

Heather McIntyre

From: Alieda Blandford [REDACTED]
Sent: October 22, 2019 10:16 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Riga Godron; Yuka Kurokawa; Leslie Robinson; Amy White
Subject: 913-929 Burdett Avenue and 914-924 McClure Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I wish to express my support of the proposed development at 913-929 Burdett Avenue and 914-924 McClure Street as outlined in [Thursday's agenda](#) (p.51). (I am also in favour of the development proposed at 1046 North Park St, for adults living with mental illness.)

I am pleased that the Mount St. Angela's development makes considerations for the needs and desires of Victoria's residents. The character of the building will be retained, and more importantly, this development will deliver several affordable rental units for seniors, as well as assisted living facilities. Our residents are very sorely in need of purpose-built rentals; affordable units and assisted living facilities are also in high demand.

With that said, I am disappointed that only half of the units in this proposal will be designated as rentals, and then only for 20 years. The five affordable units and the 26 assisted living units will also only be available for 20 years. I would ask the City to push for a better deal for Victoria's senior residents: more rental units, more affordable units, and/or for a longer period of time: at least 25 or 30, and ideally a minimum of 50 years.

Otherwise, seniors who begin tenure in these affordable and assisted-living rental units in the near future will quickly face housing insecurity and rising rents at a time when they should be comfortable, safe, and cared for.

Thank you for your consideration. I know you will do all you can to secure the best deal possible for our senior citizens.

With warm regards,

Alieda Blandford
Renters' Advisory Committee Member

Heather McIntyre

From: Victoria E. Adams [REDACTED]
Sent: October 22, 2019 5:11 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Land Use Matters - 913-929 Burdett Ave., 914-924 McLure Street

City Council
City of Victoria

I cannot support this residential development project as a senior, a tenant, and a taxpayer in the City of Victoria.

There are several problems with this proposed housing development.

1. Why is the city approving even more site-specific zoning, when no other municipality in BC is doing do?

The City of Victoria has more than 770 site specific zones! Far from simplifying the zoning categories for Victoria, the City is simply perpetuating a system of one-off zoning requests to perpetuate land value appreciation for owners in an already unaffordable real estate market. Why doesn't the R-91 (North Park District Residential Zoning) apply to this residential project?

2. This development has no net public benefit in spite of the fact that it is a 106-unit residential development.

The land lift analysis points out that although the owner will benefit from increased density from 1:3:1 to 1:96:1 FSR, the land lift value was reduced to \$1.3 million, while the owner's heritage preservation and seismic upgrading cost would exceed \$5 million. There will be no public benefit since the owner's costs will exceed the value of the land lift. What has not been revealed is whether the properties within the complex designated "heritage" have received any civic grants or tax exemptions to maintain or upgrade the properties.

3. Parking requirements for 60 spaces (46 for residents and 13 for visitors) are based on the previous proposal. The new proposal reduces the total number of parking spaces to 56 and replaces the space with cycling storage and change room facilities. The real question is, if affordability, accessibility, social equity, reduction of GHGs are to be considered a public benefit, why not eliminate private parking for residents by including a limited number of car-share spaces for residents, and limited parking for visitors. This would align with the city's Active Transportation/Mobility strategy, climate action plan, and reduce the per unit housing costs.

4. Covenants for the property have been removed. In spite of the increased density, engineering reports there is no impact on the existing sewage infrastructure from this project. Where is the evidence? What staff have not considered is how new development in this area will impacted by or limited by the carrying capacity or loads whether for potable water, sewage, storm drainage, waste removal, as well as road capacity due to increased volume of traffic.

5. In the absence of an evidence-based, consistent and Housing Agreements policy, individual housing agreements appear to be entirely discretionary based primarily on the interests and needs of the owner/investors. Where is the public benefit ensured in the city's housing agreement policy and, how are the most vulnerable occupants, i.e. tenants, modest-income seniors protected? Why is housing tenure protected

for 20 years, but not 50 years, or in perpetuity? Furthermore, there are no limitations on the conversions to strata, or the conditions of the unit sales. What does “affordable” housing mean? If five units are designated “affordable” (according to the City’s “Inclusionary Housing and Community Amenity Policy”, how much will seniors be expected to pay for these strata units or rental units? While 34 units at 1046 and 1048 North Park (to be built for VIHA to house existing Mount Angela residents) will be designated “low-income affordable units”, what will seniors be expected to pay for these units? And, is the City’s definition of “affordability” the same as VIHA’s definition of “low-income affordable units”?

Furthermore, the 34-unit VIHA purpose-built seniors rental facility (McLure Street) will not be secured through a housing agreement. Why not? Apparently, VIHA can only sign 20-year lease agreements. This means there is no low-income rental housing security related to the development of this property. And, if the site’s R-91 zone (N. Park Residential District) limits residential use to rest-homes, then why is the owner asking for a spot rezoning of the 913 Burdett property when it could be part of the R-91 zone?

Summary:

In spite of the city’s adoption of new “inclusive” “affordable” housing policies, in this 106-unit development: Less than 30% of the units will be affordable many senior tenant households in the city.

- 22 units will be strata title residential units (presumably the going rate of more than \$500,000 per unit depending on the size)
- 53 units (50% of the total number of units will be “market rental”) based on the maximum rent that can be garnered in a Victoria’s high-rental market.
- 5 units will available as “affordable market rental” (but only for 20 years).
- 26 units will be designated assisted living units (but only for 20 years).

Sincerely,

Victoria Adams
Victoria, BC

References:

Staff Report Oct. 10/19 – Rezoning Application No. 00466 and Heritage Alteration Permit Application No.00214 for 913-929 Burdett Avenue and 914-924 McLure Street
<https://pub-victoria.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=45809>

Nicole Crescenzi, “City of Victoria considers proposed senior rental development”, VicNews, 21 October 2019.
<https://www.vicnews.com/news/city-of-victoria-considers-proposed-senior-rental-development/>

Bill Cleverley, “Design and heritage panels tussle over Mount St. Angela overhaul”, Times Colonist, January 13, 2017.
<https://www.timescolonist.com/news/local/design-and-heritage-panels-tussle-over-mount-st-angela-overhaul-1.7235612>

Madison Heiser

From: Malcolm Harvey [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 10:08 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Public Hearing Bylaw(no. 1217) No. 20-022

We reside at 3-923 McClure St., directly across the street from this development. While we have no objections to the overall proposal we are very concerned about the main vehicle access to this building.

The 900 block of McClure St. is a minor local street with only one motor vehicle access point off Vancouver St. It is designated a "living street" and is currently signposted as a pedestrian/cycle connection between Vancouver and Quadra Sts.

By our estimation there are currently 134 dwelling or hotel units using this block for vehicle access. Abigail's hotel has approval for an expansion that will add another 8 units, this proposal would add 56 more vehicle spots and Council is considering a development next door to us that would add another 16 dwelling units for a total of 207 dwelling/vehicle spots all exiting onto our narrow street which, with parking on both sides, has only one driving lane.

We would point out that the 900 block of Burdett, in contrast, is 50% wider overall, has vehicle access from both Quadra and Vancouver and has no vehicle access from either of the large residential buildings currently fronting on Burdett.

In addition, Council has indicated its desire to convert Vancouver St. into a more pedestrian/cycle friendly street by blocking vehicle access at McClure which means that all the traffic from the 900 block McClure will have no option for access other than Vancouver St. south of McClure. Adding more motor vehicle traffic to Vancouver St. would seem to be counterproductive to Council's other plans, especially when it can be avoided by redesign.

We realize that the topography makes the vehicle access off McClure very convenient for the developers but that convenience shouldn't come at the expense of those of us who currently live on this block. We urge Council to request a redesign of the vehicle access to this site which would take the vehicle pressure off our small street and put it on the under-utilized 900 block of Burdett.

Please don't turn our street in to a back alley for Burdett St.

Malcolm Harvey
James McClelland