

SENT VIA EMAIL

July 16, 2019

Mayor and Council  
City of Victoria

**Re: 1224 Richardson Street Rezoning Application**

Dear Mayor and Council:

On Wednesday, June 19<sup>th</sup> the CALUC Community meeting for the above project was held, with a turnout of approximately 50 neighbors to consider and discuss the project.

While there was much support for the Affordable Sustainable Homes/Gentle Density concept behind the project, the general consensus was that there remained much further refinement required of the project to integrate well into the area. Of the 24 CALUC Community Meeting Feedback Forms returned, 19 opposed the development as proposed, and 5 supported it. In addition, 5 additional e-mails the Rockland Land Use committee received wrote in opposition to the project as proposed.

The greatest concern was expressed over the 8 + 2 visitor parking spaces proposed for 24 units. That concern was also stated in the majority of the Feedback Forms. It was widely expressed that it was unreasonable to think that most tenants would have no car, especially tenants with families. The neighbours expressed the concern that the streets of the neighbourhood were already oversubscribed for parking and there was no ability to absorb even more on street parking.

A corollary concern to the lack of parking was the potential impact of the increased density on the private lane siding much of the property. For many years this private lane has been used as a mixed use thru path for automobiles, bikes, and pedestrians but the Linden owners of that lane felt little was proposed to keep it safe for all. While the proponents discussed fencing, the concern was also on the impact of the addition 1224 owners using the lane as a driveway for vehicle access greatly increasing vehicle usage.

There was general support for the ASH concept but it was frequently voiced that the number of units was too great as there was not space for parking to adequately support the units. It was suggested that the number of units be reduced by including 3 bedroom units. This was viewed as a way to offset parking shortfalls as well as an important addition to the affordable housing stock available in the city.

Several suggested a more reasonable proposal would be to plan for 6 units per building complementing the existing conversions on Linden and in the general area. There was concern expressed over the size of the proposed buildings in overlook of the one storey homes immediately adjacent to the east along Richardson and it would be reasonable that the units maintain the height of the existing R1-B zoning.

At this time the RNA LUC would propose:

1. The size and mix of the units be reconsidered, in particular the addition of 3 bedroom units.
2. Additional analysis be done on all available parking resources on and off the property.
3. That further discussion take place to alleviate neighbor concerns about the private lane usage.

If you have any questions concerning the detail provided in this letter, please do not hesitate to contact our RNA LUC Chair, Bob June. Bob is copied here and will provide the detailed feedback referenced in this letter to you under separate cover.

Respectfully,

Marc Hunter

President

RNA

cc: Bob June, RNA LUC Chair  
Geoff Young, City of Victoria Councillor  
Gary Pemberton, City of Victoria and Rockland City Liaison



October 10, 2019

Mayor and Council:

Re: CALUC Community Meeting - 1224 Richardson Street, REZ00705

Dear Mayor and Council:

Approximately 45 attended the second CALUC Community Meeting September 17, 2019 on this proposal required by an increase in building heights. The issues raised mirrored the issue of the first meeting approximately 35 attendees.

A review of the notes accompanying shows the primary issues is the size of the project. Several voiced a concern that the buildings are too big. Several voiced concerns that there are too many units in the buildings.

There was additional concern that the units do not reflect the requirements of the community in that the units are either too small for families or that the bedroom mix does not address the need for three-bedroom housing in Victoria. There was also discussion as to whether the units provide enough value or a price point to be presented as "affordable housing."

Skepticism greeted the information that the buildings have adequate parking in their alignment with the current Schedule C Parking "Affordable" 0.20 requirements and a Modo car provision. It should be noted that the Schedule C Affordable minimum number requirement is; (affordable dwelling units secured in perpetuity through a legal agreement) Concern about available, or the unavailability, on-street parking remains high.

As the project is predicated in great part on its public transit/cycling/walkability credentials a question was raised about the future of bus service on Richardson

We have now been informed by Engineering & Public Works the Shared - All Ages & Abilities Cycling Infrastructure is being considered for this corridor and discussion is to take place on the impacts on Richardson traffic flow and on-street parking. This discussion may take place in the next several weeks and possibly provide the neighbors with good data on parking trends.

The owners of the private lane section that connects Richardson to Rockland remain concerned about safety in the lane with much higher traffic from the project anticipated.

It must be noted that there was support from some for the project as it stands and that all participants spoke in favor of seeing affordable housing. The issue is in execution, not in desirability.

Respectfully,

Marc Hunter  
President, RNA

# CALUC Meeting Notes for 1224 Richardson

## September 17, 2019

---

Facilitator: Bob June

Note taker: Anthony Danda

Proponents: 1224 Richardson Property Corp, Tim Stemp

RE 200705

### Proponent Presentation

---

Partners: Tim Stemp, Dan Pringle, Harry Newton, Gene Miller

Mr. Stemp explained that this second CALUC meeting was required to notify residents within a 200m radius as the first meeting only covered a 100 m radius.

Mr. Stemp reviewed the highlights of the presentation and the changes from the initial application.

### Questions + Comments

---

**Bill Edmonds, 715 Linden**

QUESTION: How big are the suites? It's difficult to understand the value until the developer can provide a price / sq ft comparison with the market.

RESPONSE: 1 bed = 500 sq ft, 2 bed = 600 – 700 sq ft. They are comparable to what is being built today.

**Bill Birney, 1215 Rockland**

QUESTION: City council has backed off from anything without affordable housing. I think the development is commendable and unique. But when you negotiate with the city, do you have any intentions of converting to more expensive units?

RESPONSE: The proponents have no intention of changing the prices. They are proud to bring this needed development to the market.

**Bill Edmonds, 715 Linden**

QUESTION: What would be put in place to ensure no short-term rentals, e.g. Airbnb?

RESPONSE: The city regulates STRs. There is nothing we can do to limit these rentals within those regulations.

**Nora McCoy, 1255 Richardson**

Raised a concern about the bus route on Cook Street. The #1 comes five times a day and is on the watchlist to be cancelled, so the argument about lack of parking is weakened.

RESPONSE: There are sufficient bus routes at Cook and Fort.

**Tamsen Macintosh and Peter Wells, 721 Linden**

COMMENT: Expressed concerns about the height and density.

RESPONSE: There is only a very minor height variance. In fact the house on Richardson is shorter than ones around it. It is also placed over 100 ft from neighbouring buildings, which is more than Mr. Wells' property.

COMMENT: The structures could be smaller.

RESPONSE: But they wouldn't be affordable. The house is actually smaller than most on Linden.

COMMENT: The use of the alleyway for 24 units is concerning. Access should come off of Richardson.

RESPONSE: City staff prefer the access point in the alley.

COMMENT: Is that code?

RESPONSE: The city is treating it currently as intermodal. We have provided an additional 1.5m right of way to delineate the sidewalk from the road.

COMMENT: I don't want new housing overlooking an alley that the residents pay taxes on.

RESPONSE: Why don't you put up signs today restricting access?

**Matt Drislane, 809 Linden**

COMMENT: The developers are naïve to think that people won't have cars. Residents will put savings from the affordable housing into cars. Lack of parking is a very big concern.

QUESTION: Why didn't you just build 4 – 5 single family homes?

RESPONSE: We are meeting a demand in the city of Victoria for more housing.

**Donna Meares, 715 Linden**

QUESTION: Can you explain the affordability and how it works?

RESPONSE: ASH is a private concept where units are sold at affordable prices. If a buyer flips the property within three years, they must pay the city 10% of the profit. We are modifying our profit as an investment in affordability.

**Peter Gardner, 526 Linden**

QUESTION: Do you believe that less than 0.5 car / resident is reasonable?

RESPONSE: That is what the data in studies show.

QUESTION: Where will people park if it goes over the proposed amount?

**Annette Ruitenbeck, 1200 Richardson**

I have concerns that we must trust you to stick to affordability.

ASH is a red herring. The real concern is conversion to market housing.

Families don't fit into these tiny spaces.

RESPONSE: The intent is to sell to owners in perpetuity. It's not perfect but we're trying to balance affordability and free market. Owners should be able to take part in market uplifts.

We have said we would include a restrictive covenant that we will sell at the prices we are committing to.

**Raphael Beck, 727 Linden**

QUESTION: Is there a strategy to prevent people from flipping?

RESPONSE: The fact that the units are small and have no parking will always limit their value.

QUESTION: We do not want people walking down our lane. Any solutions to prevent increased vehicle / pedestrian traffic?

RESPONSE: We are configuring the driveway so drivers must turn left. You will need to manage the pedestrians in the alley.

**Bruce Masterson, 707 Linden**

I have 5 units with 9 cars, so the data you presented before does not match my experience.

Parking will overflow onto Linden which is already packed.

**Catherine Shanker, 1255 Richardson**

We can agree that there is a dearth of housing in Fairfield. There is also a dearth of 3+ bedrooms for families, for either rent or purchase.

QUESTION: At the proposed pricing, what is the profit compared to affordability?

RESPONSE: We acknowledge that we will make a profit. We are not asking for any subsidies. One just has to compare our prices to others. It's an expensive piece of land. Jukebox is significantly more expensive for comparable units. End of the day, one can't build 3 bedroom units without subsidies. And this model still allows owners to participate in the market so they may one day afford a 3 bedroom somewhere. There are even development proposals on smaller lots with more units.

**Brian Kendrick, 538 Harbinger**

QUESTION: Are the basement units included in the FSR?

RESPONSE: Yes

**Jackie Bease, 1238 Richardson**

QUESTION: Where does the proponent live?

RESPONSE: Burdett, Rockland and Fairfield

COMMENT: Construction could have an impact on small businesses.

RESPONSE: Construction should take 1 – 1.5 years

**Lynn Walmsley, 815 / 821 Linden**

COMMENT: I'm concerned about density. Why couldn't you have built 3 x 4 multiplexes providing affordable rents? 24 units on a lot on the lane is not feasible. I wish you could do it in 12 units. Why can't you redesign to have fewer units. I am against the density and parking.

RESPONSE: If we have less units, then the units would not be affordable. We are giving 1.5m to the city. 6m is more than enough for 2 cars to pass each other.

**Kirk Bease, 1238 Richardson**

Parking is already quite contentious on Richardson and this development will make it worse.

I would like to see more 2 bedrooms for 2 incomes, which fits the neighbourhood better.

**Sean Leitenberg, 1618 Richardson**

I support the proposal.

The proponents can't develop much less because of construction and property costs. They aren't getting rich.

This is not subsidized housing. Perhaps we need more subsidized housing.

I want to see more of this type of development. I don't want to see half the units for twice the price.

**Nora McCoy, 1255 Richardson**

QUESTION: Why don't you have more 2 bedroom units?

RESPONSE: 25% are 2 bedroom units. More would change the economics and hence the feasibility of the development.

**Beth Barnes, 629 Harbinger**

I oppose this development due to the parking, which is already a huge problem in the neighbourhood. Where will guests park? There should also be fewer units.

**Bill Edmonds, 715 Linden**

You should look into where people can rent parking in the neighbourhood.