Re: 1301 Hillside Apartment Proposal

As owners and residents of the neighborhood we have the following concerns about the proposed apartment development at 1301 Hillside Avenue.

Structure

The proposed six story height of the building is beyond the existing apartment blocks on Hillside Avenue which stand at four stories. Since this intersection has two older apartment buildings that may be replaced in the future it will set a trend for rebuilding to six stories. Although the inner city needs this housing can our neighborhood handle the potential increase at 100 suits per building in one location?

Parking

The developer is offering far less than a one-to-one parking stall arrangement. Basil Avenue and surrounding streets already carry the overfull flow from the existing apartments at Cook and Hillside that have been “grandfathered” for non-compliance with current parking requirements. We don’t believe it will be possible, or fair, to have the building owner manage tenant ownership of vehicles as a method of addressing parking requirements. The developer has said that the site cannot be excavated for parking. Is that true? How does the city know that cost is a prohibitive issue?

Egress

Cook Street and Hillside Avenue is a busy intersection. With no side street access, it’s hard to imagine how the traffic flow will not be a problem. Where in the planning process will street access be addressed?
Diversity of Tenants

Single people and families need housing. A mixed population is better for the community. How many one-bedroom and multi-bedroom units will be built?

Please include our concerns about this development to the consultation process that each of your organizations partake in.

Thank You,

Don Gourlay and Charlotte Mills
January 28, 2018

I am writing in concern of a developmental proposal by NVision Properties to build an apartment building at the corner of Hillside and Cook.

Our Basil Ave residents who live near this proposed building site met with Adam Cooper, Development Manager, along with two of his colleagues on January 23rd. They presented an architectural print of their proposed six story building that is to be built to the city property line on both Hillside and Cook streets.

Our main concerns is that they are proposing 46 apartment units with only 25 ground floor parking spaces, consisting of two visitor spots, leaving no space for maintenance vehicles. Garbage and recycling space or how it is to be picked up was not addressed.

Visitors and tenants who will be left without a parking spot will in all likelihood park on Basil Ave, which will cause us to demand resident only parking. The reality is that the majority of visitors will be driving a vehicle.

Furthermore, they propose only one entrance and exit where the bus stop is on Hillside. They have failed to provide any mention of where taxis or parcel delivery vehicles will park, which will likely cause them to park on either Cook or Hillside, blocking traffic.

In essence, their present proposal is far too large for this vacant lot, which is better suited to a house.

Regards,

Terry and Reba Emerson
1254 Basil Ave.
To Whom this May Concern,

I am going to attempt to get to the meeting on the 30th January, but if i am unable to do so due to a previous commitment, I wish to voice my concerns regarding the proposed 6 story, 46-unit rental property on the corner of Cook and Hillside in the form of this email.

First off, I am all for something being done with the empty lot on the corner of Hillside and Cook where previously, there was a Payless gas station. Now that I live in the area, I wish it were still a gas station but it appears the property is destined for other uses.

We should not allow a variance of parking stalls from 69 to 25 stalls. I deduce that the zoning by-law was developed to reduce a requirement for on street parking around multi unit dwellings. Any deviation from the by-law would simply endorse parking in and around the pre-existing neighbourhoods behind the Cridge Centre in the vicinity of Kings Street and Empire Street. As a resident of Empire Street, I am acutely aware of the careful balance between on street parking and the amount of approved Duplex homes in the area. Any variance would be a detriment to the households that enjoy the balance and the freedom of parking on the street in the vicinity of their homes. Parking will also negatively impact the amount of available parking around the ball field.

The requested variance is not even considering that each of the 46 units should have a designated parking spot. A reduction of more than 50 percent of the by-law seems very short sighted on the part of the Abstract Developments. This lack of long term considerations and implications makes me wonder if Abstract Developments has the right vision and mentality for a development of considerable size in what is, essentially, a residential neighbourhood.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Christopher Lockley, CD
2593 Empire Street
Victoria, BC
V8T 3M5
Subject: NVision Properties’ presentation and discussion regarding proposed apartment building development and construction by Abstract Development at 1301 Hillside Avenue (corner of Cook Street and Hillside Avenue).

Attending for NVision Property Management (management arm of Abstract Development): Adam Cooper – Development Manager and Principal Presenter, along with two colleagues.

Mr. Cooper outlined the proposal as expressed in documents previously distributed at other development meetings. Key points were:

1. proposed six-storey building – exact height to be determined and provided at submission stage
2. building to be all rental suites owned and operated by NVision Properties; building cannot be converted to condos for sale
3. parkade of 25 spaces at street level with five storeys of suites (46 in total) above
4. mix of bachelor, one-bedroom and two-bedroom; actual allocation is still under consideration by the developer
5. grove of oak trees to the south to have branches that are overhanging the rental property trimmed
6. traffic patterns, building access, bus stops, etc. to be determined through discussions with the City of Victoria and the developer
7. re-zoning request complies with provisions in the 2012 Official Community Plan (OCP); site currently zoned C-SS Special Service Station District

Summary of residents' points of concern and matters for further consideration at the January 30, 2018 Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) meeting.

1. Hillside corridor currently has four-storey building streetscape. Developer did not have the exact proposed building height for the six storeys in either feet or metres as it is still subject to review. Six storeys for this location was a concern.
2. Apartment density (46 units) questioned given the proposal of only 25 potential parking spaces. Developer confirmed that they are still reviewing the mix of units (bachelor, one-bedroom and two-bedroom). Residents put forward the question of whether fewer, larger units could maintain the develop-expected return on investment.
3. The issue of how many actual parking spaces would there be for residents was raised given the need for visitor parking and delivery services to the
building. Developer confirmed this matter was still under discussion as the number of spaces and their dimensions were fixed because of the inability to dig below grade according to provincial and city code and regulations.

4. It is understood that the Cook and Hillside intersection is the fifth busiest in the City of Victoria. Questions arose regarding any traffic pattern changes, the current bus stop potentially blocking access to the building as per presentation of design, the impact of planned bicycle lane on Cook St., stopping area for deliveries or taxis for residents, and current Hillside corridor use for emergency vehicles (fire, ambulance and police). Developer noted that these matters fall within city jurisdiction. All matters of legal compliance are part of the developer’s proposal acceptance and approval by the City of Victoria.

5. Residents raised question about the health and future of the oak grove at the Cridge Centre, the implication of water table changes and building shadow (related to the issue of the building’s height). The developer stated that an arborist was part of the project team, as well there is city professional involvement. Details related to these concerns should be forthcoming and will be addressed throughout the development process (Note: it is expected to be about 18 months until this development proposal is submitted for final approval).

6. Questions from residents were forthcoming concerning NVision’s approach to trying to ensure their standards for qualified, long-term tenants could be achieved. Concerns were voiced regarding experiences with transient occupiers in the neighbourhood. Mr. Cooper explained the property management approach of NVision and their commitment to wanting to be a good influence in the neighbourhood. Residents again brought forward the issue of apartment density mix, with a view to fewer, larger units. Residents felt this approach could alleviate a number of concerns – fewer apartments could mean the parking issue would be somewhat addressed; larger units could provide the possibility of longer-term tenants with reduced transient turnover, and could also provide the possibility of lowering the six-storey building height.

All parties agreed that further discussion was needed as information and details become clearer, more exact and confirmed.

The meeting broke up just after 9:00 p.m.

Terry Malone
1244 Basil Avenue
To Whom It May Concern,

On January 23 2018 at 7:00 pm, 15 neighbourhood residents and three staff from NVision Properties met at 1230 Basil Avenue to discuss NVision's proposed development at 1301 Hillside.

Basil Avenue resident Terry Malone took minutes of this meeting. Here are Mr. Malone’s minutes for your reference:

After the January 23 meeting, shared concerns by neighbourhood residents remain as follows:

-proposed height of the building is not consistent with other buildings in the area. The proposed building is significantly taller than all other buildings in the area. A building of this height may be more appropriate in a village centre. Cook and Hillside is not a village centre. Concerns were expressed that this tall building will shade Basil Avenue/Cook Street homes, or that future development on Hillside or Cook will also be at six stories if a six story building goes in at 1301 Hillside.

-density of the proposed building is out of scale with other buildings in this area. Number of potential tenants is too high for a lot of this small size, and is not consistent with other apartments and condominiums in this area. A building with this number of units may be more appropriate in the downtown core or on a larger lot.

-there is not enough vehicle parking available for the tenants and guests of this proposed building. We worry that residents and their guests will drive and park and on our street. Our street is already at capacity for parking, as tenants from the two existing rental buildings at Cook and Hillside already park on Basil Avenue, as do users of Hillside Park. We do not trust that tenants and guests of this building will be exclusively car-free, as that is not the case with the existing Cook/Hillside rental buildings with limited parking.

-vehicle ingress and egress from this building seems inadequate. Vehicles leaving this building will only have the legal option to turn east on Hillside. Traffic at this intersection is already heavy, with a significant number of motor vehicle incidents. We worry that motorists will be tempted to make the unsafe and illegal turn west onto Hillside to quickly access opportunities to travel north or south or west from the building. We also worry that vehicles may leave the building via Hillside Eastbound, left Higgins, and then turn left onto Cook from Higgins. The uncontrolled intersection of Cook and Higgins/Vista Heights is already dangerous and we do not want increased vehicle traffic turning in any direction at this intersection. We recall that the previous gas station at 1301 Hillside had vehicle ingress and egress on both Hillside and Cook, and we wonder if this may be safer for the proposed development.

Here is the list of neighbours who were in attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Anguish</td>
<td>Basil Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Clark</td>
<td>The Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy and Jens Gregson</td>
<td>Cook Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Malone</td>
<td>Basil Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don and Sue Tulloch</td>
<td>Basil Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Waterman</td>
<td>Basil Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Williams</td>
<td>1230 Basil Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Basil Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Emerson</td>
<td>Basil Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Bussey</td>
<td>Basil Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>Blackwood Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carol Williams
Jennifer Chown

The following neighbours wanted to attend but had to send their regrets:

Bruce and Sandra Murray
Shauna Yeomans
Dylan Rovere

The following staff were in attendance from NVision Properties:
Adam Cooper
Sam
Holly Carrie-Mattimoe.

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Chown
1245 Basil Avenue
Lacey Maxwell

From: LT Smith
Sent: January 30, 2018 11:42 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Development proposal at 1301 Hillside Avenue

Subject: RE: proposal changes to the current land use of 1301 Hillside.

Of the 20 proposed changes that are listed (not including the variances(s) proposed changes) the applicant is asking for changes to 11/20:

- Official community plan
- Height
- Number of storeys
- Floor area
- Site coverage
- Number of rental units
- New zone being requested
- Use of land or buildings
- Number of units/residences
- Existing trees
- Views from surrounding property

Including the variances(s) the applicant is asking for changes to 13/21:

- Number of parking spaces
- Traffic volume

That is approx. 62 percent change to 1301 Hillside land use/description/zone.

As a property owner in the community, I am not fully opposed to the development of the site; should the land on the site and under the current adjacent properties/roadways prove to be environmentally safe
from leakage of the previous gas station.

As a property owner in the community I am opposed to the height, number of rental units and residences/inadequate number of parking spaces/increased traffic flow and site coverage.

Cook Street and Hillside Avenue is a very busy corner for traffic. Inadequate parking, greater site coverage, number of rental units and residences resulting in a congested approach to the proposed site is not satisfactory.

My appreciation to the volunteers from my Community Association Land Use Committee.

Regards,

Mrs. Susan Smith/owner

2664 Blackwood Street

Victoria
Dear Sir/Madam,

Our Home is in the Hillside-Quadra Area. As long term Residents we are concerned about our Neighbourhood and would like to keep informed what is happening around us and appreciated attending the information meeting last night at Oakland's Community Centre.

We believe the proposed Building at Hillside and Cook is way too high and should not exceed 4 storeys maximum, anything above this may set a bad precedent with a "Canyon" effect. We also believe the reasons given not allowing the Developer going deeper then grade level does not seem right. While there is Bedrock close to the surface this can easily be broken up by a large Dozer (Cat) no need for Blasting. The Rock on this site is not solid (confirmed by the Lady which spoke to that) as she said, it allowed the pollutants to go deeper. Removing this Rock (and disposing of it properly) and adding a Basement Parkade would also lessen the chance the pollutants would eventually find a way into the Marine environment.

Would you please be so kind and include us in the future in you email mailings.
Thank You

Karl & Ursula Prinz
Lacey Maxwell

From: Stefik, Ron
Sent: February 9, 2018 5:15 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Marianne Alto (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor)
Subject: Development Proposal for 1301 Hillside Ave, Corner of Hillside & Cook Streets

Development Proposal for 1301 Hillside Ave, Corner of Hillside & Cook Streets

I attended a community information session on January 30th, 2018 regarding the subject proposal by Nvision Properties (Abstract Development).

My concern is with the variance request, to lower the number of parking stalls required by zoning by-laws from 69 to 25 stalls.

I am a homeowner on Empire Street, in the block behind this property. This, and several blocks in the adjacent area, are all zoned R2 Duplex. This has resulted in a high density of development, and a corresponding high density of existing vehicle street parking. Most days I have difficulty entering or leaving my driveway with my car due to this street crowding.

Residents of the proposed new apartment building at 1301 Hillside will be parking vehicles within this particular neighbourhood, as convenient to not have to cross busy Hillside or Cook. This will add further street congestion and the associated safety hazards on these narrow residential streets.

The sentiments that most residents of this new proposal will shun private vehicle ownership in favour of public transit, shared vehicle ownership, or bicycle, while admirable, are not realistic. Reduced on-site building parking will result in placing the parking burden onto already very crowded neighbouring streets, affecting safety.

Ron Stefik, Eng.L.
2548 Empire Street
To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my concern over the new development proposal put forth by Abstract developments at the corner of hillside and cook st.

I support the proposal for Abstract developments to construct a rental unit building at 1301 hillside avenue, I believe a new development on this corner will be a welcome addition to the neighbourhood. I do not support their proposal to apply for a variance to lower the number of parking stalls required. I strongly feel it is necessary to provide at least one parking spot for each rental unit built on site. There are no alternate parking areas available on this corner other than in the surrounding residential neighbourhoods. I feel if adequate parking is not provided for each tenant of this development proposal the tenant and their guests will park in adjacent neighbourhoods causing the potential for the existing adjacent residents to experience parking issues. I live in this area, two multiple suite buildings are on my street, the landlord does not provide adequate parking for his tenants and I am consistently struggling to get a parking spot in front of my home, I often experience push back and negativity when I request the person not to park their car in front of my home and driveway. This proposed building is on the corner of two very busy streets and I strongly feel providing adequate parking is essential for the surrounding residences as well as the safety for the potential new tenants of this building.

Thank you,
Cory Hewko
2724 Graham street
Victoria bc

Sent from my iPad
To Whom It May Concern,

I write to express my personal comments about the proposed development at 1301 Hillside, at the corner of Cook and Hillside, in Oaklands. At this location, Abstract Developments proposes to build a 6 storey, 46 unit rental building.

I am a homeowner within 200 meters of 1301 Hillside, at 1245 Basil Avenue, in the Hillside-Quadra neighbourhood.

I think that this is an excellent location for a rental apartment building. I like the Edwardian design and the brick facade. I like that the developer proposes suites of assorted sizes in the building.

However, I have the following concerns about the proposal:

1. A six story building is too tall for this location. A building of this height on this small lot is greatly out of scale with other buildings in the area. This building would be one of the tallest on Hillside and on Cook (north of the downtown core). A building of this height would be more appropriate downtown or in a village centre. An ample number of rental units could still be available in a shorter building. A shorter building would preserve the residential feel of the neighbourhood. A shorter building would prevent Hillside from eventually being flanked by six story buildings on both sides, creating an undesirable canyon-like environment.

2. There is no area offered in the current proposal as a loading zone for moving trucks, delivery vehicles, taxis, and other such vehicles. There is no safe space on Hillside or Cook for such vehicles, nor is there space allotted on the property at 1301 Hillside. The developer suggests that many of the tenants will be car-free; car-free tenants in particular will rely on such vehicles idling and parking at the building.

3. The developer suggests using modular units to construct the upper floors. The developer should instead contribute to the local economy by using local materials and local labour. In addition, locally made units with more local materials (as opposed to materials made and assembled offshore) can produce a higher quality of unit that will be easier to maintain and will have less environmental impact with greater local economic returns.

I thank you for recognizing me as a stakeholder in this proposal. I thank you for reading this letter. I ask you to please consider my concerns as you evaluate this proposal.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Chown
1245 Basil Avenue
Victoria BC V8T 2G1
Lacey Maxwell

From: [Redacted]
Sent: March 17, 2018 7:13 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: FW: Abstract Proposal at Hillside & Cook

From: [Redacted]
Sent: March 17, 2018 7:11 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Abstract Proposal at Hillside & Cook

Overall the project is an attractive apartment building which will fit into the area very nicely. My one concern is the entrance/exit. Will cars access the one entrance/exit heading from Uvic and crossing the solid yellow line and will there be a line-up of vehicles attempting to access the entrance and exit in front of the bus stop heading east along Hillside?

Carol Williams
1230 Basil Ave.
March 16, 2018

Victoria Mayor and Council

Re: Proposed Rezoning and Development at 1301 Hillside Avenue

I am writing in response to the application for rezoning, development, and variance permits at 1301 Hillside. To be clear this is not a case of development fatigue or being against adding needed housing in our community. The property in question is a difficult piece of land that has limitations in regards to access/egress, parking as well as environmental constraints. I think the Developers proposal of 46 units with tenancy for 61 people and less than 40% parking spaces per number of tenants/visitors is too aggressive for the site. It is unreasonable and irresponsible to the neighborhood to assume that the prospective tenants will not be owners of cars, same for the visitors that will be coming to the building. These will be market level rental units which speaks of multiple occupants per unit as roommates and significant others will help make this affordable for many. Potentially the 61 tenants can increase to 86 assuming 30% of the units will have one additional tenant. Taking this into consideration the allotted 25 parking stalls are approximately 25% of the number of tenants/visitors. With nowhere to park on site the vehicles will be dispersed throughout the surrounding neighborhoods creating more congestion.

Site access is also a major concern as the proposal shows one driveway as the access and egress with right in and right out onto Hillside. The bus zone situated before the driveway will potentially cause back ups along Hillside east bound. With the right only exit out of the parking lot traffic will be using Higgins as a thoroughfare. Will controlled lights be installed at Cook and Higgins to accommodate this? With the recent installation of traffic lights at Kiwanis and Cook this does not seem likely.

Considering the limitations of the property this proposal is too large for the lot size. A building that can closer accommodate the number of parking stalls to the number of units is achievable. The future of Victoria may be using less cars but currently people rely on vehicles for everyday reasons, making it less attractive to do so does not change the culture only frustrates those whose lives depend on them.

I think a good use of this property is a public green space, taking a contaminated lot and turning it into something we can all enjoy. With the loss of the urban trees due to transportation demands and development issues this would be added value to our communities and worth consideration.

Respectfully,

Carla Coghan,
1278 Basil Avenue

cc: Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee
    Hillside Quadra Neighborhood Action Group
    Oaklands Councilor Marianne Alto
Hi there,

I am writing in regards to the proposed development at 1301 Hillside Ave.

We are homeowners living on nearby Basil Ave, and would like to express our concerns in regards to the limited 25 parking spots available in relation to the 46 units proposed.

While we do recognize the need for the additional housing, and are not opposed to the reasonable development of the site, the ratio of parking spots to proposed units is of concern, given the vicinity of Basil Ave to the site and the likelihood of parking overflow from residents and guests of the new building, which would impact our ability to park by our own home on a daily basis and increase street traffic. Therefore we believe the proposed development could have a more balanced parking to unit ratio (such as fewer levels, especially given there is an existing 4-story standard throughout the Hillside corridor) to minimize the parking/traffic disruption to our street and surrounding areas.

Sincerely,
Jacqueline Wong & Biagio DeCesare
Hello,

I attended the Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) Meeting on Monday March 25, 2019 regarding the development proposal for 1301 Hillside Avenue.

The following are my comments and concerns;

**Parking and Density,**

The architectural presentation of the building has been greatly improved however my concerns about the planning for number of units and parking are the same as reported on the original proposal. The variances for number of units and parking both exasperate the main problems of parking and density. The developer’s position that parking cannot be increased due to the restriction on excavation offers no evidence that this is actually the case. A reference was made to the fact that the city was indicating that excavation was not an option.

**Process,**

Having the developer work with the community may be a standard approach, but most of the issues at the meeting concluded with the developer saying that the issues could not be concluded at the meeting due to being within the city’s responsibility. Having a city representative at the meeting would have improved the process by furthering all stakeholders understanding of direction in a more synchronized fashion. The process has raised more questions than would have been the case with all stakeholders present. Asking the developer to “work with the community”, alone, at this point is wasting time as they are referencing direction in broader planning documents and city preferences without the owners of those directives being present.

**Access to Data for Decision Making,**

If there are good reasons for decisions on traffic, parking and density such as studies, adopted recommendations and planning polices they should be made public otherwise the process will only lead to more confusion with the community raising issues they are not informed on.

**Conclusion,**

Don Gourlay, 1270 Basil Ave, Victoria BC, V8T 2G2
The proposal is asking for too many units with too few parking spaces. The justification for 6 floors seems to come from a broad planning document on major access routes such as Hillside Avenue that may not be appropriate for specific location. The option of either creating more parking or reducing the size of the development seems not to be considered in the proposal.

Don Gourlay – owner and resident
1270 Basil Ave
Victoria BC
V8T 2G2
Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

First, congratulations on your recent election and re-election.

Second I am writing to express several concerns about the proposed apartment building proposed by Abstract Development for 1301 Hillside Avenue. I attended a public information session about the development and my partner Cheryl Coull and I have several concerns based on that presentation.

First, the proposed height at six stories is too tall for the site which is already at the crest of a hill coming either from the south or west. It will overwhelm the corner.

Second, the proposed parking is insufficient for the density but more appropriate for a four storey building which is the maximum height desirable for that location. Parking will be pushed into neighbouring streets.

Third, the proposal will be detrimental to traffic flow on Hillside Avenue and will create some hazards for pedestrians and motorists. The proposed development has no pull-out for vehicles/taxis to pick up or drop off people so vehicles engaged in that activity will necessarily block traffic on Hillside just a few metres from the busy Cook-Hillside intersection. Vehicles wanting to turn into the parking lot which is accessible only from Hillside will have to pause and wait for pedestrian traffic and that will cause congestion backing up to the Cook-Hillside intersection. Vehicles exiting the parking lot through the single entrance/exit on Hillside will be compelled to turn west but those wanting to go south or west will attempt to cross four lanes of traffic to be able to turn left onto Higgins Street, and then left onto Cook from Higgins, in both cases creating new congestion and hazards. To ameliorate these issues the development needs to include a pull out for passenger pick up and drop off and an entrance/exit on both Cook and Hillside Avenues.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

John Lutz and Cheryl Coull
Hello,

I just received a proposal of zone change for 1301 Hillside Ave in the mail because I have property within 200m of the site. I am unable to attend the meeting for proposed development to change the zoning to 2:46 FSR through affordable housing. I am writing to voice my opinion in favour of this proposal.

Thank you,

Robby
April 6, 2019
Lisa Helps, Mayor
City Council Members
City Hall, #1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Development Proposal at 1301 Hillside Avenue

Please accept this letter opposing the development proposal at 1301 Hillside Avenue. I am encouraged to hear of and support the concerns expressed by neighbours from both Hillside/Quadra and Oaklands Communities at the March 25, 2019 Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee.

Specific concerns expressed include the following.

- A single combined entrance and exit into the site off Cook Street is not acceptable to both communities, recognizing serious negative effects beyond the immediate location, that is, drivers of service and other vehicles must navigate through residential streets and connectors to reach access to this proposed building.
  - This will increase non-local cut-through traffic on Cedar Hill, Fernwood Road, the designated people-priority greenway of Kings Road, and Haultain Street;
  - This will increase non-local cut-through traffic with a similar negative effect for access to the Cook street location through Hillside-Quadra residential streets;
  - This will increase risk at the already dangerous pedestrian crossing at the Kings Road on Cook Street just below the single access point to the proposed building;
  - This will increase non-local parking on Kings Road, Empire Street and Capital Heights resulting from insufficient parking and loading zones as proposed, given the short walk through Cridge Centre grounds to the proposed building.

- Increased non-local traffic and parking are direct threats to the already designated People Priority Greenway of Kings Road and the Oaklands Rise Woonerf initiative which you, Mayor Helps and Councillors past and present, have unanimously approved three times.

- Bicycle parking is significant (65 stalls plus 6 visitor spaces) and very positive (despite lack of innovation to reduce physical size required—witness Dutch and other models). However, this does not mitigate the effect of poor vehicle access to this building given that service vehicles are overwhelmingly motorized (taxis, food delivery, relocation/moving, emergency) and that there is inadequate parking for these and especially for visitors or residents who have motor vehicles.

- As proposed, the development is contrary to the intent for “presence of nature in the City” as stipulated in the current Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan. And, it provides no space for place-making capacity for the community, something specifically sought in discussions now underway for the upcoming Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan.
• As proposed for approval, this building draws upon surrounding green space not in control of the developer and subject to unknown future development.

• The proposed building occupies the entire lot with minimal set back, differing from other apartment buildings along the Hillside Avenue corridor between Cook Street and Cedar Hill which offer a significant green buffer.

• The building points toward a design intention that is over-urbanized creating a built-environment unmitigated by onsite green space and places for people in community, other than owners. It leans toward a streetscape that is not characteristic of this mixed use, multi-generational neighbourhood.

• The transition from rental to owner-occupied relies upon 35 units priced at a higher cost to offset 15 below market units of 350q ft+. This will increase real estate comparables and, in turn, the valuation of surrounding housing stock: antithetical to “affordable housing”.

• In short, as a gateway to the Oaklands Community the building is not suitable.

We recognize that the lot is challenging. However, if this building is to be forced upon two impacted communities, then a second point of access on both Hillside Avenue and Cook Street are critical as was historically the case in the former gas station. The existing bus stop should be retained instead of relocated as shown in the plan, providing ample space. In our estimation, two parking spaces would be eliminated to achieve building entrances/exists on both Hillside Avenue and Cook Street to partially mitigate the negative impact.

The newly formed Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee, at its first meeting, supported the views expressed by neighbours from both Hillside/Quadra and Oaklands.

Please understand that we welcome increased density but expect a much higher standard of planning and performance from both developers and the City's staff and leadership.

We look forward to your support on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Tomack  
Chair, Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee  
Co-Lead, Oaklands Rise Woonerf

Harry Kope, Acting President, Oaklands Community Association Board of Directors  
David Angus, Chair, Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee  
Chris Holt, Executive Director, Oaklands Community Association  
Jocelyn Jenkyns, City Administrator  
Michael Angrove, Planning Department
I am writing to express my concern over the proposed development at 1301 Hillside Ave.

As a homeowner that lives within a very close proximity to the proposed development I have a few major concerns that stem from the information I have received from the most recent changes that were discussed at the last CALUC meeting in Oaklands. The first concern is the massive variance on parking that this developer is requesting. From what we learned at the meeting the condo building is proposing 50 units with 24 parking spots. According to the developer, this would mean 19 parking spots after the visitor parking spots. With literally zero option for on-street parking in this location, this would inevitably mean that tenants and visitors would then be parking in already overwhelmed and over used streets such as the one I live on that for some reason do not qualify for residential parking. This is not ok, and I am very concerned with this proposed variance and would hope that the Mayor and Council will not approve this insanely massive variance.

My second concern is that this development has almost no pull in for delivery, moving vehicles, taxi cabs, car share, food delivery. With the limited parking spots that would be available for the tenants, you would assume that the developer would realize the need for an area for vehicles such as this to be able to pull in and out safely and easily. After asking the question directly to the developer at the CALUC meeting, I was not given an answer as to where these types of vehicles would go, making an already busy and congested intersection such at Hillside and Cook even more unsafe with vehicles attempting to stop on the road to drop off/pick up.

The third concern is the variance on the size of the building. I feel that this particular proposal is much too large of a building for this specific lot, particularly on what is probably one of the busier intersections in Victoria. I am not against a building of a similar nature for this spot, but I would hope that anything that is approved for this lot would make sense for the area for years to come. I believe the restrictive design on this building is a major concern and would hope that Mayor and Council agree and not approve the proposed variances.

Thank you for your time
Angela Goodliffe
Monica Dhawan

From: Johans >
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 10:17 AM
To: Ben Isitt (Councillor); Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: 
Subject: RE: 1301 Hillside Ave Proposal - NVision Properties / Abstract Developments
Importance: High

Good morning,

We are homeowners that live at 2720 which is at the corner of Basil Avenue and Cook St.

We have attended the information nights regarding 1301 Hillside Avenue. We have three concerns regarding this project.

1) Parking will be an issue. Since we live at the end of Basil Avenue and live directly across from the green apartment building (right beside Hillside Park), several of those tenants park in front of our house. I count 5 cars that park regularly just in front of our house each evening. Thus, if anyone along Basil Ave that have friends or family visiting, they need to park further down Basil Ave or onto the adjoining street, Blackwood.

If this building (1301 Hillside Avenue) is going to have 50 units and 24 parking stalls (with 5 of those for visitors), where are the other 20 plus people going to park? It is bad enough with the current parking situation on our small side Street Basil Avenue.

The Developers are hopeful (and they seem quite naive) that many tenants will not have cars. However, if many do, most side streets around us will be completely full with overflow specifically from this building due to the lack of parking the Developers are openly admitting in their design details of the proposal.

2) Safety and concerns of only having one entrance/exit off of Cook Street. The Cook/Hillside intersection is extremely busy and dangerous daily! The tenants that drive up Cook Street (north) would be able to turn in to their building; however, those driving either up Hillside, down Hillside or down Cook Street would need to drive around the block until they could drive up Cook Street and take a right into their building. This would cause frustration over time and more and more people would be taking illegal left turns to enter off of Cook Street. We see people running yellow lights at any time of the day at the Cook/Hillside intersection. Those that would take illegal left turns could no doubt cause an accident. Over time drivers become complacent and once they make their illegal left into the building, without any incident, it will happen more and more often. Thus, there could be more accidents (rear enders, cars getting t-boned).

As I mentioned, Cook/Hillside is a very busy intersection. In mid-October, a young adult (impaired) drove up Cook Street through the intersection, across two lanes, jumped the curb, and drove onto our property smashing part of our fence, mowing down two of our 20 ft. hedges before crashing into our bedroom basement window. It was approximately 1:30 am early on a Saturday while thankfully we were all asleep. It was a horrible accident and we are now left dealing with the aftermath. The
young person that was driving up Cook Street at approximately 90 km/h (is what experts estimated his speed was by the rubber tire marks left on the sidewalk). He raced right through the Cook/Hillside intersection and had there been anyone driving into the intersection from the other direction, he would have hit them head on. It is such a dangerous intersection as it is already. The developers need to look at this new proposed entrance/exit issue off of Hillside Avenue again.

3). Far too many units proposed in such a small area. We all agree that 50 units would be far too many for that small area, especially at the junction of two major roads such as Cook Street and Hillside Avenue.
This is a residential family oriented neighbourhood. The developers need to re-visit the proposed size of the building and downsize the number of units.
No one on our street can wrap our heads around the number of proposed parking spots they are proposing on site (24 parking stalls) in such a small area for a now proposed 50 unit condo building.
We realize the developers want to recognize a healthy return on investment but this should not at the cost of public safety nor degrading a currently well established quiet family oriented community and bringing overcrowding to an already densely populated suburban community.

Thank you for you consideration of not approving the go-ahead of this 50 Unit condo structure.

Sincerely,

Kirstina and Robert Gregson (homeowners)

2720 Cook Street

Proposed development below (artist's rendering of proposed structure below) This will be our view from our front windows showing the future proposed condo 50 unit condominium development.
My name is Marc Waterman, and I reside on Basil Avenue. I was in attendance at the March 25th Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee update presentation by the developer regarding the proposed building at 1301 Hillside.

The developer presented a number of positive changes from the original concept previously presented, as follows:

- the lowering of the six-storey structure by 12 feet resulting from changes in the design and the use of materials,
- the conversion from a rental building to purchase for ownership, including some designated voluntary affordable units, and
- the provision of some work/living units.

Regardless of these positive changes, a number of key concerns remain. The Official Community Plan (OCP) states it will be permitting six-storey buildings along the Hillside corridor on development properties. However, the contaminated former gas station property at 1301 Hillside does not allow for any underground parking or other services.

The current schedule (as per the City’s document) states 53 parking spaces are required, whereas the proposal shows only 24 spaces (19 residential and five visitor/delivery) for a 50-unit complex. Clearly, because of the inability to excavate below ground for parking, this indicates a property that does not meet normal development requirements under the zoning, even with the OCP planned changes.

Other homeowners besides myself have raised the issue of the height of the building. Reducing the number of storeys should reduce the number of residences, thereby addressing the parking issue to a large extent.

Many homeowners have also raised the issue of the traffic flow at the busy Hillside and Cook corner. Although interested residents recognize that this is a planning matter for the City of Victoria, nonetheless it would be helpful to have clarity on this issue.

Having attended the developer’s presentations as well as neighbourhood meetings, and having spoken with several of my neighbours, I find that there is general agreement that some development of this site would be welcome. I believe we all hope it will be based in reality, not just the aspirations and wishful thinking reflected in some of the statements made by the development team; for example, that most purchasers will not have automobiles – even electric vehicles – but will use bicycles and public transit.
Thank you.

Respectfully,
Marc Waterman
1239 Basil Avenue

Sent from my iPad
Letter regarding development at 1301 Hillside Avenue

To: Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC)
   Hillside-Quadra Neighbourhood Action Group
   Mayor and Council, City of Victoria

My name is Marc Waterman, and I reside on Basil Avenue. I was in attendance at the March 25th Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee update presentation by the developer regarding the proposed building at 1301 Hillside.

The developer presented a number of positive changes from the original concept previously presented, as follows:

- the lowering of the six-storey structure by 12 feet resulting from changes in the design and the use of materials,
- the conversion from a rental building to purchase for ownership, including some designated voluntary affordable units, and
- the provision of some work/living units.

Regardless of these positive changes, a number of key concerns remain. The Official Community Plan (OCP) states it will be permitting six-storey buildings along the Hillside corridor on development properties. However, the contaminated former gas station property at 1301 Hillside does not allow for any underground parking or other services.

The current schedule (as per the City's document) states 53 parking spaces are required, whereas the proposal shows only 24 spaces (19 residential and five visitor/delivery) for a 50-unit complex. Clearly, because of the inability to excavate below ground for parking, this indicates a property that does not meet normal development requirements under the zoning, even with the OCP planned changes.

Other homeowners besides myself have raised the issue of the height of the building. Reducing the number of storeys should reduce the number of residences, thereby addressing the parking issue to a large extent.

Many homeowners have also raised the issue of the traffic flow at the busy Hillside and Cook corner. Although interested residents recognize that this is a planning matter for the City of Victoria, nonetheless it would be helpful to have clarity on this issue.

Having attended the developer's presentations as well as neighbourhood meetings, and having spoken with several of my neighbours, I find that there is general agreement that some development of this site would be welcome. I believe we all hope it will be based in reality, not just the aspirations and wishful thinking reflected in some of the statements made by the development team; for example, that most purchasers will not have automobiles – even electric vehicles – but will use bicycles and public transit.
Thank you.

Respectfully,
Marc Waterman
1239 Basil Avenue

By adding my signature to this letter, I am indicating that I am in agreement with the sentiments expressed in this letter, but that I am currently opposed to the development at 1301 Hillside in its current form.

Name: Carla Coughlan
Address: 1239 Basil Ave

Carla Coughlan
Re: Development by Abstract Development at 1301 Hillside Avenue

To: Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC)
   Hillside-Quadra Neighbourhood Action Group
   Mayor and Council, City of Victoria

My name is Shauna Yeomans, and I reside on Basil Avenue. I was in attendance at the March 25th Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee update presentation by the developer regarding the proposed building at 1301 Hillside.

The developer presented a number of positive changes from the original concept previously presented, as follows:

- the lowering of the six-stories structure by 12 feet resulting from changes in the design and the use of materials,
- the conversion from a rental building to purchase for ownership, including some designated voluntary affordable units, and
- the provision of some work/living units.

Regardless of these positive changes, a number of key concerns remain. The Official Community Plan (OCP) states it will be permitting six-stories buildings along the Hillside corridor on development properties. However, the contaminated former gas station property at 1301 Hillside does not allow for any underground parking or other services.

The current schedule (as per the City's document) states 53 parking spaces are required, whereas the proposal shows only 24 spaces (19 residential and five visitor/delivery) for a 50-unit complex. Clearly, because of the inability to excavate below ground for parking, this indicates a property that does not meet normal development requirements under the zoning, even with the OCP planned changes.

Other homeowners besides myself have raised the issue of the height of the building. Reducing the number of stories should reduce the number of residences, thereby addressing the parking issue to a large extent. All other buildings in the area are four stories.

Many homeowners have also raised the issue of the traffic flow at the busy Hillside and Cook corner. Although interested residents recognize that this is a planning matter for the City of Victoria, nonetheless it would be helpful to have clarity on this issue.

Having attended the developer's presentations as well as neighbourhood meetings, and having spoken with several of my neighbours, I find that there is general agreement that some development of this site would be welcome. I believe we all
hope it will be based in reality, not just the aspirations and wishful thinking reflected in some of the statements made by the development team; for example, that most purchasers will be single and not have automobiles – even electric vehicles – but will use bicycles and public transit.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Shauna Yeomans
1234 Basil Avenue

By adding my signature to this letter, I am indicating that I am in agreement with the sentiments expressed in this letter, but that I am currently opposed to the development at 1301 Hillside in its current form.

Name: __________________________ Address: __________________________
Letter regarding development at 1301 Hillside Avenue

To: Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC)
Hillside-Quadra Neighbourhood Action Group
Mayor and Council, City of Victoria

My name is Marc Waterman, and I reside on Basil Avenue. I was in attendance at the March 25th Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee update presentation by the developer regarding the proposed building at 1301 Hillside.

The developer presented a number of positive changes from the original concept previously presented, as follows:

- the lowering of the six-storey structure by 12 feet resulting from changes in the design and the use of materials,
- the conversion from a rental building to purchase for ownership, including some designated voluntary affordable units, and
- the provision of some work/living units.

Regardless of these positive changes, a number of key concerns remain. The Official Community Plan (OCP) states it will be permitting six-storey buildings along the Hillside corridor on development properties. However, the contaminated former gas station property at 1301 Hillside does not allow for any underground parking or other services.

The current schedule (as per the City’s document) states 53 parking spaces are required, whereas the proposal shows only 24 spaces (19 residential and five visitor/delivery) for a 50-unit complex. Clearly, because of the inability to excavate below ground for parking, this indicates a property that does not meet normal development requirements under the zoning, even with the OCP planned changes.

Other homeowners besides myself have raised the issue of the height of the building. Reducing the number of storeys should reduce the number of residences, thereby addressing the parking issue to a large extent.

Many homeowners have also raised the issue of the traffic flow at the busy Hillside and Cook corner. Although interested residents recognize that this is a planning matter for the City of Victoria, nonetheless it would be helpful to have clarity on this issue.

Having attended the developer’s presentations as well as neighbourhood meetings, and having spoken with several of my neighbours, I find that there is general agreement that some development of this site would be welcome. I believe we all hope it will be based in reality, not just the aspirations and wishful thinking reflected in some of the statements made by the development team; for example, that most purchasers will not have automobiles – even electric vehicles – but will use bicycles and public transit.
Thank you.

Respectfully,
Marc Waterman
1239 Basil Avenue

By adding my signature to this letter, I am indicating that I am in agreement with the sentiments expressed in this letter, but that I am currently opposed to the development at 1301 Hillside in its current form.

Name: Susan Taillock  Address: 1266 Basil Ave.
Victoria, BC.
V8T 2G2
Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am a resident of the Hillside/Quadra neighbourhood and am very concerned about the plans proposed for the development at 1301 Hillside. Specifically I’m concerned about parking (24 spaces provided for 50 units) and the cut-through driving that will be necessary which will definitely be a problem if the current plans are approved. I am also concerned that was was originally proposed as rental housing is now a condo development. How did that happen?

Regards,

Barb Clausen
2940 Graham Street
Dear Ms. Wheater:

Thank you for the elevation of the 1301 Hillside Ave new proposal. My apologies for a delayed response.

I did, in fact, invite Michael Bacon’s contact at an earlier Land Use Committee meeting but have had no follow-up from Abstract Developments.

FYI, I have copied the responsible City of Victoria planner with whom you are familiar, as well as the Oaklands CALUC Chair; President, Board of Directors; Executive Directors of the Oaklands and Hillside-Quadra communities, and Chair, Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee on which I serve as representative of small housing providers and the Oaklands Rise Woonerf pilot where I am Co-Lead of the ORW Planning Group (members of which are bcc’d) along with Mayor and Council.

We remain open to dialogue. However, there are a number of concerns that remain outstanding, none of which are addressed by the elevation you provided on July 5, 2019.

1) The location of the proposed project is, effectively, a gateway marker for entry into the Oaklands neighbourhood. We must consider whether the project fits with the image desired for Oaklands in the decades to come. Feedback from attendees at CALUC and dialogue with area residents in both Hillside-Quadra and Oaklands suggests that it does not.

2) This project does not fit the desired “missing middle” philosophy for sensitive density that is increasing reflected in community dialogue. Rather, it fits a model that if applied along the Hillside arterial in general, divides rather than unites, north and south Oaklands with a virtual canyon of monolithic structures. This is contrary to the informal feedback currently received via dialogue in the affected neighbourhoods and feedback received at the weekly Oaklands Sunset Markets. Data on community perspectives is being collected as part of the Oaklands Neighbourhood pre-planning process.

3) Access to the building is poor, and made more so by the determination that only Cook Street is viable for access. In response to community concern that the single access point will force vehicles approaching from the North, East and West to cut through neighbourhood residential streets in order to position for access from the Cook Street hill, the City advises that “1301 Hillside, Staff do not anticipate significant impacts to traffic on Fernwood related to the proposed development at 1301 Hillside.”

We suppose this is an ill-considered, rather than facetious response to expressed community concern. This kind of dismissive response works against the trust residents have in City processes, a consideration raised to Council, management and staff on related matters. The City of Victoria must connect the dots on related matters that staff do not see as related.

All parties must understand that efforts to de-incentivize cut-through traffic are seriously threatened by this proposal.
Lack of sufficient drop-off/pick-up spaces for vehicles, and overall lack of adequate parking exacerbate limited access to the building itself. However optimistically we may look toward a “less car” future, the fact is that most people, including cyclists, have cars, often more than one per residence, and this fact demands off-street parking.

Such a provision can be built with future non-parking use in mind without harm to local neighbourhoods and I would be happy to explain that further if the City is not already encouraging such forward thinking.

Residents of Kings Road, Empire, and other streets in Hillside-Quadra as you are already well aware, foresee that proximity will result in additional traffic from non-local drivers circling to await an empty pick-up/drop-off access or parking on already stretched residential streets, exactly where some two years of ground work with the City to reduce cut-through traffic along the Kings Road woonerf continues.

4) As a matter of concern for affordable housing, we note that this building will foreseeably increase real estate comparables in the surrounding area by raising the cost of units that will compensate for 13, “below market” units starting at a concerning 355 square feet. Such tiny accommodation warrants proximity to public placemaking areas not seen in the locale or proposal to avoid a degradation of quality of life.

We are dismayed that Council has permitted a project initially proposed as “affordable” rentals to be reconceived for sale, and then justified through a rationale that “below market” is “affordable”, only to have effect of raising the cost of housing throughout the area. This is diametrically opposed to the notion of encouraging affordable housing.

I strongly urge that Abstract Developments consider remediation of this land and return of the lot to either the Cridge Centre for the Family, or to the City of Victoria for public placemaking and a conceptually suitable entryway to Oaklands, or through some other venture to realize a benefit that is compatible with community perspectives. This, of course, requires ongoing dialogue as invited earlier and not yet realized.

Please do not hesitate to contact me and I will do my best to facilitate that dialogue among community members.

Sincerely,

John James O’Brien
Co-Lead, Oaklands Rise Woonerf
Member, Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee

On Jul 5, 2019, at 1:51 PM, Olivia Wheater wrote:

Dear Neighbour,

You are being contacted due to your previously expressed interest of our proposed development at 1301 Hillside. Attached you will find a detailed, project summary sheet to inform you of the updates regarding the development. If you have any questions about the project, please do not hesitate to contact myself or Michael Bacon, the Development Manager, whose contact information can be found in the attachment.

I hope you have a great weekend!
Sincerely,

OLIVIA WHEATER  
Development Coordinator
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<2019-06-14 - Project Summary Sheet FINAL- 1301 Hillside.pdf>
Hi John,
Thank you for your comments on the 1301 Hillside project.

As you are aware we are advancing our proposal towards Committee of the Whole for their consideration. We are very happy to take your feedback into consideration and your email below provides us with a substantial amount of food for thought. That said, we have and continue to communicate to public stakeholders via personal conversations, emails and at our open houses and CALUC meetings that we intend to get feedback from all key stakeholders before making modifications to the project.

The key stakeholders that we work with during the development of any project include:
1) the community; who have now had several opportunities to provide input on the project
2) City Planning Staff and Advisory Bodies; we are working with this group now on the concept for the site and the building design and we did receive endorsement for this project from the city’s Advisory Design Panel are working with us now and who have being one key stakeholder
3) City Council; who have not yet had an opportunity to provide us with their feedback
4) and finally the developer Abstract, who seeks to have an economically viable project, while also meeting the needs of the other stakeholder groups.

As such, I would like to remind you that our intention is to get Council feedback via the Committee of the Whole process prior to making any changes to our current proposal. Please do keep in mind that we have already made significant design revisions to this project, some of which spoke directly to the community feedback that we received earlier in this process, including reducing the overall height of the project (by 13 feet), completely re-designing the exterior of the building, as well other changes to access and egress that were intended to create the best outcomes possible with this site in terms of access for emergency vehicles, deliveries, pick up and drop off, etc. Again, at this point we would like Council to see the latest version of this project prior to making addition changes to the building design and program.

With regard to the Oaklands Neighbourhood Planning process, it is unfortunate to hear that this has kicked off and we were not notified. I was previously working with the Chair of the CALUC (Ben Clark) who was very keen to have us involved and did advise that he would engage us when the time was right. Perhaps that time is now? If you are the correct person to introduce us to the process, I would be very happy to find a way for us to provide input.

As a friendly reminder, I would suggest that our future conversations could be more direct and that perhaps you could consider removing Council and staff members from the discussion unless there is a specific reason to engage them. I am happy to have my responses be in the public domain, but I am also aware that Council and Staff receive an overwhelming volume of emails daily and it would be my preference to not further compound that burden on their time and resources.

Kind regards,

ADAM COOPER, MCIP, RPP
Director of Development
Greetings, Michael, I must admit that I mixed up names. Thank you for the reminder.

We must agree to disagree on several points.

Please understand that the views I have expressed are not mine alone, but represent feedback received at a number of community engagement activities underway at the Oaklands Sunset Market and beyond. They will no doubt resonate from your knowledge of opposition to the project expressed by residents of Hillside-Quadra as well as the Oaklands neighbourhood at Land Use Committee meetings. Indeed, I have sought additional feedback on the draft of this note from over 10 individuals, some representing larger groups (hence my delayed response).

To clarify my use of the term “missing middle”, please understand that this is not a description of an economic demographic, but a form of housing. You may be familiar with Mole Hill behind St. Paul’s Hospital in Vancouver, or the Fernwood Neighbourhood Group’s building on Yukon Street. Certainly you are aware of the increase in density provided through retrofitting and in-filling, contrary to more monolithic structures that lean toward a canyon-like streetscape. This is a real concern where Hillside is already much like certain Vancouver streets in which development has fostered a highway-like character. City of Victoria planners sought to achieve a similar degradation of neighbourhoods along Burnside-Gorge and, thankfully, citizen representation at Council brought about limits which, I understand, will mitigate that effect while accommodating an increased density.

Personally, I am not opposed to increased density. However, I see the importance of understanding the character and form of a neighbourhood in planning for the future, and, strongly disagree that the form and character of Hillside Avenue from Gorge to, say, Prior/Blackwood should be replicated en route to Cook and beyond as the gateway to Oaklands Neighbourhood.

We seek to mitigate the continuance of a highway-canyon effect with variable setbacks and heights, planned placemaking that incorporates plantings (water?) such that the experience is one of living in an outwardly engaged community, not an inwardly focused bunker.

While Abstract’s Modo and cycle provisions are laudable, they reflect an aspirational view of transportation rather than the reality of one and two car households (with bikes) whereby the car sits at home anticipating trips up/off-island, etc. even as people increasingly walk and cycle.

I would argue that adequate parking, planned for future retrofit into usable commercial or combined work-live units, meets current needs while pointing to the fewer personal vehicles that will be our future. Failure to provide adequate access (moving a bus stop is not hard where there is will) and adequate vehicle storage will absolutely create cut-through traffic in two neighbourhoods that have clearly expressed this concern. I recently spent time with strata owners hearing of their experience now, and fears of a worsening situation based on observable patterns of driver behaviour.
The site at Cook and Hillside is extremely problematic. I understand the economics of the situation (better than your response at #4 below suggests). I am also aware that the City’s response to concerns about cut-through traffic ignores the specific locations raised with an unsupported denial of effect on Fernwood Ave. I appreciate your kind suggestion: Steve H. is well aware of the related woonerf concerns and knows how to reach concerned parties.

Not least, I am aware that the City prefers to reduce car usage by eliminating parking at domiciles ahead of reduced destination parking and, critically, increasing the convenience of public transit. This imagines that people will choose not to have a car rather than park it on a nearby street, despite the evident practice of shifting parked cars rather than electing to use less convenient public transit.

Again, I urge responsible developers to build parking in situ such that the infrastructure for tomorrow’s retrofit into alternative uses can be incurred in today’s dollars: community, commercial and residential work-live space. If not feasible, then:

Abstract might find a long lasting benefit in re-thinking this project as a landmark opportunity to demonstrate community support.

For example, declare it a project for public space (along the lines of the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) model). Waterfalls over stone and the existing cement walls and an open area serving multiple transit routes incorporating placemaking amenities along the lines of the City’s recent Humboldt Street example (chess boards, ping pong) are concepts that have received a positive, informal response.

As valued sponsors of the Cridge Centre for the Family, Abstract might consider such a move to be in line with its notable community support.

Kindly let me know what interaction you have had with the Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan (ONP) Steering Committee which is well into a process to update the 1993 ONP which, among other considerations, limits buildings to a four storey height. The ONP under development is certainly not anti-development, but, as I am reminded by the Oaklands Community Association, it will set expectations for scrutiny from a neighbourhood perspective.

As a Phase One representative of the Oaklands Rise Woonerf on the ONP Steering Committee, I would be pleased to facilitate your engagement, as I am not aware of any approach by Abstract to date. How can I help?

Sincerely,
John

John James O’Brien,  
IRM Strategies Consulting  
Co-lead, Oaklands Rise Woonerf  
Member, Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee  
is.gd/1Hs7JF

*This message is intended for addressees only and may contain views of the author that are not representative of affiliations shown. Communications are subject to relevant information, privacy and records management legislation. If the purpose of this email message is not within your purview, kindly delete it as a non-record. If mis-directed, please advise the author immediately.

On Aug 23, 2019, at 12:57 PM, Michael Bacon wrote:
Hi John – Thank you for email dated July 27th, 2019, and my apologies for the delayed response.

As a reminder, we did have a phone conversation after our CALUC meeting for the 1301 Hillside project – where we did discuss the proposed Woonerf project. We have also spoken to staff and some members of Council about the project and advocated for its implementation, as you had requested.

In direct response to your letter, I see your frustration over a new development in your neighborhood and I offer the following feedback which I hope you will consider:

1. We agree that the location will be the gateway to the Oaklands neighbourhood and we believe we have designed a building that serves this purpose. It is a thoughtful design that will attract new residents wanting to enjoy the Oaklands area and its proximity to a number of Victoria destinations.

2. In regards to the “missing middle”, we have developed a building concept that speaks to this cohort. Our project is unique in that it will contain affordable housing units in a partnership program with BC Housing. In addition, our smaller units in this project will also be naturally attainable for young families and professionals (who are generally characterized as the missing middle) – due to their size.

3. In regards to site access – Cook St is the only way to enter this site. All frontage along Hillside will be devoted to the transit stop in front of the building. Cook St heading north will be fine – Cook St heading south – users will have to find a more direct route – of which many will be available to them. Hopefully the City will find a way to control traffic on streets that you deem to be not appropriate. I would encourage you to contact Steve Hutchinson at the City of Victoria in regards to this issue. Furthermore – although our parking in this building is somewhat limited – we will be making commitments to the Modo Car Share program as well as providing for and encouraging the use of bicycles and ebikes for the residents of the building.

4. In regards to your comments about the project increasing real estate comparables in the area, we may not agree on this point. A healthy, balanced community should include a variety of living options for its residents. It is our opinion that a new development in this location will have a greater impact on the visual aesthetic of the neighbourhood that it will on real estate values – which are more related to supply and demand and overall economic factors.

We see a major benefit to the Oaklands neighbourhood to redeveloping a former gas station site that is currently vacant (and likely having a negative impact on the community) into new housing that is immediately adjacent to parks and child care, with direct access to the shops and services found on the Hillside corridor, as well as the downtown core via Cook St. It is our firm belief that new residents in this project will inject a life and spirit into the area as they enjoy their new home, neighbourhood, and the amenities and services that it offers.

I thank you for your comments and appreciate your interest in our proposal.

Kind regards,