Taylor and the North Park Neighbourhood Association. In addition, we have conducted three separate CALUC meetings in relation to this Proposal.

#### First Concept

After initial informal discussions with the North Park Neighbourhood Association, our first concept proposed a four to six story brick Brownstone themed **workforce rental apartment** with underground parking. To offset the increased cost of underground parking for this concept, the building was designed to the property lines with no setbacks and contained an interior outdoor courtyard for the residents. Ms. Taylor expressed a concern with the density, height and setbacks of this proposal and was not overly impressed with the Brownstone concept.

#### Second Concept

Our second concept proposed a six-story modern **workforce rental apartment** with significant front, rear, and side yard setbacks and a **1.9:1 FSR**. As a result of much reduced density, this proposal included at grade parking at the rear of the proposal. This proposal was presented to the North Park Neighbourhood Association through a CALUC hearing. There were some concerns raised at the CALUC by one single-family residence owner to the South of the Site with respect to the height of the proposal and more generally with respect to the modern design aesthetic. Following similar concerns raised by Staff, and the economic climate at the time, we determined that reducing the proposal to four stories would render the proposal economically unviable as a workforce rental apartment building.

The owners of the adjacent properties to the East and West both support this six-story purpose built **workforce rental apartment** as the optimal proposal. Attached hereto at **Addendum B** are copies of such letters of support.

### Third Concept

Given the change in the economic landscape related to housing, we determined that reducing the proposal to four stories would now be viable. We remained of the view, however, that a six-story proposal was best for the area as it had the added benefit of offering **three, 3-bedroom units** on the top two floors for **working families**. We presented this proposal once again at a CALUC and the response was generally quite positive, with the exception of the same neighbour to the South. Nevertheless, the support was not unanimous and Staff concerns with respect to height and setbacks remained. As a result, we finalized a third concept that proposed a four-story **workforce rental apartment** with significant front, rear, and side yard setbacks and with additional setbacks at the third and fourth floors as requested by Staff. This proposal envisions 11 one- and two-bedroom rental apartment units. The **FSR is 1.38:1**, well short of the 2:1 FSR referenced above.

### Sister Purpose Built Rental Building

It is important to note that we recently designed, developed and completed an 11-unit purpose built **workforce rental apartment** at 1032 North Park Street ("North Park Project"), approximately one block from the Site. This project was completed in December 2016 and consists of a four-story building constructed on a 4930 square foot (458m<sup>2</sup>) site. The current Site is 7233 square foot site (672m<sup>2</sup>) or approximately **47% larger** than the site of the North Park Project.

The target renters for both the North Park Project and this Site are blue-collar, working class individuals/couples/families. The one bedrooms at the North Park Project **start at \$1100/month** and average \$1200/month; the two bedrooms start at \$1400/month and average \$1550/month. At the top end, there is one townhouse renting for **\$2000/month**.

Contrasting this Proposal with higher scale purpose built rental buildings or condominium buildings encompassing half- or full-city blocks may lead to improved design through the use of more expensive materials and/or the provisioning of better amenities for residents; however, the economics of such proposals will also inevitably lead to this becoming a condominium proposal (with stratified units for sale) and and/or a professional rental apartment with higher rents as opposed to workforce rental units.

Based on publicly available information, Hudson Walk Two, for example, rents one bedroom units that **start at \$1510/month** with an average rent much higher; two bedroom units rent for as high as **\$3095/month**. Clearly there is a demographic of professionals in Victoria who are prepared to pay these rents for apartment units in high-end purpose built rental apartments. However, these rents are **approximately 30% - 55% higher** than those we are setting and targeting, and as such make it difficult for blue-collar workers to live within

Victoria. Both our sister North Park Project and this Proposal target a workforce who provide invaluable services within Victoria.

### Proposal

This application is being brought forward after careful review of the Official Community Plan and the provisions thereof dealing with the North Park Neighbourhood and the 900 block of Balmoral Road. The OCP envisages projects of a larger scale and scope than the one being proposed. For example, a 2:1 floor space ratio is envisaged in the OCP for this location. This Proposal is for an FSR of 1.38:1. Additionally, there is a need in Victoria for more **affordable** housing.

As you are no doubt aware, the North Park Neighbourhood is a rich and vibrant part of the City of Victoria. New, affordable housing, particularly an apartment building geared towards non-professional renters is precisely what this neighbourhood requires. There are other apartment projects that are targeting a more affluent demographic, but this project is vital to ensuring a diverse socio-economic mix within Victoria. This Proposal is being advanced after several re-designs over the course of nearly five years and after lengthy consultations with staff.

The only concern with this project lies with the parking ratio being proposed. There are 11 units proposed for this Proposal and servicing these units are five general parking stalls and one dedicated MODO stall. As outlined in a report from Boulevard Transportation Group, the significant transportation demand management (TDM) measures proposed are sufficient to offset the off-site parking that would otherwise be generated. Attached hereto at **Addendum C** is such report. In other words, the: (a) proximate location of the Proposal to downtown Victoria, including its immediate access to major bicycle routes, (b) substantial number of bicycle lockers provided to each unit, (c) provision of bicycles to each unit, (d) public transit passes provided to each unit, (e) public information provided to residents of the Proposal relating to TDM measures, and (f) purchase of a vehicle for the dedicated MODO stall respecting this Proposal, cumulatively offset the off-site parking demand created by this Proposal.

The need for quality, affordable housing in the City of Victoria is ever-present. Despite the provision of new high-quality, purpose-built apartments, the rents associated with those projects have been inaccessible to a significant segment of our population. The North Park Neighbourhood is an eclectic community that is looking to avoid further gentrification. This Proposal has been designed after taking into account the results of consultation with the North Park Neighbourhood Association. As a purpose-built **workforce rental apartment**, this Proposal is designed to meet the long-term needs of the local area and the City of Victoria more broadly.

There are certainly buildings being proposed and developed that offer more amenities and are generally more expensive. I recently submitted and spoke to Mayor and Council with respect to a proposed LEED GOLD office building which has broken ground at Dockside Green with an expected completion date of December 2018. However, the intended occupants of such buildings spend a lot more per square foot to occupy these spaces than the occupants of this Proposal; a Proposal that is geared for working people.

In addition to letters of support from the adjacent neighbours to the east and west of the Proposal, attached for your review at **Addendum D**, is a letters of support from a local community leader in the area of affordable housing, generated after an informal meeting held at the Parsonage Café in North Park (see **Addendum E**).


The environmental benefits of Victoria's workforce living within or adjacent to the same community within which it works cannot be overstated. By eliminating the need for single vehicle ownership, the Proposal contributes to environmental sustainability. By targeting Victoria's workforce, the Proposal contributes to social sustainability.

### Summary

This Proposal has been designed specifically for this neighbourhood in accordance with the OCP, after consultation with the North Park Neighbourhood Association, and after consultation with the City of Victoria. The building's design and mass has been modified to accommodate the concerns of the NPNA. This includes a recent reduction in floors from six to four and a unit reduction from 17 to 11. Unfortunately, this has come with the elimination of three, 3-bedroom units geared towards families on the top two floors of the Proposal.

The only objective non-compliance concern is with respect to on-site parking. The provision of significant TDM measures more than offsets the potential off-site parking impact of this Proposal. This Proposal has been custom-designed to address specific needs identified by our community and warrants our strong support to move it along expeditiously to completion.

Kind regards,



Rajinder S. Sahota  
Principal  
Method Built Homes Inc.  
[www.methodbuilt.ca](http://www.methodbuilt.ca)

## ADDENDUM A

From: Rajinder Sahota [mailto:[rajinder@methodbuilt.ca](mailto:rajinder@methodbuilt.ca)]  
Sent: Tuesday, Oct 23, 2012 9:52 PM  
To: Mike Wilson  
Subject: Re: 953 Balmoral Rd.

Hi Mike,

Would you be able to give me an initial impression of your thoughts on possible development of this site and what the City would like to see here? I see from the OCP that this is likely a similar growth strategy as North Park but the current zoning may be different.

Please let me know.

Kind regards,

Rajinder Sahota

---

From: Mike Wilson <[MWilson@victoria.ca](mailto:MWilson@victoria.ca)>  
To: "Rajinder Sahota" <[rajinder@methodbuilt.ca](mailto:rajinder@methodbuilt.ca)>  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Date: Wed, 24 Oct 2012 16:07:38 +0000  
Subject: RE: 953 Balmoral Rd.  
Hi Raj,

With respect to planning policies for the area, the highest level plan is the Official Community Plan (OCP). The OCP designated the site as Core Residential. This designation generally envisions multi unit residential buildings. A detailed breakdown of the designation can be found here (Page 41): [http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP\\_BOOK\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP_BOOK_WEB.pdf) <[http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP\\_BOOK\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP_BOOK_WEB.pdf)>

At a more detailed level, the Downtown Core Area Plan is also relevant to the site. For this site the plan envisions an FSR of 2:1 (Page 37) and maximum building height of 20 m (six residential storeys) (page 89). See: <http://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/departments/planning-development/community-planning/downtown-plan.html> <<http://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/departments/planning-development/community-planning/downtown-plan.html>>

This property is also located within Development Permit Area 3: Core Mixed Use Residential. This DP Area provides design guidelines to be used when developing the design of the building. See Page 183/184: [http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP\\_Part4\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP_Part4_WEB.pdf) <[http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP\\_Part4\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.shapeyourfuturevictoria.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/OCP_Part4_WEB.pdf)> . Many of the relevant design guidelines are included in the Downtown Core Area Plan.

## ADDENDUM A

A new zone for the site would have to contemplate up to 2:1 FSR as per the guiding policy. It would be best to base your proposal on the guiding policies and design guidelines rather than an existing zone. We would then craft a zone based on your proposal.

The foregoing is given for your convenience only and it should be clearly understood that you must satisfy yourself as to whether the existing or any proposed development would be in conformity with all applicable bylaws and policies of the City or any provincial or federal statutes or regulations.

If you require any further information please don't hesitate to give me call or e-mail.

Regards,

Mike

Mike Wilson, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner - Urban Design  
Development Services Division  
Planning and Development Department  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square, Victoria, BC, V8W 1P6  
Phone: 250.361.0384 Fax: 250.361.0386  
[www.victoria.ca](http://www.victoria.ca) <<http://www.victoria.ca/>>

## **ADDENDUM B**

July 24, 2017

Michael Rowe  
949 Balmoral Road  
Victoria, BC V8T 1A7

Mayor & Council  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

**Re: 953 Balmoral Road**

I am writing to express my unqualified support for the development proposed by Method Built Homes at 953 Balmoral Road. I have owned the property adjacent to this site at 949 Balmoral Road for many years. In addition, I have owned and operated a prominent business on this block of Balmoral Road for many years.

I initially reviewed the six-story proposal Method Built Homes proposed for the site and supported that proposal. It was sensitive to the needs of the neighbourhood and was geared towards families by providing an additional three, 3-bedroom units over the top two floors. It was attractive, modern and current. The revised four-story proposal does not maximize the full potential the six-story proposal brought to the neighbourhood, and the region more generally, by offering additional accessible rental accommodations. This neighbourhood has had difficulty attracting investment capital for developments, and these proposals are welcomed.

As a result, I am fully supportive of the current four-story proposal from Method Built Homes, with the only reservation being that I would prefer the more densified six-story proposal that was an earlier concept.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions.

Respectfully yours,



Michael Rowe

July 23, 2017

Michael Forbes  
959 Balmoral Road  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8T 1A7

**Mayor and Council**  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, British Columbia  
V8W 1P6


Re: 953 Balmoral Road

I write with respect to the Development Permit application submitted for 953 Balmoral Road. I understand the application submitted is for an 11-unit rental apartment building covering 6 floors.

I own the property immediately adjacent to this proposal and to the East. I believe the No. 1000 Park neighbourhood and the 900-block of Balmoral in particular would benefit tremendously from this development. In fact, I prefer the earlier six-floor proposal as it also included 3, 3-bedroom units on the top two floors. The proposal falls within the Official Community Plan for this block and neighbourhood and would improve the area tremendously while bringing additional life and vibrancy with more residents. The block is within the downtown core and needs density to provide more affordable housing options for Victoria residents.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions.

Respectfully yours,



Michael Forbes Bsc Pharm  
0.882.3784

## **ADDENDUM C**



953 BALMORAL ROAD

Parking Study

Prepared for: **Method Built**

Prepared by: **Watt Consulting Group**

Our File: **1906**

Date: **October 27, 2017**

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In November 2015, Watt Consulting Group was retained by Method Built to undertake a parking study for the proposed development at 953 Balmoral Road in the City of Victoria. The proposed development has undergone several architectural changes over the last several months. As a result, the content presented herein is an updated parking study from the report submitted on December 7, 2015.

The purpose of this study is to assess site parking demand and any off-site impacts. The study considers parking demand at representative multi-family residential sites, on-street parking conditions, and transportation demand management (TDM) programs.

### 1.1 LOCATION

The development site is located at 953 Balmoral Road in the City of Victoria. See Map 1.

MAP 1. SUBJECT SITE



TABLE 1. VEHICLE OWNERSHIP AT REPRESENTATIVE SITES

Site	No. Units	Owned Vehicles	Ownership Rate (vehicles/unit)
975 Balmoral Road	38	10	0.26
1635 Cook Street	72	30	0.42
1035 North Park Street	79	21	0.27
1022 Pandora Avenue	40	13	0.33
1130 Pandora Avenue	45	24	0.53
1020 Pembroke Street	109	75	0.69
1630 Quadra Street	121	67	0.55
2310 Quadra Street	19	14	0.74
1017 Queens Avenue	27	11	0.41
1110 Queens Avenue	17	9	0.53
		<b>Average</b>	<b>0.47</b>

## 4.2 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Site observations and vehicle ownership information has been obtained for previous studies that are representative of the subject site. All study sites are rental and in representative context (i.e. location, access to transportation options) as the subject site. See Table 2. Results suggest average parking demand is 0.49 vehicles per unit and average vehicle ownership information is 0.50 vehicles per unit. Applied to the subject site, this results in approximately six resident vehicles.

TABLE 2. PARKING DEMAND FROM PREVIOUS STUDIES

Area	Observations	Vehicle Ownership
North Park <sup>1</sup>	0.56 vehicles per unit	0.53 vehicles per unit
Oak Bay <sup>2</sup>	0.54 vehicles per unit	0.61 vehicles per unit
Outside of Downtown/North Park <sup>3</sup>	0.39 vehicles per unit	0.37 vehicles per unit
Victoria West <sup>4</sup>	0.46 vehicles per unit	0.49 vehicles per unit
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.49 vehicles per unit</b>	<b>0.50 vehicles per unit</b>

<sup>1</sup> Previous parking study completed in 2012 on North Park Street

<sup>2</sup> "The Clive" - See [http://www.theclive.ca/pdfs/Clive%20Oak%20Bay%20Parking%20Study\\_FINAL\\_Feb4.pdf](http://www.theclive.ca/pdfs/Clive%20Oak%20Bay%20Parking%20Study_FINAL_Feb4.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> "The Azzurro" - previous parking study completed in 2014 on Blanshard Street for affordable housing. Sites selected may have a lower parking demand

<sup>4</sup> "Wilson's Walk" - previous parking study completed in 2014 on Wilson Street for affordable housing

## 5.0 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Transportation demand management (TDM) is the application of strategies and policies to influence individual travel choice, most commonly to reduce single-occupant vehicle travel. TDM measures should adopted be where possible to enhance travel options, minimize parking demand, and facilitate sustainable transportation.

The following summarizes the TDM options that are proposed and estimated impact of each in reducing parking demand.

### 5.1 CARSHARE

As discussed in Section 2.1, the subject site has immediate access a dedicated MODO carshare parking space / vehicle on Balmoral Road. The site plan identifies an on-site resident parking space for a MODO carshare vehicle in the future, should the on-street space be removed. The vehicle will be purchased by the proponent and memberships (valued at \$500 each) will be provided to each unit. Residents will be responsible for usage fees. With immediate access to a carshare vehicle, it is anticipated that carsharing will reduce resident parking demand.

Research has shown that carsharing programs have a significant impact on reducing vehicle ownership and thereby lowering parking demand. Below is a summary of key findings:

- One of the most comprehensive North American studies to date surveyed 6,281 households in carsharing organizations across the continent. The study found a statistically significant decrease in average vehicle ownership from 0.47 to 0.24 vehicles per household among households that joined carshare services, an approximately 50% reduction in vehicle ownership<sup>6</sup>.
- A study of carshare programs in the City of Toronto found that vehicle ownership rates at condominium sites without carshare vehicles was 1.07 vehicles per unit, whereas buildings with one or more carshare vehicles had significantly lower rates at 0.53 vehicles per unit, which represents a 50% reduction in vehicle ownership rates<sup>7</sup>.
- A 2013 study from the City of Toronto looked at the relationship between the presence of carsharing in a residential building and its impact on vehicle ownership. This was one of the first studies to examine this relationship at the building level as previous research explored impacts at the neighbourhood or city level. The study surveyed residents of buildings with and without dedicated carshare vehicles. According to the author's

<sup>6</sup> Martin & Shaheen. (2011). The Impact of Carsharing on Household Vehicle Ownership. Access Magazine, Spring 2011. Available online at: [http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/carshare/access38\\_carsharing\\_ownership.pdf](http://sfpark.org/wp-content/uploads/carshare/access38_carsharing_ownership.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> City of Toronto. (2009). Parking Standards Review: Examination of Potential Options and Impacts of Car Share Programs on Parking Standards. Available online at: [https://www1.toronto.ca/city\\_of\\_toronto/city\\_planning/zoning\\_environment/files/pdf/car\\_share\\_2009-04-02.pdf](https://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/city_planning/zoning_environment/files/pdf/car_share_2009-04-02.pdf)

are provided and a vehicle easily accessible, and a similar reduction of 5-10% is recommended in *Parking Management Best Practices*<sup>16</sup>.

Residents of the subject site will have access to a Modo carshare vehicle and provided with free memberships. Given the research and discussion above, it is recommended that resident parking demand will be reduced by 15% (i.e. one vehicle) as a result of proximity to the carshare vehicle and free membership.

## 5.2 PUBLIC TRANSIT

The subject site is well served by public transit, as follows:

- The subject site is located within walking distance of bus stops on Pandora Avenue (approximately 260m from westbound bus stops and 370m from eastbound bus stops). These stops are served by the no.27 – Gordon Head / Downtown and no.28 – Majestic / Downtown frequent routes, as well as the no.1, no.2, no.24<sup>17</sup>, and no.25<sup>13</sup> local routes.
- The no.6 – Royal Oak / Downtown route offers service between downtown Victoria and Royal Oak. Bus stops on Quadra Street are approximately 180m from the subject site.
- Bus stops on Douglas Street are approximately 600m from the subject site, providing access to an additional nine transit routes with service throughout Greater Victoria.

A transit pass subsidy is proposed to facilitate transit use among residents. The proposal is to commit funds to fully subsidize one monthly transit pass for each unit over a period of three years (396 monthly passes)<sup>18</sup>. In the event that not all committed monthly passes have been acquired after three years, remaining funds will be made available to residents to purchase monthly passes beyond the three-year timeframe up to amount of the total committed budget. Uptake on similar transit pass programs has been in the range of 20%, suggesting that subsidized passes will likely be available to residents that request them well beyond the three-year timeframe. The proponent and City may wish to agree on a mechanism to commit the identified funds and ensure the program is administered as proposed.

Studies<sup>19</sup> have found that sites with transit access and free transit passes experience approximately 10% reduced parking demand (one study suggests 5-10%, another 11%). Accordingly, it is recommended that resident parking demand will be reduced by 10%, or one vehicle (0.7, rounded) as a result of the free transit pass and proximity to transit service.


<sup>16</sup> T Litman, *Parking Management Best Practices*, American Planning Association, 2007

<sup>17</sup> Eastbound only (westbound routes via Yates Street)

<sup>18</sup> Total contribution estimated at approximately \$52,000 assuming \$85 monthly pass rate. Proponent may negotiate reduced rate with BC Transit through Developer Pass Program.

<sup>19</sup> Bort, J., *Reforming Parking Policies to Support Smart Growth, Parking Best Practices & Strategies for Supporting Transit Oriented Development*, 2007; and Tumlin, J., *Tools for Creating Vibrant, Health, and Resilient Communities*, Transportation Planning, 2012

MAP 2. ON-STREET PARKING SUPPLY + RESTRICTIONS



## 6.1 ON-STREET PARKING SUPPLY

A total of 243 spaces were observed. The 38 parking spaces directly adjacent the site on Balmoral Road (between Quadra Street and Vancouver Street) are restricted for a maximum stay of 2 hours from 9:00am to 6:00pm, Monday to Saturday. The majority of parking that was observed has either a 1- or 2-hour time restriction Monday to Saturday daytime, with the exception of residential permit parking adjacent specific residential properties.

## 6.2 ON-STREET PARKING CONDITIONS

On-street parking conditions were considered over seven observation periods. A summary of observations is provided in [Appendix B](#). Observation periods were as follows:

- Saturday October 17 at 8:15pm
- Sunday October 18 at 2:00pm
- Monday October 19 at 8:00pm
- Wednesday October 21 at 9:30pm
- Sunday October 25 at 2:00pm
- Tuesday November 17 at 10:30am<sup>21</sup>
- Thursday November 19 at 2:00pm<sup>8</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Observation area limited to immediately adjacent the subject site – Balmoral Street from Quadra St to Vancouver St (both sides)

## 7.0 SUMMARY

The proposed development is for a four-storey residential rental building with 11 units. The proposed parking supply is five spaces; 9 spaces less than the City's parking requirement.

Expected peak resident parking demand was determined to be seven vehicles based on vehicle ownership information from representative sites and previous studies. A significant TDM program is proposed (see below) that is expected to reduce resident parking demand by two vehicles. Peak visitor parking demand is expected to be one additional vehicle. The total site parking demand is anticipated to be eight vehicles, three more than the proposed supply.

The site is expected to contribute one resident vehicle to on-street parking during the residential peak period (evenings, weekends). On-street parking on the block of Balmoral Road immediately adjacent the subject site could accommodate the expected spillover at approximately 58% occupancy (16 vacant spaces), and would not prevent others in the neighbourhood from accessing available parking. On-street parking on Balmoral Road was observed near full occupancy during weekday daytime periods when site parking demand will be met by on-site parking supply. Parking spaces must be "shared" in order to be utilized by all site users.

A comprehensive TDM program is proposed to enhance sustainable travel options and support reduced parking demand. TDM options include a Modo carshare vehicle on-site with memberships provided for each unit; monetary contribution for monthly transit passes for each unit over a three-year period; 1.4 secure bike parking spaces per unit; a free bicycle for each unit; and a travel information package provided at move-in. The TDM provisions are expected to reduce resident parking demand by approximately 25% (2 vehicles).

## 7.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should commit to adopting the proposed TDM provisions, especially the carshare vehicle / memberships and transit passes, which are expected to reduce parking demand by 25%;
2. Parking demand is expected to exceed off-street parking supply by one vehicle during weekday evenings and weekends; and
3. The addition of one vehicle to adjacent on-street parking will not negatively impact the ability for others to access available parking.



- ① 2310 Quadra Street
- ② 1110 Queens Avenue
- ③ 1017 Queens Avenue
- ④ 1020 Pembroke Street
- ⑤ 1035 North Park Street

- ⑥ 1630 Quadra Street
- ⑦ 975 Balmoral Road
- ⑧ 1635 Cook Street
- ⑨ 1022 Pandora Avenue
- ⑩ 1130 Pandora Avenue

On-Street Parking Observations  
953 Balmoral Road Parking Study

Section	Side	Restrictions	No. Parking Stalls	Saturday October 17, 8:15pm		Sunday October 18, 2:00pm		Monday October 19, 8:00pm		Wednesday October 21, 9:30pm		Sunday October 25, 2:00pm	
				Observed Vehicles	Occupancy Rate	Observed Vehicles	Occupancy Rate	Observed Vehicles	Occupancy Rate	Observed Vehicles	Occupancy Rate	Observed Vehicles	Occupancy Rate
North Park Street, Quadra to Vancouver	N	1 Hour, 8am-6pm, Mon-Sat	19	9	47%	11	58%	9	47%	5	26%	11	58%
	S		21	10	48%	12	57%	11	52%	12	57%	6	29%
North Park Street, Vancouver to Cook	N	2 Hour, 9am-6pm, Mon-Sat	19	9	47%	10	53%	6	32%	10	53%	4	21%
	S		22	9	41%	11	50%	7	32%	10	45%	8	36%
Balmoral Road, Quadra to Vancouver	N	2 Hour, 9am-6pm, Mon-Sat	20	10	50%	9	45%	5	25%	11	55%	9	45%
	S		18	7	39%	12	67%	8	44%	10	56%	10	56%
Balmoral Road, Vancouver to Cook	N	2 Hour, 9am-6pm, Mon-Sat	20	11	55%	9	45%	6	30%	6	30%	9	45%
	S		18	7	39%	13	72%	9	50%	8	44%	11	61%
Mason Street, Quadra to Vancouver	N	2 Hour, 9am-6pm, Mon-Sat	17	8	47%	6	35%	11	65%	9	53%	8	47%
		Residential Parking Permit	5	4	80%	5	100%	3	60%	7	140%	3	60%
	S	2 Hour, 9am-6pm, Mon-Sat	16	10	63%	8	50%	10	63%	11	69%	14	88%
Mason Street, Vancouver to Cook	N	Residential Parking Permit	6	2	33%	4	67%	4	67%	5	83%	5	83%
		2 Hour, 9am-6pm, Mon-Sat	18	11	61%	9	50%	11	61%	9	50%	10	56%
	S												
Vancouver Street, North Park to Balmoral	E	1 Hour, 8am-6pm, Mon-Sat	11	8	73%	4	36%	5	45%	3	27%	4	36%
	W												
Vancouver Street, Balmoral to Mason	E	1 Hour, 8am-6pm, Mon-Sat	5	3	60%	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	2	40%
	W												
Vancouver Street, Mason to Pandora	E	1 Hour, 8am-6pm, Mon-Sat	8	6	75%	5	63%	4	50%	0	0%	4	50%
	W												
Total Occupancy			243	124	51%	131	54%	111	46%	116	48%	118	49%

ADDENDUM D

September 8, 2017

Sasha Kvakic  
9-103 Wilson Street  
Victoria, BC  
V9A 6X1

Victoria City Mayor and Council  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, BC  
V8W 1P6

Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to register my enthusiastic support for the proposed redevelopment of 953 Balmoral Road. In the midst of a housing crisis driven by record low vacancy rates the city can ill afford to miss the opportunity to improve an underutilized space and add new rental housing units to the local market.

The only issue I have with the project is its reduced size from the originally proposed 6 story, 17 unit building down to 4 stories and 11 units. The public interest lies with encouraging the most socially responsible use of this property, which in this case is as affordable rental housing; the more units the better. Neither the current nor the original proposal are out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood, which is transitioning from a rough mix of light industrial/commercial, surface parking, and aging single family housing stock to a vibrant urban residential district on the edge of downtown. I hope that the city will embrace the opportunity presented by this project to improve the North Park neighbourhood for future generations.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Sasha Kvakic', written in dark ink.

Sasha Kvakic

ADDENDUM E

**953 Balmoral Road**

Which purpose-built workforce rental apartment building do you prefer and why?

Open Discussion with the Developer at Parsonage Café on Saturday 05 August 2017 at 10AM



17 units over six floors, includes three, 3-bedroom units on the top two floors



11 units over four floors

## NORTH PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION

### Minutes of Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) Meeting June 7, 2017

#### **Present:**

Board members: Pam Hartling, Christopher Fleming, Penny Bond,

Members: Michael Rowe, Lori Nielson, Anne Moon, Stacey Ness, Anthony Colyn, Julie Poskitt, Gillian Hurwood (Girl Guide House), Jim Harlick (represented by proxy Steve Blumberg)

Guests: Curtis Knichel, Tommy Ngo, Jim Aalders (HDR CEI Architecture); Carly Abrahams, Biki Kang (Kang & Gill Construction); Rajinder Sahota (Method Built Homes); Kevin DeCoste, Lucy Poskitt, Michele Blumberg, Steve Blumberg, Helene Beaudvin, Holly Rockery, Nona Dyck

**Call to Order:** Christopher Fleming, NPNA CALUC Co-chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

#### **Process:**

This meeting will present two land use proposals, with one hour allotted to each. The developer will present the proposal, then the floor will be open for questions and discussion. The NPNA secretary will record the minutes of the meeting. After the conclusion of the meeting, NPNA's Land Use Committee will write a separate letter to the City for each proposal reporting on decisions and recommendations from the meeting; the minutes will accompany this letter. The NPNA letters and minutes will be sent to all NPNA members and to those who were guests at the meeting.

Based on the conclusions from the meeting, the developer would send modified plans to the City.

Individuals who have particular opinions about the development proposal may send their own letters to the City.

#### **A. Proposal:**

**926 - 932 Pandora Ave. — Kang & Gill Construction;  
HDR CEI Architecture Associates**

##### **1. Presentation**

- The Pandora Ave. side of the proposal is for the maximum height permitted by the Official Community Plan (OCP):
  - 30 m. on Pandora Ave. (10 storeys); 20 m. on Mason St. (six storeys)
- Current zoning is CA-1 (up to 15.5 m. or 5 storeys); OCP supports up to 10 storeys. This development, as planned, would create a site specific zone.
- There are 147 units: studio; several versions of 1-bedroom; 2-bedroom; and 3-bedroom to level 8.
- Level 9 has a common rooftop garden.

- Levels 9 and 10 have the larger suites.
- Floor to space ratio (FSR) is 4.78
- There will be maintenance of good light and view for everybody.
- Plan includes better street right of way on Mason St.
- Five townhouses on Mason St. respond to same landscape as existing houses on the north side of the street. Townhouses are two storeys with patio and second floor balcony.
- Building mass is broken up into three components of differing configuration.
- There is a strict set of rules. The developer is working with City Planning.
- Building is L-shaped with a courtyard on Mason St., heights stepping back from six to 10 storeys from Mason towards Pandora.
- Main entrance on Mason St. has landscaping, courtyard.
  - Secondary access to entry lobby by exterior walkway from Pandora Ave.
- Common amenity room for all tenants adjacent to entry lobby.
- Bylaw dictates that traffic access and egress must be on the less busy street, which is Mason St.
- Underground parking is on two levels with 81 residential stalls; seven commercial.
- First floor is commercial space.
- Coloured glass on outer aspect of west side stairwell echoes stained glass in the many churches in the area.
- There will be a direct access point to the Pandora bike lane.

## 2. Q&A

Q: Is the building all strata?

A: Yes.

Q: Does it include low cost accommodation?

A: Not at this point.

Q: Shadowing of Mason St. is a concern. How much shadow will fall on the north side of the street?

A: A shadow study was done and will be made available.

Q: The building is "monstrously tall". It will negatively affect quality of life of the houses on Mason St. Shadow, noise, night-time deliveries are great concerns.

A: Commercial loading zone, including garbage collection, is in place on Pandora. The plan is to maintain a quiet, pleasant atmosphere.

Q: Traffic flow is a major concern in the vicinity of St. John's Church. There is a fear of being clogged with cars. Additionally, access off Mason St. removes the "eyes on

the street” on the Pandora side, which is a sociological concern. People who live in the building should have a connection to Pandora Ave.

A: Commercial activity all day, and the height of the units will provide eyes on the street. People who live or do business in the building are more likely to travel southward towards Pandora and downtown, rather than away from Pandora.

Q: Drug activity nearby is a concern.

A: The building is solidly commercial on ground level, which should prevent activity from sprawling across Pandora. Our Place is good about engaging and working with the developers.

Q: What impact will the building have on the neighbourhood during construction, in terms of noise, dust, etc? This already is a problem with current construction in the next block.

A: The developers are doing their best to control this aspect of construction. They will try to keep the bulk of the work towards Pandora, not Mason. Due to many factors, it is hard to know when construction will start. The proposal requires full re-zoning, requiring public hearing, so it may take some time for approval of the project.

Q: Does it have to be built to the maximum height?

A: Zoning is in place but looking at the OCP, development is supported for up to 10 storeys. Looking at the long-term vision, there likely will be further development with maximum allowable height all along this block of Pandora. The developer is trying to be sensitive to Mason St. by stepping the height. They will do shadow studies of both the current and proposed heights.

Comment: Victoria Conservatory of Music (VCM) is appreciative of developers looking to improve the neighbourhood. VCM is supportive of these plans.

Q: What materials will be used?

A: Glass, brick on lower floors, south-facing metal screens, wood soffit (overhang). There is an effort to complement the VCM stone.

Q: What will be the impact on the street itself on the Mason St. side?

A: No changes at the stop signs. The street will be widened. There is no talk of changing the parking limits.

## **B. Proposal**

### **953 Balmoral Rd. — Method Built Homes**

This proposal originally was presented to NPNA on July 28, 2016.

#### **1. Original Proposal:**

- The property at 953 Balmoral currently is a 7,200 sq.ft empty lot.
- Zoning is R2 (duplex). The developer is seeking zoning change to R3 (multiple dwelling).
- The proposal is for a purpose-built rental building with six storeys.
  - The building itself takes up one-third of the site.
  - There are 17 units — six one-bedroom, 10 two-bedroom, one three-bedroom.
  - There are five vehicle parking stalls.
  - Each residential unit has storage for two bicycles.
  - There is one parking stall for a Modo car share vehicle, located at the front of the building. Each residential unit would have, in perpetuity, a Modo membership acquired by the developer.
- Affordability is directly relational to amenities.
  - This building offers Modo car share, bike stalls, proximity to downtown, green roof.

## 2. Possible Revision:

Since originally proposal last year, which was not supported due to height and limited number of parking stalls, the market has changed and it is more feasible now to revise to a four storey plan.

## 3. Q & A:

Q: What is the building's relationship to Pacifica Housing?

A: The developer is on the board of Pacifica Housing. Pacifica interest in another Method Built project on North Park St. fell through.

Q: What is the size of the one-bedroom suites?

A: 500 - 600 sq.ft.

Q: Is this the same as last year's proposal?

A: Yes, but market rents change all the time and a subsequent change has made reducing height to four storeys more feasible.

Q: If the height is reduced to four storeys will the building cover more land?

A: No, the number of units would be reduced with no change in the footprint.

Q: There is a lack of space between the back of the building, where the parking is situated, and the neighbouring house on Mason St. This causes a privacy issue. Could there be a green wall to visually separate the two properties?

A: As information, the similar North Park St. building has been rented since January 2017 and not many tenants need or use the parking. However, the city insists on a certain number of stalls.

The OCP guidelines mean that there will be density. The plan has tried to maintain as much set-back as possible. The units are stepped back from the decks and would not permit vision into neighbours' homes. The decks themselves are small and more for air circulation than occupation.

Q: Can LEED standards be looked at as a possibility?

A: What LEED offered as progressive in 2012 has been incorporated into the building code. About two-thirds of LEED standards now are in the building code. Further such progress is happening.

Comment: A neighbour who opposed the original proposal would be happy with the four storey option.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Recorder: Penny Bond, NPNA Secretary

**Record of the North Park Land Use Committee Public Meeting**  
*August 15, 2017*

Raj Sahota, on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017, presented Method Built Homes' four-storey revision of their proposal for 953 Balmoral Rd. A similar six-storey proposal by Method Built Homes was presented to the North Park community in June 2017, but since the application submitted to the City of Victoria was a four-storey building, a second community meeting was held.

There was not a lot of concern with the building specifically, other than a comment that exterior of the building should be of good quality; the discussion largely focussed on the grounds surrounding the building. It was proposed that any hard surface that surrounds the building should be permeable, which Mr. Sahota was supportive of. There were questions as to whether five parking stalls would be sufficient for the building, to which Raj stated that the target demographic for the units would be carless, either utilizing the Modo ride sharing stall or the ample bike stalls in the building.

There were several questions about the landscape design of the proposal, to which Raj stated that the landscape designs had not be finalized yet, but there would be a landscape company maintaining the property. There was support for a green wall along the permeable hard surfaces to shield the adjacent properties from the parking area as well as a wish to retain a line of trees along the back property line. There was also concern about the root system of a chestnut tree that may or may not be a part of the back of the 953 Balmoral property. In addition, due to a lot of trespassing taking place in the neighbourhood, there was a request that any fence, as a part of the green wall, not be climbable.

Raj anticipated that the build time would be roughly 18 months, and that the property during construction would be monitored by video but would not be patrolled. It was estimated that the rents for the one-bedroom would be \$1,200 a month and the two-bedroom was estimated to \$1,525, although the rents would depend on the market at the time of rental.



Chris Fleming  
Co-Chair  
North Park Land Use Committee



Talbot Mackenzie & Associates  
Consulting Arborists

# **953 Balmoral Rd, Victoria**

## **Construction Impact Assessment & Tree Preservation Plan**

PREPARED FOR: Method Built Homes Inc.  
The Garage  
4566 Cordova Bay Road  
Victoria BC  
V8X 3V5

PREPARED BY: Talbot, Mackenzie & Associates  
Tom Talbot – Consulting Arborist  
ISA Certified # PN-0211A  
TRAQ – Qualified

Noah Borges – Consulting Arborist  
ISA Certified # PN-8409A

DATE OF ISSUANCE: January 29, 2018

Box 48153 RPO - Uptown Victoria, BC V8Z 7H6  
Ph: (250) 479-8733  
Fax: (250) 479-7050  
Email: tmtreehelp@gmail.com



## Talbot Mackenzie & Associates

Consulting Arborists

Jobsite Property: 953 Balmoral Rd, Victoria  
Date of Site Visit: January 19, 2018  
Site Conditions: Empty residential lot. No construction activity present.

**Summary:** One (1) Horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*) tree on the east neighbour's property may be impacted by the proposed construction. The impacts to the tree's health will be minor if our recommended mitigation measures are followed, namely that a floating driveway be constructed where the proposed parking stalls overlap with the tree's critical root zone. Small roots are expected to be encountered during excavation at the southeast corner of the building. Pruning will also be required to lift the lower canopy above the nearest parking stall and may be required for clearance for building construction.

**Scope of Assignment:** To inventory the existing bylaw protected trees and any trees on neighbouring properties that could be potentially impacted by construction or that are within 3 meters of the property line. Review the proposal to construct an 11 unit building with 5 parking stalls, and comment on how construction activity may impact existing trees. Prepare a tree retention and construction damage mitigation plan for those trees deemed suitable to retain given the proposed impacts.

**Methodology:** We visually examined the trees on the property and prepared an inventory in the attached Tree Resource Spreadsheet. Each by-law protected tree was identified using a numeric metal tag attached to its lower trunk. Municipal trees and neighbours' trees were not tagged. Information such as tree species, DBH (1.4m), crown spread, critical root zone (CRZ), health, structure, and relative tolerance to construction impacts were included in the inventory. The by-law protected trees with their identification numbers were labelled on the attached Site Plan. The conclusions reached were based on the information provided within the attached plans from Coast + Beam.

**Limitations:** No exploratory excavations have been requested and thus the conclusions reached are based solely on our visual examination, critical root zone calculations and our best judgement using our experience and expertise. However, the location, size and density of roots are often difficult to predict without exploratory excavations and thus root growth larger than anticipate may be encountered. The tree is however located a sufficient distance from the tree that roots that are encountered within the building footprint can be pruned without having a detrimental impact on the tree. It will be necessary to raise the parking grade to avoid the loss of critical root structures.

**Summary of Tree Resource:** One tree was inventoried, a 52/99 cm Horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*) on the east neighbouring property (959 Balmoral Rd). The tree is in good health but has a number of structural deficiencies (e.g. previously topped, weak and narrow unions, decay in its scaffold limbs).

**Trees to be Removed:** No trees will require removal as a result of the proposed construction.

**Potential Impacts on Trees to be Retained and Mitigation Measures**

- **Building Footprint:** The Horse chestnut is approximately 6.5m from the southeast corner of the proposed building. Provided 1m of additional working room, excavation will occur in only one quadrant of the tree's root zone about 5.5m from the base of the tree. At this distance, we anticipate there are likely to be roots encountered, but the health impacts should be minor, as the roots are likely to be small and the majority of the tree's critical root zone will remain undisturbed.
- **Parking Stalls:** We estimate the nearest parking stall will be located approximately 3m from the base of the Horse chestnut tree. In order to preserve the tree's critical roots, a portion of the parking area will have to be elevated. Where the parking stalls overlap with the tree's CRZ, we recommend constructing a floating parking area. If the parking area is not elevated, several large structural roots are likely to be damaged resulting in a significant decline in the tree's health. The "floating parking area" specifications are attached. The objective is to avoid any excavation resulting in root loss and to instead raise the base layer of the paved surface above the roots to be preserved. This may result in the grade of the parking stalls being 15-30cm above the existing grade (depending on how close roots are to the surface of the existing grade). It may also mean that some of the A horizon soil layer (rich in organic material and roots) will be left intact below the driveway.

To allow sufficient water to drain into the root systems below, we would also recommend that the parking stalls not be made of solid concrete or asphalt. Instead the surface should be made of a permeable material such as permeable asphalt, paving stones, Gravelpave, Grasscrete, or Grasspave. An arborist should be on site to supervise any excavation within the tree's CRZ.

- **Landscaping:** According to the landscape plans provided, pavers are to be installed in the area between the proposed building and parking stalls. If the area within the tree's critical root zone cannot be retained as is or designed with 'softscape' elements, we recommend the pavers be permeable to maximize water percolation to the tree's roots. The grade of these pavers must also be installed in a manner that limits excavation below the existing site grade.
- **Pruning:** The tree's canopy extends 4-5m over the property line and approximately 7m north towards the proposed building. The tree's crown extends nearly to ground level. Pruning will be required for clearance above the parking lot and may be required for clearance for the building construction, but such pruning should not significantly impact the tree's health or stability.

- **Barrier fencing:** The areas surrounding the trees to be retained should be isolated from the construction activity by erecting protective barrier fencing. Where possible, the fencing should be erected at the perimeter of the critical root zones. On this site, the entire designate critical root zone area that is outside the building footprint should be protected by erecting barrier fencing including the area designate for parking. This fencing can be relocated at the direction of the project arborist at the time the floating parking area is constructed. The barrier fencing must be a minimum of 4 feet in height, of solid frame construction that is attached to wooden or metal posts. A solid board or rail must run between the posts at the top and the bottom of the fencing. This solid frame can then be covered with plywood, or flexible snow fencing. The fencing must be erected prior to the start of any construction activity on site (i.e. demolition, excavation, construction), and remain in place through completion of the project. Signs should be posted around the protection zone to declare it off limits to all construction related activity. The project arborist must be consulted before this fencing is removed or moved for any purpose.
- **Arborist Supervision:** All excavation occurring within the critical root zones of protected trees should be completed under supervision by the project arborist. Any roots encountered must be pruned back to sound tissue to reduce wound surface area and encourage rapid compartmentalization of the wound. In particular, the following activities should be completed under the direction of the project arborist:
  - Any excavation within the critical root zone of horsechestnut NT1.
- **Methods to avoid soil compaction:** In areas where construction traffic must encroach into the critical root zones of trees to be retained, efforts must be made to reduce soil compaction where possible by displacing the weight of machinery and foot traffic. This can be achieved by one of the following methods:
  - Installing a layer of hog fuel or coarse wood chips at least 20 cm in depth and maintaining it in good condition until construction is complete.
  - Placing medium weight geotextile cloth over the area to be used and installing a layer of crushed rock to a depth of 15 cm over top.
  - Placing two layers of 19mm plywood.
  - Placing steel plates.
- **Irrigation Systems:** The installation of any in-ground irrigation system must take into account the critical root zones of the trees to be retained. Prior to installation, we recommend the irrigation technician consult with the project arborist about the most suitable locations for the irrigation lines and how best to mitigate the impacts on the trees to be retained. This may require the project arborist supervise the excavations associated with installing the irrigation system. Excessive frequent irrigation and irrigation which wets the trunks of trees can have a detrimental impact on tree health and can lead to root and trunk decay.
- **Arborist Role:** It is the responsibility of the client or his/her representative to contact the project arborist for the purpose of:
  - Locating the barrier fencing

Talbot Mackenzie & Associates

- Reviewing the report with the project foreman or site supervisor
  - Locating work zones, where required
  - Supervising any excavation within the critical root zones of trees to be retained
  - Reviewing and advising of any pruning requirements for machine clearances
- **Review and site meeting:** Once the project receives approval, it is important that the project arborist meet with the principals involved in the project to review the information contained herein. It is also important that the arborist meet with the site foreman or supervisor before any demolition, site clearing or other construction activity occurs.

Please do not hesitate to call us at (250) 479-8733 should you have any further questions. Thank you.

Yours truly,  
Talbot Mackenzie & Associates  
ISA Certified Consulting Arborists

Encl. 1-page tree resource spreadsheet, 1-page site plan with trees, 4-page building plans, 1-page landscape plans, 1-page floating driveway specifications, 1-page barrier fencing specifications

**Disclosure Statement**

Arborists are professionals who examine trees and use their training, knowledge and experience to recommend techniques and procedures that will improve their health and structure or to mitigate associated risks.

Trees are living organisms, whose health and structure change, and are influenced by age, continued growth, climate, weather conditions, and insect and disease pathogens. Indicators of structural weakness and disease are often hidden within the tree structure or beneath the ground. It is not possible for an Arborist to identify every flaw or condition that could result in failure or can he/she guarantee that the tree will remain healthy and free of risk.

Remedial care and mitigation measures recommended are based on the visible and detectable indicators present at the time of the examination and cannot be guaranteed to alleviate all symptoms or to mitigate all risk posed.

January 19, 2018

953 Balmoral Rd  
Tree Resource


Tag	Common Name	Latin Name	DBH (cm)	CRZ (m)	Crown Spread (m)	Health	Structure	Relative Tolerance	Remarks and Recommendations
NT1	Horse chestnut	<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>	99, 52	13	13	Good	Fair/poor	Good	Neighbour's tree. 1m from root collar to property line. Topped. Weak and narrow unions. Decay in scaffold limbs.

Prepared by:  
Talbot Mackenzie & Associates  
ISA Certified, and Consulting Arborists  
Phone: (250) 479-8733  
Fax: (250) 479-7050  
email: Treehelp@telus.net

Site Plan Of:

Lot 15, Suburban Lot 9, Victoria City.

Except That Part In Parcel A (DD 209667i).




Scale = 1:250

This document is prepared for municipal purposes only.

Dated this 3rd day of March, 2015.

Distances and elevations shown are in metres.

Elevations are geodetic and referenced from OCM 16-138.




Wey Mayenburg Land Surveying Inc.

[www.weysurveys.com](http://www.weysurveys.com)

#4-2227 James White Boulevard  
Sidney, BC V8L 1Z5

Telephone (250) 656-5155

File: 150053\SIT\BM








PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE	
Zone identifier	5-2 (DOWDLE PARKWAY PROJECT)
Proposed project or use name	RENOVATION
Project name, title, year project	1998-2000
Owner	CHS, INC.
Total floor area (sq ft)	200,000
Conversion of floor area (sq ft)	200,000
Floor space uses	100,000-150,000
Construction (sq ft)	100,000-150,000
Other uses (sq ft)	100,000-150,000
Number of buildings	12
Number of stories	4
Permitted total floor area (sq ft)	60
Permitted parking spaces (Class 1 and Class 2)	Class 1-101 Class 2-2
Building setbacks (ft)	
Front yard	2.5m
Side yard	30.0m
Back yard (detached units only)	EXIST 15.0m
Back yard (detached units only)	EXIST 2.64m
Detached side yards	2.5m
Permitted setbacks (m)	
Front	11
Side	9-10-12-13-14-15-16-17-18-19-20-21-22-23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30-31-32-33-34-35-36-37-38-39-40-41-42-43-44-45-46-47-48-49-50-51-52-53-54-55-56-57-58-59-60-61-62-63-64-65-66-67-68-69-70-71-72-73-74-75-76-77-78-79-80-81-82-83-84-85-86-87-88-89-90-91-92-93-94-95-96-97-98-99-100-101-102-103-104-105-106-107-108-109-110-111-112-113-114-115-116-117-118-119-120-121-122-123-124-125-126-127-128-129-130-131-132-133-134-135-136-137-138-139-140-141-142-143-144-145-146-147-148-149-150-151-152-153-154-155-156-157-158-159-160-161-162-163-164-165-166-167-168-169-170-171-172-173-174-175-176-177-178-179-180-181-182-183-184-185-186-187-188-189-190-191-192-193-194-195-196-197-198-199-200-201-202-203-204-205-206-207-208-209-210-211-212-213-214-215-216-217-218-219-220-221-222-223-224-225-226-227-228-229-230-231-232-233-234-235-236-237-238-239-240-241-242-243-244-245-246-247-248-249-250-251-252-253-254-255-256-257-258-259-260-261-262-263-264-265-266-267-268-269-270-271-272-273-274-275-276-277-278-279-280-281-282-283-284-285-286-287-288-289-290-291-292-293-294-295-296-297-298-299-300-301-302-303-304-305-306-307-308-309-310-311-312-313-314-315-316-317-318-319-320-321-322-323-324-325-326-327-328-329-330-331-332-333-334-335-336-337-338-339-340-341-342-343-344-345-346-347-348-349-350-351-352-353-354-355-356-357-358-359-360-361-362-363-364-365-366-367-368-369-370-371-372-373-374-375-376-377-378-379-380-381-382-383-384-385-386-387-388-389-390-391-392-393-394-395-396-397-398-399-400-401-402-403-404-405-406-407-408-409-410-411-412-413-414-415-416-417-418-419-420-421-422-423-424-425-426-427-428-429-430-431-432-433-434-435-436-437-438-439-440-441-442-443-444-445-446-447-448-449-450-451-452-453-454-455-456-457-458-459-460-461-462-463-464-465-466-467-468-469-470-471-472-473-474-475-476-477-478-479-480-481-482-483-484-485-486-487-488-489-490-491-492-493-494-495-496-497-498-499-500-501-502-503-504-505-506-507-508-509-510-511-512-513-514-515-516-517-518-519-520-521-522-523-524-525-526-527-528-529-530-531-532-533-534-535-536-537-538-539-540-541-542-543-544-545-546-547-548-549-550-551-552-553-554-555-556-557-558-559-560-561-562-563-564-565-566-567-568-569-570-571-572-573-574-575-576-577-578-579-580-581-582-583-584-585-586-587-588-589-590-591-592-593-594-595-596-597-598-599-600-601-602-603-604-605-606-607-608-609-610-611-612-613-614-615-616-617-618-619-620-621-622-623-624-625-626-627-628-629-630-631-632-633-634-635-636-637-638-639-640-641-642-643-644-645-646-647-648-649-650-651-652-653-654-655-656-657-658-659-660-661-662-663-664-665-666-667-668-669-670-671-672-673-674-675-676-677-678-679-680-681-682-683-684-685-686-687-688-689-690-691-692-693-694-695-696-697-698-699-700-701-702-703-704-705-706-707-708-709-710-711-712-713-714-715-716-717-718-719-720-721-722-723-724-725-726-727-728-729-730-731-732-733-734-735-736-737-738-739-740-741-742-743-744-745-746-747-748-749-750-751-752-753-754-755-756-757-758-759-760-761-762-763-764-765-766-767-768-769-770-771-772-773-774-775-776-777-778-779-780-781-782-783-784-785-786-787-788-789-790-791-792-793-794-795-796-797-798-799-800-801-802-803-804-805-806-807-808-809-810-811-812-813-814-815-816-817-818-819-820-821-822-823-824-825-826-827-828-829-830-831-832-833-834-835-836-837-838-839-840-841-842-843-844-845-846-847-848-849-850-851-852-853-854-855-856-857-858-859-860-861-862-863-864-865-866-867-868-869-870-871-872-873-874-875-876-877-878-879-880-881-882-883-884-885-886-887

Average Existing Grade Calculation:  $27.5 + 27.6 + 28.3 + 28.7 = 108.3 / 4 = 27.8$  average existing grade  
Proposed Average Grade:  $27 + 27 + 27 + 27 = 108 / 4 = 27.0$  average proposed grade

# COAST + BEAM


**SITE PLAN & ROOF PLAN | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | SEPTEMBER 2017 | SCALE 1:100**




**COAST  
+ BEAM**

**FLOOR PLANS** | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | SEPTEMBER 2017 | SCALE 1:100







NORTH ELEVATION



WEST ELEVATION



SOUTH ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATION


**MATERIALS**

- ① Variable Charcoal Brick
- ② Stained Wood Siding
- ③ Stucco
- ④ Glazing
- ⑤ Screen
- ⑥ Brise Soleil

**COAST  
+ BEAM**

ELEVATIONS | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | SEPTEMBER 2017 | SCALE 1:100






**COAST  
+ BEAM**

SECTIONS | APARTMENTS @ 953 BALMORAL | SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & REZONING APPLICATION | SEPTEMBER 2017 | SCALE 1:100



[illegible]

**Diagram –Permeable paver driveway crossing over Critical Root Zone**



**Specifications for permeable paver driveway crossing over critical root zone**

1. Excavate to a 6-8 inch depth, for the required permeable driveway surface, under the supervision of an ISA Certified Arborist.
2. Excavation for area around structural roots with an Airspade or by Hydro Excavation to bearing layer of soil if required.
3. Backfill area around roots with coarse sand or a structural soil mix
4. A layer of medium weight non woven Geotextile (Nilex 4535 or similar) is to be installed over the backfilled area of the driveway.
5. Construct base layer and permeable surface over Geotextile layer to required grade.

## Leanne Taylor

---

**From:** Deanna Bhandar <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** June 7, 2018 9:03 AM  
**To:** Leanne Taylor  
**Subject:** 953 Balmoral  
**Attachments:** northpark\_959Balmoral\_17may2018.pdf

Hello Leanne,

It's just come to my attention that 953 Balmoral is on the CoW agenda today. As the new neighbour to this property, we would like to advise Council that we oppose this form of development and the impacts that it will have on the existing tenants of the affordable housing at 959 Balmoral. The proposed setbacks and height of the current proposal will all but eliminate natural light for 10 of the units on our property and it is concerning to us that no revisions to the current proposed plans were considered in relation to impacts on the neighbouring properties. As stated in the attached letter, our broader objective in purchasing 959 Balmoral was to preserve affordable housing in the downtown area and to seek out opportunities to further increase affordable housing there.

Thanks,  
Deanna

Deanna Bhandar MSc  
Director, Real Estate Development



Victoria Cool Aid Society  
T: 250. 383.1977 ext 143  
[REDACTED]  
101-749 Pandora Avenue  
Victoria, BC V8W 1N9

[www.CoolAid.org](http://www.CoolAid.org)

*Together we will end homelessness.*

Victoria Cool Aid Society acknowledges the Lekwungen and WSÁNEĆ peoples of the Songhees and Esquimalt Nations, on whose traditional territories we build homes, lives, and community. HÍSWŪE.



May 17, 2018

North Park Neighbourhood Association  
PO Box 661  
#185-911 Yates Street  
Victoria, BC V8Y 4Y9

Dear North Park Neighbourhood Association Board,

We are writing to advise the North Park Neighbourhood Association that Victoria Cool Aid Society has purchased the rental building located at 959 Balmoral. Our interest in purchasing this building came about as we feel there is a strong need to preserve affordable rental housing within the downtown area.

Cool Aid is celebrating our 50th Anniversary this year, of providing housing, health and support programs for some of our most marginalized community members. Our organization began its operations in the North Park and Fernwood neighbourhoods. In fact, Cool Aid's very first youth hostel opened its doors at 953 Balmoral in 1968 – 50 years ago!

Cool Aid intends to continue operating this building with the existing tenants, and as vacancies arise we will continue to offer affordable rents to tenants on fixed incomes.

As Cool Aid continues to operate our Next Steps housing program in the North Park neighbourhood, we are pleased to expand our relationship with the community association and look for ways to work together on housing affordability and ending homelessness.

Should you have any questions or concerns about the operations at 959 Balmoral, please don't hesitate to contact Cool Aid's manager responsible for property management, Andrew McNamara:

[Redacted] or [Redacted]

Yours sincerely,

Kathy Stinson CPA, CMA, CIHCM  
Chief Executive Officer

Copy: Council Liaison, Jeremy Loveday [jloveday@victoria.ca](mailto:jloveday@victoria.ca)  
City of Victoria Downtown Coordinator – Michael Hill [mhill@victoria.ca](mailto:mhill@victoria.ca)

*Victoria Cool Aid Society acknowledges the Lekwungen and WSÁNEĆ peoples of the Songhees and Esquimalt Nations, on whose traditional territories we build homes, lives, and community. HÍŠWŨKE*


---


Rezoning Application No. 00598  
and Development Permit with  
Variance Application No. 000506  
for 953 Balmoral Road



Subject Property – 953 Balmoral Road

---





[illegible]

## Proposed Housing Agreement

- Proposed 11 dwelling units would remain as rental housing for a 25-year term
- Rent two units 8% below market for the duration of the Housing Agreement (25 years)



## OCP Policy – “Logical Assembly of Land”

