

November 27, 2020

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

As requested, below is a detailed response to the Downton Residents Association (DRA) letter dated September 14, 2020. The DRA letter has been pasted below in its entirety. For clarity, our responses are highlighted yellow. Unfortunately, much of the letter is devoted to the R48 zone, rather than our application. Please know that we have great respect for the author of the letter and, similarly, great respect for the entire DRA. Over the years, we have always engaged with the DRA in a collaborative manner and have always received valuable advice. The DRA is a great asset to the City of Victoria. That we disagree with much of the content of the letter is not a reflection of our feelings towards the DRA. We look forward to working with the DRA in the future.

Mayor Helps and Council
City of Victoria
No.1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

September 14th, 2020

Re: 1150 Cook Street – Development Permit with Variance

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

The DRA LUC met with the applicant in 2017 prior to application to discuss an earlier version of this application. The DRA has expressed ongoing concerns regarding the loopholes of the R48 Zoning Bylaw and Council's apparent lack of interest in closing them.

Our application should not be subject to discussion about the R48 zone. It is not only unfair, but unwarranted. Ours is a Development Permit application with variances (height/number of storeys). This application is not a rezoning.

Comments and concerns regarding the application at 1150 Cook Street by the DRA LUC members are as follows:

- In the recent Staff report to ADP it states, *“Staff consider that the proposal is generally consistent with the use, density and height envisioned in the DCAP”*. This kind of Staff guidance to Advisory Design Panel is highly problematic as it appears factually incorrect. Density for this proposal is 40% greater than permitted by the OCP and DCAP; which is clearly “generally” not consistent with either the prescriptions or what was envisioned by the OCP.

We believe staff have acted in good faith and in the interest of the City of Victoria and have not provided factually incorrect information. We have been working with staff for over a year on this application. Staff are professionals hired by the City to act on behalf of the City. The recommendations put forth to ADP, COTW and Council are well considered. Our project is a good one and is generally consistent with the OCP and DCAP and is deserving of the support provided by Staff.

- Built examples of R-48 zoned land that maintain the required 10-storey height limit have not achieved a density greater than 5:1. The Jukebox Condo is on land zoned R48 and was built a short distance away and achieved a density of 4.45:1 under the maximum

10-storey limit of the zoning. The proposed density for 1150 Cook is 7.78:1 while the OCP maximum is 5.5:1. The R-48 zone does not state a specific density entitlement and instead staff have adopted a highly debatable calculation to interpret and justify “as of right” densities. If the R48 zoning bylaw does not specifically state a density entitlement, why isn’t an OCP amendment required for this proposal?

As per our presentation, a 10-storey building would result in exactly what the author refers to later in the letter as “bulky”. This is what we are trying to avoid. Our taller, more slender design is preferred and is well within the 20-storey OCP guideline. Taller buildings are already on View Street half a block away and taller buildings are coming across the street.

- West side yard setbacks of only 4.8m are proposed for floors 11-15 while DCAP requires 6.0m. DCAP specifications for building separation have been recently identified as grossly inadequate as the current rules impact livability. At minimum, no variance should be granted under this circumstance.

No variance is being requested for any setback. The proposal exceeds the zoning requirements and exceeds the DCAP guidelines in 3 of 4 directions. It is only the west setback that does not meet the guideline. Firstly, please note this is a guideline. A guideline, not a zoning requirement. The application meets the zoning requirement. Secondly, this comment appears to pertain to floors 11-15 only. The building to the west is 10 storeys and thus, there is arguably no impact. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, is that in addition to the 4.8m setback to property line achieved by the application, there is a drive aisle to the neighbour’s parkade on the other side of the property line. That is, another 6-7m before the adjacent building is reached. That building then presents a predominantly blank wall housing a stairwell. The only windows in that wall are small windows in the stairwell. The building then jogs a couple of times as it works its way west down View Street. The first habitable window facing our project is approximately 100’ from our property line. Including our 4.8m, it is about 115’ before a window in the building to the west faces a window in our building. We are very confident in the livability of our west-facing homes. The site is a small one and the core, for seismic and structural reasons, cannot be reduced in size any further. The units have been squeezed as much as they can. Any further reduction in the west setback disproportionately affects the livability of the west facing homes in a negative manner.

- Rear yard setbacks of 5.9 m are proposed for floors 11-15 while DCAP requires 6.0m.

Revised to meet DCAP

- Front setbacks do not comply with DCAP above the 10th floor. No variance should be granted.

A variance is not being sought.

- There are 41 parking spaces proposed for 129 market condo units. There are commercial units proposed within this project and yet no commercial parking spots are being provided. There is no parking for moving trucks, delivery vehicles or guest parking and both short term and long term street parking are typically at a premium already in our neighbourhood and with all the Covid deliveries, it is even worse.

There are no parking requirements for this application. We have gone to great expense to provide two levels of underground parking, provide 4 electric car charging stations and will be making our building ready for more future electric cars. Clearly, we are doing far more than required.

- The evidence-based Schedule C requires over double this number of spaces. R-48 does not require parking however there is a height variance being sought that will permit a building approximately 42% larger than the existing 10-storey zoning limit, the OCP and DCAP would permit exacerbating the parking shortage downtown.

As stated, there are no parking requirements under R48. 200 units could be built in a blocky 10-storey building with no parking. Our application is a commonsense approach to urban development.

- There is no evidence to justify the provision of such a minimal amount of parking for this type of housing tenure, as the demand for onsite parking by tenants will surpass the parking supply. The outcome will be that these vehicles will be parked in the surrounding neighbourhoods effectively transferring the problem elsewhere.

As per above, we are doing far more than required. In addition to the non-required vehicle parking stalls being provided, significant bike parking is being provided.

- The parking garage exit/entry should be more than just a plain garage door - it (and all others in the downtown) should add some aesthetic appeal/value. And it should operate silently.

Good point. We have done some work around this.

- The current pandemic has made it clear that privately owned vehicles will remain popular but electric cars may inevitably dominate. As reported by CTV News on November 28, 2019, "The province now boasts the highest per-capita sales of electric vehicles in North America". This application should provide the parking required by Schedule C as well as charging stations to support and incentivize the conversion from internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles to electric vehicles.

Agreed. We are doing much to make our building electric car friendly.

- With due respect to the marketability of the proposed units, public feedback on other applications indicates that more consideration could be given for 2 and even 3 bedroom units as many millennials and others are looking for larger units, in order to share the space and the costs. This may be even more of a factor now with COVID, as people may not want to live in such isolation. Plus with more people working from home, and that may likely continue, they need space to do that, so even one bedroom + den units might be advisable..

Thank you for your input.

- While the developer has provided 143 Bike parking spots, there appears to be no storage lockers proposed. It can be expected that the proposed bike parking will in all likelihood be utilized as storage.

Perhaps. That some bike parking might be used inappropriately, does not, in our opinion mean less should be provided. Nor does it mean that storage lockers are necessary. As always, we will maximize the efficiency of our homes and attempt to provide ample and creative storage.

- Bike parking has to be very secure. Recent thefts downtown illustrate there are substantial problems with theft from under ground garages.

Agreed.

- The shadow plans do not show December - the worst month of all. The building as proposed will create an unreasonable shadow over the neighbours. This is a residential neighbourhood and yet nowhere else in the city would this kind of shadowing of pre-existing homes be considered acceptable.

Industry-standard (equinox) shadow studies have been provided.

- The proposal appears to utilize attractive and high quality cladding materials.

Thank you.

- There are no public amenities proposed for this application. The original propertyowner has been able to extract the total value of the original R-48 rezoning entitlement without any corresponding contribution to the public good.

Agreed. When the R48 zone was granted (in the 1990's?) there was likely a financial benefit to the property owners at that time.

The DRA has long expressed concerns about how the R-48 zone has been egregiously gamed far beyond current OCP maximums and the original intent of the Council that created the zone. It is strongly felt that Council permitting R-48 applicants to cherry pick to their advantage the one OCP/DCAP policy that allows extra height and then ignore all of the other limiting policies of our core planning bylaws has to stop. Existing DCAP policies have been identified as woefully inadequate to support liveability and proposed changes to correct these shortcomings are currently under review. R48 zoning produces buildings several orders of magnitude worse than our already inadequate DCAP prescriptions. The resulting buildings are overly bulky for their height and produce profoundly negative impacts on neighbouring properties. The City of Vancouver does not allow anything approaching these densities in urban residential areas and neither should Victoria. Council needs to decline any height variance that facilitates any configuration that doesn't comply 100% with DCAP policy for height, setbacks and floor plate sizes and OCP density maximums...period. The DRA would be happy to support this application under those circumstances.

This application facilitates the undermining of our core planning documents. It is high time for Council to support liveability Downtown and support the principles enshrined in the City's core planning documents.

We prefer not to weigh in on the pros and cons of the R48 zone. Our application is not about the R48 zone. It should not be subject to debate or discussion about the zone. I suspect we might agree with the author on some points and disagree on others. Certainly, I have had numerous discussions with the author around urban development. I believe we are quite like-minded (he may disagree!). In response to the above paragraph, I will say that we spent considerable time contemplating OCP/DCAP policies and tried to reflect these in our application. I believe we have done extraordinarily well in this regard. Our homes all have bedrooms on exterior walls (i.e., not shoe boxes) and are extremely livable. Our building is not "bulky" and does not "produce profoundly negative impacts on neighbouring properties". As per above, the building to the west presents a "blank" wall approximately 40' from our building and no habitable windows for over 100'. To the south, the building presents a 2-storey blank wall over surface parking. We are confident in our position that we do not negatively affect our neighbours. We believe quite the contrary. Council's support of this application is exactly what the author has requested in his closing statement "**to support liveability Downtown and support the principles enshrined in the City's core planning documents**". Please look at our application through a lens not clouded by distaste for R48.

From: Dan Robbins

Sent: November 30, 2020 12:38 PM

To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; cthorton-joe@victoria.ca <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>

Cc: Fraser McColl

Subject: Re: 1150 Cook St

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please find attached our detailed response to the DRA letter. This has also been sent to COV staff. Both Fraser and I are happy to clarify any points via email or telephone.

We continue to work on items a through e of the staff report to Council. Following the COTW meeting on Nov. 26th, we met with a number of COV staff on Nov. 27th and subsequently BC Hydro and Fortis BC. We are confident that items a through e will be resolved in the very near future. As suggested by COV staff, the belief was that these relatively insignificant issues could be dealt with between COTW and the subsequent Council Meeting in which final approval of our application would be contemplated. Most, if not all, of these items will be resolved this week. As such, we urge you to reconsider your decision on Nov. 26th to refer our application back to Staff. It is an unnecessary step. Rather than ratify your decision on Dec. 3rd to refer our application back to Staff, we urge you to reconsider and forward our application to Council and a forum for public comment. Support of Staff's recommendation "That Council authorize the issuance of Development Permit with Variance Application No. 00130 for 1150 Cook Street..." is warranted.

Kind regards,

Dan Robbins, PhD

On Fri, Nov 27, 2020 at 6:48 AM Dan Robbins < > wrote:

Dear Mayor and Council,

Thank you for taking the time yesterday to review and discuss our application for 1150 Cook St. While disappointed our application was referred back to staff rather than forward to a forum for public comment, we understand the process and will work diligently with staff to respond to your requests. Please know that we have been working collaboratively with staff for over a year. As always, staff have been helpful and contributed positively to the project. While a number of small issues remain (i.e., items a through e listed in the staff report), as indicated by staff, these were deemed to be resolvable in the time between COTW and the subsequent council meeting. Now, we will attempt to resolve these issues prior to returning to COTW. In addition, we will respond in a detailed manner to the DRA letter dated Sept. 14, 2020.

Given our application does not involve a rezoning, but rather variances related to height/number of storeys, it was surprising that the majority of the meeting was devoted to the R-48 zone. It seems incredibly unfair that our application be subject to a philosophical debate around R-48 and, ultimately, be punished for it. What was expected to be the meat of the discussion (i.e., height) was generally, if not unanimously, supported. A number of you stated the preference for a taller, more slender building as compared to the shorter, thicker buildings typical of past R-48 buildings. Our application is a good one. The building is attractive and well-designed. 129 functional and extremely liveable homes will be added to our housing stock. We will be back in front of you soon. Please do not punish us for being R-48.

Kind regards,

Dan Robbins, PhD

Monday, April 5, 2021

Dear Mayor and City Council,

As a business owner (book shop) in Victoria for the past twenty years, would like to support the proposed building 1150 Cook Street, called MOD.

I have known Fraser McColl for almost twenty years as he leased me my first shop when I started in the retail book business in the Mosaic Building, and now in the Jukebox. His buildings are works of art proved by both the Jukebox and refurbished Mosaic into the first work/live building in the city. In fact, *Hop On Hop Off* sightseeing tour stops at the Mosaic Building and offers a history of it to clients.

Built with integrity, Mr. McColl's structures offer progressive and beautiful additions to Victoria. People choose to walk along my block of View now because of the ambience provided to the public by the stunning art deco style Jukebox.

I would be thrilled to support the addition of MOD to our neighborhood.

Many thanks,

Frances G. Thorsen
Chronicles of Crime, your mystery bookshop
Unit 103 - 1029 View Street
Victoria, BC, Canada, V8V 0C9
[REDACTED]

Amanda Ferguson

From: Patricia Hultman [REDACTED]
Sent: April 6, 2021 3:56 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: View/Cook Street ; Pluto's proposed development

We are writing to express our strong disagreement with the proposed development on former Pluto's location at View and Cook Street

After the opening of the new bridge, Mayor Helps shared that the Jawl family proposed a development with the new firehall at their Mazda location bordered by Johnson and Yates with Cook Street. This set the stage for the massive developments proposed in this corridor.

Oh lots of talk about housing for the families that work downtown and have to commute to get to work. How many families will be moving here? This is absurd. How can a family of 4 squeeze in these spaces proposed for the Pluto's location or the Harris Victoria location? Where will children play? How will they get to their schools? What about parking? Visitors parking?

What happened when Black & White development was approved? Why was only 4 stories approved? And now we're talking 16 or 17 stories only a block away! The Pluto's site is too small for such a proposal

What would make more sense would be to stop these massive buildings at this immediate area. Spread the high rises out every 4 blocks or so, one on 800 Yates, Another down 800 Johnson, another 700 Pandora etc, the city skyline would leave room to see the sky, see around without peering into another condo when you sit on your deck or open the curtains in your livingroom.

It has been observed that only the Mayor lives in Victoria, but none of the other council members, yet you are making decisions affecting thousands of lives. Renters want safe walkable neighbourhoods too. Victoria is a charming place to live, don't make it into ghettos like Vancouver or New York, help keep the atmosphere that drew all of us here.

We do not want Harris or Pluto's developments to be tall sky scrapers, let us keep more space between these massive building

Thank you for opportunity to share our concerns and suggestions Patricia and David Hultman
1020 View Street

Sent from my iPad

Amanda Ferguson

From: Steve Catte [REDACTED]
Sent: April 6, 2021 12:19 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 1150 Cook St. - Proposed Development

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing this letter to support the proposed development at 1150 Cook St. I have worked on View Street for the last 5+ years and have watched the neighborhood grow and improve as a result of the new buildings and infrastructure.

I currently live in Langford and commute to the work. With the improved commute time resulting from COVID and the new overpass, this has been more tolerable than in the past, however I am still looking to purchase my first home in the area. Like most first time purchasers, I have been quickly priced out of the housing market and condo's are my only option. I think this project could provide a great Live/Work/Play environment for me and many others.

Regards,
Steve Catte

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



Sparrow Salon & Spa

111-1029 View St
Victoria, BC V8V 0C9



5th April 2021

City of Victoria Mayor, Council and Planning Staff

Victoria City Hall
1 Centennial Square
V8W 1P6

Dear Mayor, Council and Planning Staff,

I am writing in support of the application for the proposed development at 1150 Cook St.

I have operated a business in Victoria for 14 years, 10 of these years within a block of the proposed development and most recently as of March 1st of 2020 I bought a commercial unit at 1029 View in the Jukebox building. This was a very fortuitous move as the support from local residents living within the Jukebox and the surrounding buildings have been integral in supporting my business, especially through this past year.

My previous location was a commercial lease in a retail/office building and since moving into a building with residential above as opposed to offices I have witnessed a distinct difference in the foot traffic around my business. There is more traffic as there is a tendency for people who live in an area to explore and support their surroundings more as opposed to just getting to and

from work. Having more residents in the immediate area has been nothing but beneficial for my business.

This year has proved, more than ever, that local residents are the backbone of our city. Many government/office workers have been working from home and it is the residents that have supported mine, and many other businesses. Those that reside here are more invested in our community, wanting to see it thrive and stay safe.

I appreciate the support my community has shown me and look forward to seeing it grow. Developments such as this proposal can only enhance our community.

Sincerely,

Crystal Ross

April 6, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Letter of Support for the Mod

I am writing you today with the intent to put forth both a letter of reference and support for the proposed building going in on the old Pluto's lot located at the corner of View and Cook in downtown Victoria.

As a local business owner with locations in the downtown core at 726 Yates St and 1029 View St and as a resident at 989 Johnson St the need for cleaning up and reviving our city is vital to its growth, survival and desirability.

Owning a business on View St and residing in the Harris Green area I confident this building will only bring more positive growth and help to our economy and the clean-up we desire and require.

Having worked directly with both Fraser McColl and Dan Robbins, seeing their support in our businesses and the community along with the vision they have, I would like to offer my full support in their building and vision in beautifying our city. We need more builders who share this vision and are willing to go that extra mile working with the local business owners and residents ensuring they grow along side and together.

Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions and thank you in advance for considering my letter and feedback on our city, its community and our growth as one.

Gavin Henderson-Peal



www.grmarketinggroup.ca

www.pbhwellnessgroup.ca

Amanda Ferguson

From: Jack Fraserg [REDACTED]
Sent: April 6, 2021 10:33 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Permit Application No 00130

Friends,

Frank Gehry the renowned Toronto born architect has lamented the fact that few places in the world have been saved from the construction of tall nondescript apartment blocks. For purely economic reasons architects are avoided and these projects are promoted by contractors with the signature of an engineer.

Keeping the limit of 10 storeys will help preserve the relaxed charm of Victoria which so many have found attractive.

With regards,

John Fraser

413-1039 View St.
[REDACTED]

Robert Shannon

Unit 216, View Street, Victoria, B.C., V8V 0C9

Phone: [REDACTED]

March 28th 2021

**City of Victoria Mayor, Council and
Planning Staff**

Victoria City Hall
1 Centennial Square, Victoria, B.C., V8W 1P6

Re: the proposed development at 1150 Cook Street

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed development at 1150 Cook Street. As a resident of the Jukebox I am excited for the much needed revitalization of 1150 Cook Street. The area has been vastly improved by the quality and design of the Jukebox and I am confident that the current proposal will have the same build quality and community consideration in its design. I have enjoyed walking out the door and being able to shop and dine in the immediate area. I have supported the local business in the area and I am sure that another building built by the developers would draw the same type of community based people.

Respectfully,

Robert Shannon

Amanda Ferguson

From: S Stackhouse [REDACTED]
Sent: April 6, 2021 1:15 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Public Comment for Hearing Thurs April 8

Opportunity for Public Comment
Hearing to be held Thursday April 8 at 6:30 pm

Written Submission by email to publichearings@victoria.ca on April 6, 2021

Re: **Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00130, 1150 Cook Street**

From Sue Stackhouse, 302-1020 View Street, Victoria

1. Why were residents **within one-half block of this corner development** at 1150 Cook (we live at Regents Park, 1020 View) not pro-actively notified about Thursday April 8 hearing and opportunities for comment? A document was generated by the City entitled "It's Your Neighbourhood" but was not sent to residents at 1020 View St. The lobby entrance and parking entrance of this proposed development will both be on View Street, so perhaps this should be noted for future neighbourly communications?
2. **The requested variance for an increase in density, 40% more than permitted by the OCP and DCAP, and 5 or 6 stories higher than allowed should NOT be granted.** Just say no. The developer wants a variance to allow 129 units with (likely) average occupancy of 2.5 people per unit, plus commercial/retail/food service ground floor tenants, each of whom will want to welcome friends and family with cars, deliveries of mail, food, meals, goods of all sorts by vehicles from van size to 26 foot truck size, tradespeople's vehicles, handi-dart buses, ambulance, garbage and recycling pickup, etc.
3. The letter of support from NSDA Architects includes ***"Neighbouring properties will experience an increase in activity and use . . ."*** Exactly. And that's why we need the developer to provide adequate short-term parking for all the deliveries and visits by friends and family that up to 129 additional living units will generate. If we cannot lessen impacts that way, then at least – please – hold the size of the development to existing allowed density requirements. **A developer should not be allowed to reap the benefits of R-48 zoning in terms of parking while also asking for such massive increases in density.**
4. My understanding was that – in the OCP and similar long-term legal documents generated by City Planning – that the overall height of buildings was to be greatest along Yates then stepped down substantially moving north and south of Yates and east towards Cook. But this developer is trying to convince decision-makers that their tower should be welcomed as a "Downtown Core Area boundary marker". Their words. **But we do not live in the Downtown Core**, we live in Harris Green which is primarily a residential neighbourhood and becoming even more so with every new permit granted.
5. Will rental of strata suites be permitted? If so, then move-in, move-outs could be more frequent. We average 6 move-ins and 6 move-outs at the end of each month. The number of units being rented out by owners will impact space required for moving vehicles.
6. What is the height of entrance to parking garage? Will delivery vans be able to access? Are any of your 41 underground parking spots allocated as short-term/visitor/commercial use/trades parking?
7. Why is there no "splay" indicated for vehicles turning right out of underground parking, heading towards Cook Street? Cars edging around the back of a moving truck or handi-dart bus or other delivery vehicle that is backed up to

the edge of that parking entry will have to head straight out at a right angle, perhaps into the opposite driving lane before swinging right, and very close to an intersection.

8. I could not find the exact measure from the end of curb at the proposed parking entrance to the beginning of curved curbing along View, but it seems to offer no more than 35 feet of curbside parking. A U-haul moving truck is up to 26 ft long, ambulance 23 ft, KIA Rio is 14 ft, Ford Escape 15 ft, Audi A6 16 ft. At that rate, you are only expecting a maximum of two cars/pickups or one truck/ambulance/handi-dart to be able to park curbside. But a 2019 report says that **an average 200-unit building in New York receives 70 packages per day**. All those daily packages, appliances/furniture and food deliveries, service people, arrive in fleets of white vans, cars, and large trucks. And the developer is also planning commercial use at ground level. Please understand, we will not permit any vehicles visiting or servicing this proposed development to access our private property at 1010/1020 View for any reason. Period. We've had enough of people speeding through our private driveways doing a u-turn – we have little kids and elderly here. We also don't appreciate them using our visitor spots while they enjoy a meal across at the noodle place, have their hair cut at the barber on View, or visit friends at the Jukebox.

9. I'm not sure that a traffic signal will be viewable by traffic coming along View heading toward Cook if in the position shown on the developer's plan. A wide/high vehicle parked curbside will block the driver's view of that signal. I hope there will also be an overhead traffic light or a stop sign that is closer to the actual traffic lane?

10. Where will the developer's garbage bins be positioned while waiting for pickup and later re-positioning? We are running out of available on-street space due to density of our block already.

11. There do not appear to be any grassy areas for all those occupants' dogs to relieve themselves. We strongly suggest that planners require a dog toilet area at ground level, whether as part of city property or of the developer's private property.

12. Please do not try to suggest publicly that you have canvassed the neighbourhood on this variance request when it appears you have not done so in any pro-active way. I only found out about this hearing by chance. I am beginning to believe that City Planners don't actually want to hear from neighbours, especially if we point out that you are – in many cases – not upholding density and heights and setbacks in **legally registered community plans**.

Amanda Ferguson

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: April 7, 2021 11:33 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: Proposed 20 story building on Cook Street

From: Bennett Guinn [REDACTED]
Sent: April 6, 2021 9:37 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>
Subject: Proposed 20 story building on Cook Street

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

I wish to add my opinion to the proposal to build a 20 story building on Cook Street currently occupied by the former Pluto's Restaurant.

Victoria is getting too congested with high rise buildings and the upset to traffic flow affects everyone trying to get around. I propose that any new building have appropriate setbacks to allow construction equipment to work without impeding traffic. This would have the added benefit of bringing the building more to scale with pedestrians. I moved here from a concrete jungle and I'm seeing that Victoria is becoming too dense and that affects its charm.

Please keep urban density to a reasonable level. Build highrises on the outskirts where there is more room.

Thank you.

Bennett Guinn
Victoria



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Amanda Ferguson

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: April 7, 2021 11:45 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: 1150 Cook St development permit

From: Cathy Brankston [REDACTED]
Sent: April 7, 2021 11:39 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: 1150 Cook St development permit

Mayor and Council

I am dismayed that only 2 councillors opposed this permit request. The developer has chosen his own interpretation of the OCP and Harris Green guidelines. The proposed density and height are both 40% higher than the OCP. Harris Green should not be a high density neighborhood. Forcing this densification into a few blocks, loses the neighborhood aspect the city should be supporting.

Again, the nimby approach, at which I mean the other areas have been more than satisfied Harris Green has taken the brunt of over-development and years of homeless issues. Lack of support from the council on rejecting this proposal will be an open door for future over-built development applications.

The Cook St corridor is already lined with towers, built or proposed. With the bike changes on Vancouver St, the 3000 cars a day have been forced to Cook St. As I can walk to this location in 5"/7", I consider it my neighborhood.

Thank you
Cathy Brankston
314 999 Burdett Ave
Victoria BC
V8V 3G7

T

Kevin Dunic
990 Perez, Dr
Saanich BC, V8Y 3G2

City of Victoria Mayor, Council and Planning Staff
Victoria City Hall
1 Centennial Square V8W 1P6
April 7, 2021

City of Victoria Mayor, Council and Planning Staff,

I am writing this letter in support of the development proposed for the building site located at 1150 Cook St, Victoria BC.

I have lived on Vancouver Island for over 30 years, and have 8 investment properties located in the Harris Green Neighborhood (5 of which are in the Jukebox: 1029 View St). I have chosen to invest in this neighborhood because of it's low vacancy rates and surrounding small business community which many of my tenants are a part of.

The development at 1150 Cook St will enhance the Harris Green community further by providing high demand housing for people and businesses in the area whilst adding harmonious visual interest to the area.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kevin Dunic', written over a horizontal line.

Kevin Dunic
Investor