



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

8 March 2020

Re: Rezoning for 1205 & 1209 Quadra, 910 View, 903 & 911 Yates & 1045 Yates

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

The DRA LUC hosted a CALUC meeting for this application on 3 December 2019. One hundred and four members of the community registered their attendance at the door. Mr. Mark Chemij and Andrew Brown of Starlight Investments were in attendance. Several members of the project team were in attendance and they conducted the majority of the presentation and answered questions from attendees.

Based on the information the applicant provided at the meeting and the information the applicant submitted to the City (and posted on the Development Tracker), we highlight the following points:

- As stated by the applicant, the information provided at the CALUC meeting was intended to “introduce a development concept” as opposed to representations of the specific development plans and commitments (which are typically expected at CALUC meetings).
- The applicant stated that they “will use the feedback from the meeting to refine the concept before submitting”.
- There remains a great deal of ambiguity as to what the applicant is specifically proposing across almost 5 acres in the heart of the Harris Green community.
- It was stated that there are three OCP amendments for this project but specific information was not accurately provided to the community at the meeting.
- The applicant proposes to create “customized design guidelines that describe the development as a whole”. No analysis has been provided to the public showing how the developer’s guidelines align with, or vary from, the official guidelines outlined in the Downtown Core Area Plan.
- There are a number of discrepancies between the information presented to the public at the CALUC meeting and what is outlined in the documents submitted to the City, including, but not limited to:
 - Building heights up to 25 storeys vs 28 storeys (over the proscribed max of 17)
 - FSR of up to 6.0 vs 6.5
 - Podium heights of 6 storeys vs 4 storeys
 - Phasing of an indeterminate number vs 3 phases
- All vehicular entrances are proposed for View Street but a traffic study has not been completed nor presented to the community. Many community members expressed

concerns about the potential impact this project may have on the streets in general and the Vancouver Street bike lanes.

- It must be emphasized that this is a significant project that will be a major part of Victoria's skyline for decades to come and, as such, shouldn't be rushed through the approval process.
- This very large master-planned community application represents a new approach in the downtown core. The applicant is seeking a rezoning for a multi-phase project that will impact the immediate neighbourhood for years to come. It is at the conceptual stage, and proposes negotiation with the city on guidelines that would supersede the OCP. That leaves the community the possibility to provide feedback only very early in the process, with many aspects of the development still poorly defined. The rezoned property would give the developer the bulk of the changes they might need and not much further input would be possible except within the limited opportunity under Development Permits over a long period of phased build-out. That's great for business certainty but not very comfortable for the community. We recognise that under a DP, City Council and the community has limited discretion to request or require changes or refinements to the project.
- This project is too important to the future of Harris Green and the liveability of the community to rezone almost 5 acres of land as one application. If it's intended that this project will be operationalized over three phases, we recommend that the rezonings occur over three separate applications.

In summary, it is our opinion that the impact of this proposal is far too significant for it to proceed to a public hearing simply on the basis of the general concept presented to the community. Although a concept presentation is welcome, it cannot be considered as fulfilling the required and necessary public presentation under the CALUC process, unless the terms and topics like specific OCP amendments, building heights, densities, housing affordability, etc are clearly defined.

A number of residents' issues and concerns were not addressed and remain unresolved in the absence of more complete information. The DRA LUC looks forward to reviewing the applicant's refined plans with specific commitments for each phase and anticipates hosting the applicant at another CALUC meeting when they present the necessary information required by the clearly defined process for public review and comment.

Note: The following pages include notes that capture the presentation made by the applicant and their team, questions asked by attendees and answers provided, and additional comments offered on the project.

Sincerely,



Ian Sutherland
Chair Land Use Committee
Downtown Residents Association

Presentation

Project team: Deane Strongitharm of CitySpaces (Planner), Franc D'Ambrosio of D'Ambrosio architecture + urbanism (Urban Designer), Gwyn Vose (Project Architect) and Kate Lambert (Planner, Urban Design and Public Engagement) of IBI Group and Joe Fry of Hapa Collaborative (Landscape Architect).

Meeting Notes:

Introduction (Mark Chemij)

- The intention is to develop two sites within the Harris Green area: the London Drugs site and the Harris Dodge site.
- Proposed concept includes mixed use (commercial & residential rental).
- Starlight intends to own and manage these properties in the long term.
- New green space to be built and maintained by Starlight that will be for the wider community.

Public Engagement Overview (Kate Lambert)

- The information provided at the meeting is the proposed development concept that will comprise the rezoning application that will be submitted to the City.
- From public engagement process the feedback emphasized the importance of a vibrant public realm; a variety of shops and services (same as now or better), a community gathering space with green elements, trees and green spaces were highlighted.
- An emphasis on high quality design.
- Balance between buildings/built space and open space; common themes emerged that were used for design phase of the project.

Design Ideas that form the Baseline for the Concept (Franc D'Ambrosio)

- Underlying principle is the alignment of the buildings on the street.
- Blocks should be of a pedestrian scale that include midblock walkways which creates a village green with ground oriented residential units on View Street and a hard public plaza.
- Yates Street is a primary shopping street that is already a lively active space – expand, augment and improve.
- Very high quality public spaces should be designed for longevity (100 to 200 years) to enhance the social life of the city.
- The nature of the walls that establish that street envelope should be transparent to help animate the streets.
- This is a popular location and to expand it by introducing more seating, rain gardens, a social space that brings life to the street both day and night.
- Pedestrian and residential oriented streets: along Vancouver – new front patios and porches from residences. Along Quadra – transparency along street. Along View – vehicle entrance created in a manner not off-putting with artwork, pedestrian spaces and planting.
- Cook St – mature trees will be protected and preserved during construction.
- Urban Plaza – good for quiet contemplation and rentable for public events that extends to View St where it becomes a smaller scale green space in the more residential area.

Architectural Concept (Gwyn Vose)

- Early stage, will be going through a number of iterations before reaching its final form
- Presentation shows overall intent.
- 100,000 sqft of retail with 1200 -1500 units of 100% residential rental across all of the buildings and includes ½ acre of public space. It's a fantastic series of sites with so many street fronts.
- 1045 Yates: pushed all of our building in by 3m extending the public realm along the street. Retail on Yates and Cook and town homes along View. All of the parking is below grade and all of the loading is fronted by active uses. Above parking is roughly 5-floor

podium of residential, creating a street wall along Yates. The towers are pulled away from the corner at Yates and Cook. At the centre of it is a private space/courtyard for the residents.

- 900-block Yates: same strategy with but with midblock plaza with retail facing in and townhouses also facing onto Vancouver (in addition to View).
- Towers located to reduce shadowing on public spaces, to preserve as many of the views of neighbours as can be achieved and for the views of the units themselves. Green space is in sunlight as much as can be achieved both in summer and up to the equinox.

Landscape Component (Joe Fry)

- Present some of our early ideas and receive feedback. This project helps to transform the heart of Harris Green.
- Franc mentioned a lot of the urban design principles that we'll be referring back to for process and inform our thinking with specifics to the central plaza and green space. Focus: that the plaza is the right size for the community, that it provides a level of flexibility, and compatibility with what this neighbourhood wants and needs as a public space. Work with community and City to make this happen. Needs to be inviting, a public space, connectivity, delight, comfort are the aspirations.
- The high street of Yates is used right now as a public space as a principle gathering space and we want to retain that quality of social spaces and enhance it along that edge and have a wider sidewalk to do that. Along View it becomes more residential.
- Gateway feeling as you're coming into town but a pedestrian oriented space with lots of things happening.
- Studied proportion, scale and size in relation to other sites: Bastion Sq – similar grade changes (10 ft) from Yates to View, Selkirk Commons – variety of programming opportunities, NVan waterfront – programming. Other parks and open spaces – middle connection between Harris Green itself and the park site to the south but we don't think of this as park but as an urban space. Balance of green features with plaza spaces for programming. Yates is a public space and midblock area is an "enlarged street condition" that welcomes people onto the site.
- Very conceptual rendering showing initial ideas.
- Will work with the City to preserve the horse chestnut trees along Vancouver and Cook.
- Sloped walkways with bleacher seating for access across public space.
- Programming in plaza with Starlight facilitating.

Questions raised at the CALUC public meeting:

- **Q: I understand there are amendments to the OCP being requested, could you remind us what they are?** A: One, because of the size and nature of this project, the standard DCAP, some of the design guidelines within the governing policy documents are not necessarily conducive to a large multiphase development. So for example, we need to rezone the entire site now, but we need to proceed with only one DP at a time. The reason is that we need provide certainty for our tenants and we need to design underground parking that need to join to later phases, so we need certainty as to what we can put beside it. Part of that means that the City will need an alternate means of ensuring they know what will be happening in subsequent phases. We will be producing customized design guidelines that describe the development as a whole, both sites, which will be the governing design guidelines for this development. It will be a substitution of different design guidelines, which are largely consistent with the existing ones with some tweaks as required. Second, the other main difference (amendment) would be the additional increment of density. This site is designated 5.5:1 FSR; we're seeking 6.0:1. We are looking at an affordable housing component as well which isn't something we can provide within the existing 5.5, and it's something that we don't need to do by policy as it's a rental, not a condo, but we prefer to come to the table with something and we need the additional density to do that. The third amendment is with respect to building height. If we need to achieve a certain amount of development in order to have viable rental housing and we want the public spaces, something has to give. We think we've arrived at

a solution that optimizes both building heights that work on solar performance, and yielding a large public space about 21000 sqft.

- **Q: Can you demonstrate the public benefit that justifies the bump in FSR?** A: We are asking for an additional 0.5 to move from 5.5 to approx. 6.0 and it's incumbent on us to come with more details about exactly why, not tonight. As we've spoken about previously we don't have specific details about the affordability component we will be providing. We need to work with our team, we need to talk with the City about targeted groups and priorities and we absolutely need to provide that. Below 5.5, the land costs are such that development for concrete high-quality rental is not viable. The land cost is too high per square foot when you divide by fewer square feet. And you end up with units that we can't build because they will be too expensive to rent. There are insufficient people here who could pay the amount required to amortize that same land cost over fewer units. The 5.5 FSR, from our point of view, is a bare minimum for rental viability on the site. Which is why we can't provide affordable units within that 5.5 like a condo would be required to.
- **Q: But you're going to be building up quite a few storeys beyond what's in the area. You're going to be getting a premium for those suites that are up high or on the sunny side of the building or still have some vestige of a view, and that should be what offsets some of the more affordable units that you'll be offering in other parts of the building. It's not a uniform thing. Your rents will vary.** A: There are certain views that have premiums, but one of the loss leaders that is very expensive is the underground parking. The cost of one underground parking stall, which can rent for about \$75-\$100 per month. The cost of developing one parking stall is about minimum \$40k depending on how deep, can be \$80k. There is a lot of cost to provide the underground parking and that public space. That square is a precedent that will be built, operated and maintained by Starlight over the length of the property and that's a significant cost. And I think that's why you don't ever see it occurring before because it's not financially viable unless you have a substantial threshold of units that makes that space viable. And while there are units that command higher rents (with better views or patios, etc), there are also units that offset those units that don't have that. The project as a whole has to make sense.
- **Q: Why are you referring to a maximum density of 5.5:1 because I understand that the base density for that area is 3.0:1? In other words, what you're looking to do is to double the density that is currently allowable in that area.** A: The OCP says a base density of 3.0 up to approx max 5.5. The base is set for residential and the City requires a land lift analysis be done, so 3.0 becomes the base, and the whatever the difference is between what is achieved, the City looks for Community Amenity Contributions. In this instance, part of it will be significant urban open space.
- **Q: Land lift analysis – City policy reads....** A: The allocation of density across the site. Both sites fall within Harris Green and particularly for the London Drugs site there is no differentiation in terms of location of the building height within that city block. So in this instance in terms of what is proposed, the highest building is towards the center of the block. Determined by analysis as to what's best in terms of shadowing impact, etc so it's actually an urban design aspect that's been provided to show the location of the proposed structure.
- **Q: Map 15 referring City bonus system. It does comment that the higher density is shown along Yates St corridor.** A: The highest building, highest amount of floor space is along the Yates St frontage.
- **You refer to storeys, up to 25 storeys, what is that in terms of actual meters or feet?** A: We have not computed that yet, we haven't designed that out. There will be elevator penthouses and HVAC equipment. Commercial floor heights are different from residential. We still need to work that through. We expect them to be typical.
- **Q: Thanks for the shadow studies, so I understand the placement of your towers. However, if you're going up to 25 storeys and most of the buildings in that neighbourhood are 17 or 18, and two on Yates, Yates on Yates is 20 and Vivid is 20. That's a significant increase. Your asking for that increase, it sounds like, to include some affordable housing component. You said you're not sure what scale of subsidy you're talking about. Right now, can you define affordable housing to the residents of our city?** A: We are asking for

- up to 25 storeys on one building, not every building. There are five towers proposed: two on the Dodge site would be 15 and 17 which is exactly in compliance with what is anticipated for that site. On the LD site, we're looking at one tower at 25, one at 22 and one at 19. The middle tower on the LD site is the 25. I wouldn't say that height is linked to affordability exactly. What really links to height is open space. So when we're talking affordability, we're talking more about the amount of floor area. And obviously that does relate to height but the decisions we've made around arranging that floor area and the decisions that other residents of Victoria made in the engagement exercise, was really playing off the cost-benefit of how do I achieve significant open space and achieve floor area around the site. That's what's driving height, as well as solar performance. It's not the case that a squat building performs better for sun. You can have a shorter building that creates more shadow. So those factors probably, more than affordability, dictate that form. And you mentioned those other buildings, but we are the only development providing this amount of open space. The Dodge site is within the OCP. We are going higher on the LD site, as we want to provide the open space. We are not that far off but we think it's important to offer.
- Q: With regards to the highest tower, you propose it in the middle of the block. Why do you feel that's the best location for sightlines, etc when there are two residential buildings and another on Johnson, as opposed to closer to Vancouver. This location will interfere with the sightlines for a whole bunch of people.** A: The location was dictated by the shadow study. Regent Towers for example are in the middle of the site; it doesn't have a podium, because that's the location that has the least impact on the periphery. Luckily we have enough space laterally, so there's a lot of air around them. It's a balancing act. Their height has less to do with it than the proportions and their locations on the site. We modeled them based on different locations at different times of year and optimised it based on the study.
 - Q: Did you take into account the buildings you're putting on your site.** A: We took into account the surroundings as well. Our site is significantly shadowed by buildings like View Towers. We've added the angle; one of the reasons is that at certain times of the year, it gives another 30-45 min of sunshine in the public space. There's also a mandate from the City to tend them towards the larger street, Yates, so the majority of our height is on Yates. But the one tower that had to be elsewhere, we located precisely because of the shadowing.
 - Q: Beside View Towers, there's going to be another development on that lot and it's going to block the light in the green space. I'm wondering how that's being anticipated.** A: We have some modeling there, but we made some assumptions based on current zoning although we don't know what's going on there. There are other sites that we included to see what it might look like. We've been trying to consider both existing and potential context. Planner: there is an application and the details are available on the Development Tracker.
 - Q: Concerned and questioning the streamlined appearance of the glass walls along the street. The walls are long and linear without variation or differentiation with respect to depths, textures, colours and envelope at street level. That's one of the features of Victoria that's most attractive – it's the variation with the experience of moving and entering and being in that space. So a long single glass wall is repetitive and sterile despite the domestication of it by planters and trees, etc.** A: As far as the frontages align, these are schematics, these are cartoons of an intention, these are the what-ifs, we don't like to show dead diagrams. The precedent photos showing the smaller incremented division storefronts and windows that are separated and entrances that are set back, all of that will be proscribed in the design guidelines that will go with rezoning. So even on the future phases that aren't specifically designed they will be part of the development permit application for each phase. Scrutiny to the nature of the frontage have variety of scales, push and pull, levels of transparency, weather shelter – all will be proscribed in DP applications for each architectural permit. There won't long glass frontage. That's shown in the rendering for ease as just "painted over". All of that will be specified when the architectural development permits are made.

- **Q: The City has max floor plate sizes, which were relieved for the Fire Hall building recently. The Fire Hall building has the same floor plate as View Towers for it's entire height. It's over 80% above the max floor plate size in the upper floors. Will you make a commitment that this development to stick with the max floor plate size as proscribed by DCAP? Which will produce a slender building and prevent overshadowing?** A: This concept does comply with the DCAP floor plates.
- **Q: Are the towers set back from the podiums?** A: The podiums are set back from the property line and the towers are set back from the podium.
- **Q: I was at the meeting last night and thanks for coming to our building (Regents Park) and there were about 60 ppl at that meeting and there's only about 10 of them here tonight. I think it's important to capture all their comments, but I'll make those later if they're not mentioned as I think it's important to have them on the record. A question I didn't ask yesterday, everyone is talking about the height of the towers, but what is the height of the podiums that the towers are being built on and how high are they in relation to View Towers? Will the height of the podiums be the full stretch of View Towers? As you're walking down the street, if they are 6 or 8 storeys, that's still a substantial amount of height right if they are right along the street. I know your set backs is 3m but that is what's required, I believe, so you're not actually pushing in any more than what you're required to.** A: The podiums are 6 storeys, approximately the same length as View Towers then there's a gap for the open space and then they continue afterwards for the rest of the block.
- **Q: Have you done a viability study? How are you making your decisions? Has it been presented to the City? How are you justifying the increase in FSR?** A: A viability study is actually comprised of a rezoning application. It's a number of studies; it's civil, traffic, urban design, architecture and all those studies provide justification for the proposal. Profitability is a consideration but it's not a submission to the city. It has to be financially viable. That is an internal calculation but not submitted to the city. But all these reports are reviewed by the city and peer reviewed by clients and staff and again they go through the public process.
- **Q: If it could be viable at 5 F less or with a FSR that was more in keeping with the 3.0:1 rather than 5.5:1 or 6, that you're asking for, why wouldn't we want you to do that?** A: We believe the number of units are needed. We believe the market will absorb them immediately. Victoria has such a serious and long-standing need for housing that some of these numbers, in aggregate, not just on our site but across the city are big. But they're needed. We have absolutely no interest in building something that would remain vacant. We would love our shirts, so to speak. So we're confident there's a significant demand for supply both on this site and elsewhere.
- **Q: I'm a resident at 845 Yates St and there are a couple of us here and I'm trying to figure out how we are going to get sunlight during the day because your building will be in direct line of the eastern light. If your building is 25 F, we may only get a sliver of sun.** A: The path of the sun will still allow for sunlight and the slenderness of the building is important. If it were wider, it would make a much bigger impact.
- **Q: Is it correct that Starlight will be running these rental properties?** A: We own the properties and use property management companies to manage them.
- **Q: Who are these rental properties targeted towards? What is the demographic market? Are they low income, are they retirees, is it higher end?** A: We don't have a specific market in mind. With the number of units we have, but we don't know the size of the units but there will be a range in sizes from bachelors to one-, two-, and three-bedrooms. We have to make sure we have the right mix for each phase.
- **Q: But all I'm asking is are you focusing on the richer more expensive properties? There are some affordable housing units?** A: Discussions with the City, are we talking about more units that have a modest subsidy? Or fewer units with a deeper subsidy? Are we talking about some middle ground? So at this stage, it's difficult to talk about a fixed number or a percentage. We need to work through that, but it's our intent to have an affordable component.

- Q: Could you answer my question about affordability? To you, what constitutes affordable?** A: It depends. There is no one definition. A common benchmark is in reference to CMHC. They compile monthly data series of average rents and those tend to be purpose built market housing about +40 years old, so those rents tend to be lower than what you would call the average rent in the secondary market, which is eg. you own a condo and rent it out. The condos are newer so the rents are higher. So usually affordability is benchmarked to CMHC. Sometimes it's simply the CMHC average, sometimes it's some percent below the average and it's always for that unit type in that community. It depends on what the objectives are, what the priorities of the municipality. Housing crunch for a particular type of unit for a particular type of person? There is no one answer.
- Q: So it's not going to be linked to income?** A: It can be linked to income as well. 30% of household income. Link the need to that housing.
- Q: It's important to me, as a concerned resident downtown, rental housing prices are very, very important to me.** A: There's a significant need for rental housing, that's why rental prices are so high. With a development of this scale, this will make a difference in Victoria, not just in the neighbourhood. Vacancy rates range between 0 and 1%. People like to have mobility; they don't want to stay in a place because they feel they have to if there's no place to go. With a project of this size, when you ask which market we're targeting, the answer is all of the above not any one of them.
- Q: Will the units be rental in perpetuity?** A: I believe the policy is either for the life of the building or in perpetuity. And for Starlight, that is our core business. We never build condos. The agreement will be on title. Charlayne: if a new building owner wanted to change the agreement and strata the building, they would have to come to council.
- Q: Are you going to be implementing residents per unit capacity limits? In our building, units that are being rented, we recently see too many people packed into one unit. We've had units being operated as a dorm, just stuffing people in the unit.** A: It's a good question but I don't know the answer in terms of our standard practices. It doesn't sound like it would be in our interest to allow a bunch of people stuffed in. Wear and tear. Etc.
- Q: Are you committed to residential townhouses along that stretch with gardens because I think that makes a substantial difference to how things look from the street?** A: Yes, we'll be doing townhouses along that street with setbacks to allow for patios and gardens.
- Q: I know that Starlight has acquired a rather bad reputation in James Bay and I don't know if it's fair, but as a landlord I'd be interested in that. And this thing is really huge. 1500 units, that's about 5 View Towers and yet View Towers seems to be substantially empty. I'd like to know a little bit more about the deal made for housing. I know we need housing, but there's so much being built.** A: I know there's a lot of development and I know it's concentrated in one neighbourhood, but the vacancy rates are still not at a healthy rate. In the city as a whole, there's still not enough supply to meet the demand for housing.
- Q: I have a lot of concerns about green space, a lot of concern. But what I like about Harris Green is that it has a variety of vibrant colourful tenants. It provides a lot of services. Yes, there's the Market and LD, but there's also independent coffee shop, bakery, pet store and you mentioned the Olympic Village as one of your touch points. I used to live in Vancouver when that development went in and for years it was an absolute ghost town. It was new and beautiful but there was nothing there for people. So my concern as a local resident who lives and shops around here, all of these businesses get an opportunity to move into a more expensive place that they cannot really afford to rent and we lose the vibrancy of downtown retail and what built it. And what comes in? A chiropractic clinic? That's what we see at the bottom of all of the buildings. It's not useful to me as a person. There's no restaurants, there's no coffee shops going in. And I have a real concern that we're not just going to lose the public space hub but also a commercial space hub.** A: We know what we have here. We have a retail centre that works. We don't want to wreck that, even though we'll be demolishing it, but at the end of it, we want something that works. It matters to us because we need to work; we want our tenants to be there. They have been very positive that they will stay with us. One difference is that

we're designing this thinking of retail. We're thinking very specifically about how this will function. So a chiropractor's office might be good to have, does it need to be on the ground level, in the storefront? We're not selling, we'll continue to own and operate it, so the better it works, the better it works for us as well. I can't speak any specific tenant, but your concerns are close to ours.

- **Q: How is public space controlled or limited when it is in fact private property? Homeless? Political demonstrations? Etc?** A: Privately owned public space. City will require an easement to permitting public use; travel through and to the space. Or public access covenant. The exact terms of any agreement are unknown, as we haven't applied. We have flexibility to operate the space to address safety but don't want to be overly limiting. Work with the City to define a governance model.
- **Q: Interesting ideas, thanks for the presentation and time. I'm concerned about how the public space will be maintained for crime prevention to prevent another tent city.** A: We'll have obligations to both our residential and commercial tenants. We have the flexibility to operate it as a public private space and provide security. Will be agreements on the land and a framework in agreement with the City. The design will also provide eyes on the street built in.
- **Q: You're selling that space as a public space but if it's always unavailable due to programming how is it a public space that the community can access and use?** A: We're not proposing a continuous strict schedule of programming; we were just illustrating a variety of uses for proof of concept for scale and size. The space relates to our own residential and commercial tenants. But we will have a budget to operate and maintain that space but we what we can't do is make people do a specific activity. We have local precedence, in the Atrium, the events in that space are for non-profits or charitable. Those orgs ask if they can hold events there and they can only do that if they are not commercial. It becomes another venue for arts and recreation orgs. It's a highly curated space. That's all up for negotiation with the City but it already happens.
- **Q: Will there be a mechanism for feedback on how the public space is being used?** A: There should be but I can't tell you that we've articulated anything yet. But we want to be programming things that people want to do.
- **Q: When we look at the whole project, the one thing that seems to be missing or not clear is what are the plans to accommodate road transportation infrastructure? We're talking about adding thousands of cars in a limited area, plus the people coming into the area for shopping and looking for parking. It's already difficult.** A: A part of our application is traffic modelling looking at the impact of the number of units and potential number of cars for our development as well as commercial space and other developments in the area. We haven't done that study yet, but when we get the results for the whole development, we'll work with the City to determine whether there areas where there will be congestion and if need traffic calming or new lights, etc. so that the infrastructure in the area still works. All of the parking is underground and we intend to comply with the City's parking bylaws. Also all of our loading will be underground, including tall proper loading, as we need to get tractor-trailers in for our potential tenants. That also means all the garbage collection will happen underground.
- **Q: I presume the underground parking is primarily for tenants and owners. Will there be visitor parking? Currently, there isn't enough parking on View St.** A: Yes, we are required to provide parking for tenants, tenants' visitors, for commercial tenants and commercial tenants' visitors – all of those users.
- **Q: I like a lot of what I see. Certainly will have more comments when I see the workings of plans, OCP amendments and what's required there and the rationale is for that but I think an important concern is the obstruction on the neighbourhood. Not just the neighbourhood but for the traffic and the existing businesses, the people that are employed at those businesses. For instance will this be a phased development that will allow business to continue to operate during the construction. These businesses are important for the community and to have them shut down would generally not be acceptable to the community.** A: We heard that during engagement. Will be a multi-phased development over several years. It allows it for some of the retail tenants to

relocate with minimal or next to no down time. We can keep our anchor tenants: Market on Yates and London Drugs. We are negotiating with our tenants. There is a lot of development in the neighbourhood and we'll be preparing our construction management plan which will be reviewed by the City which helps control hours of operation and trucking, etc.

- **Q: Plans for the commercial space, particularly for the 900-block (LD site). You've told us the floor space that you're planning for commercial tenants and I assume that's more than what's there now. As far as the major tenants go, LD and Market, do you anticipate allotting more space than they use currently?** A: That's up for discussion with the tenants. That's part of the negotiation with the tenants.
- **Q: There's been a lot of density added to the neighbourhood in recent years and not a lot in the way of services to support all the people in the area. Because there has been so much concern about the 25-storey tower, has there been any consideration for bringing up some of the 6-storey podium and reducing the towers down?** A: When you raise the building along the street, there's a direct relationship with width of the right of way. So right now, 6 residential storeys on top of a commercial podium is what you want in relation to the size of Yates St. It's in proportion. If you anything taller, it starts to canyonize the street. The other thing is the courtyards in the interior. At 6 storeys people living in the units still get sun, but if you make it taller it impacts the sunlight in those units. It's a balancing act.
- **Q: What consideration have you given to the impact on the existing infrastructure in the area? Putting in 1200-1500 toilets, washers, dryers, showers, tubs, etc, sewage, etc. Hydro cables, vehicle traffic. I sat outside and counted traffic on Vancouver St on 4 different occasions. Right now, there are about 250-300 cars per hour. And this wasn't at rush hour. How will people get in and out? This development seems too dense for what the area can absorb. And how many parking stalls will you be providing onsite for commercial and residential?** A: We do not have an exact number of parking stalls. But it's to the bylaw standards. We've done some gross studies to what that would look like underground and we believe we can accommodate it. So we don't anticipate looking for any parking reductions. For traffic, we are still running our traffic modeling. I would say the City has identified this area for growth so we're not going outside of what's expected to occur. I'm sure the City will let us know about any potential targeted signalization changes, or whatever might needed to address a particular intersection's function. In terms of servicing: sanitary, sewers and storm, water and power, our preliminary servicing study is underway. The City says grid we'd be connecting into for water, storm, sanitary is actually quite good. It's sized appropriately and has capacity. We do understand we may have to do some additional work with hydro. Upgrades to ensure adequate power to our site. We're still studying that as well.
- **Q: I live in one of the 14 units that will be demolished by this project. What are your plans, what is the timeline, to give us enough time to find new homes?** A: We're looking at phasing so I don't have a definite answer. The absolute earliest for first phase for site preparation which includes demolition is early 2021 and that assumes everything moves ahead full speed at City Hall. While we don't know which site will be first, we can make some guesses and it would be that where the existing apartment building is, your home is, would not be the first phase. So you're looking at 2 (or 3 or 4 years) after 2021 at the earliest before you need to do anything. We know we have obligations to you. We can help you in a number of ways as we have other rental properties, so you can choose which is better for you. This is a multiphase, multi year project with a time frame of 8-10 years, so nothing may happen on that portion of the block for many years.
- **Q: With consideration for the conditions we hear of for View and Vancouver (swamp conditions), isn't it dangerous to build something that big on the 900-block Yates?** A: We have done geotechnical testing and the site is about what we expected; it's not awful and it's not great. The good news from our point of view is that we are excavating all the material out because we're putting in underground parking. The bedrock depth varies across the site but it's not outside the norm and it's well within the capacity of a structural engineer to deal with.

- **Q: When in the process will you be filing those?** A: When the first phase starts. The project schedule is up in the air right now. We'll be filing for rezoning application shortly in the new year 2020 Q1. We'll be filing the DP application following that shortly after. No specific date.

Comments offered:

- The City's decision to the pack the development in Harris Green was not done with the consent of the people who already live in Harris Green. We've been bulldozed over by the City Council.
- Downtown Harris Green has absorbed the majority of the housing growth for the entire CRD, not just for the City of Victoria, and most of that has been in Harris Green.
- I've lived in Regents Park for 15 years and I expect and welcome development. Who wants to keep looking at parking lots? And we recognise these projects will last well beyond our lifetime, so we really want it to be the right development. Starlight has done some good things and I admire what you've done. The thing is you're the biggest development. It's unfortunate that with all of these other one offs, we haven't had the turn out, because frankly in Harris Green, we're all in development fatigue. We're all getting public notices about all kinds of buildings going up in the neighbourhood and they're all asking for changes and not everyone is showing up for every meeting. So things are happening that we kind of haven't had a lot of input into. Of course, because you're the big development we're all out to talk to you about it. It is a big development and it is a prime parcel and you could do some really exciting things. Some of what you've suggested is really good, so I don't want you to think that simply because we're all owners that we're all against development. Some of the things that were raised (at the meeting at Regents Park) I want to put on the record. Because this is the record that goes to City Council. Spaces for electric bikes, spaces for electric cars. You're thinking ahead and you're thinking about doing some of that and I think it's great. But there are some things that are lacking. We are the filling in the sandwich between your project. We provide the dog space for the whole neighbourhood. There are lots of people in all the buildings around us with pets and there's nowhere for them to pee. It would be great to have some green space for them to pee. Not just in our yard. We don't mind it so long as people clean up. The rain gardens are a lovely thing to have, but don't work for dogs to pee. When you think about the streetscape, all those 1500 apartments, if they have dogs they need somewhere for them to have a dog run. The vehicle access for all those uses, commercial and residential and service for all those towers is all on View. With the Jukebox already we're having traffic jams getting in and out of our building. The site lines make it difficult to see. Whether people are on bikes or in cars, goes in and out everyday that will be a substantial amount of traffic and I think there's got to be vehicular traffic access off of Yates or Cook or Quadra. It has to be split up. View just cannot handle it. View is not a big street. We also talked about shading and wind issues. And trying to avoid creating a wind tunnel. Where you're doing your commercial units. We already have enough chiropractors and nail salons. And we have enough that close at 5pm or 6pm, which creates dead streets. London Drugs and the Market are all open later and that makes it a safe street to walk down. If you're providing public amenities, how about creating public bathrooms? No public bathrooms is a problem for the homeless people and if could have good, well-monitored public bathrooms so people can use them. Build it into the public realm. This is more for the City, but if you're getting 1200-1500 units, we have no school, but we have no recreation centre downtown. The downtown residents have nothing but the downtown has the highest density and we're bringing in all these new buildings, all these new apartments, all this new tax revenue and yet we're getting nothing for it in terms of public amenities. Some of the new units are tiny little apartments; they can't even have people over, they have to go out, go for coffee, out to the gym to get some space. So I think it's really important that there be public space. I really like what you're doing in the green space. I think there should be more. There should be some of both sites. I know it's supposed to be a public amenity but it's really the landlord's

amenity. You guys are making it an attractive place to get tenants by providing a public space. So it's something that's as much to your benefit as it is to ours. So all that commercial space that will be along the open space will get a higher rent. I think you can provide more green space. Once the city is built out, we'll never get this chance again, so we have to do it right and provide the amenities. We all want to stay there. I think the City needs to take all of this into consideration and because of the particular size of the development, it's important that it be done right.

- I think there's a lot of good material here to work with conceptually. Some of the more detailed pieces still concern me. The height issue I'm uncertain about. I appreciate that you're offering affordable housing and that you're not being compelled by the city but I'm concerned with the lack of clarity and I don't expect more information now, by asking again. I want to point out that if you're going to the City to talk about affordable housing, the City does have a very specific definition of what constitutes affordable housing, so I would hope and expect that going forward when we hear more references to affordable housing, you are using the City's definitions as opposed to offering 10% below market so it's non-market rental. Particularly if you're saying that's the piece that drives your ask for greater density and greater height.
- I was very nervous about Starlight buying these properties. I live at 930 Yates at the end of the midblock crosswalk. My building is slowly being surrounded by towers; the streets are being taken over by bicycles. And it's amazing and getting better. The green space is crucial for the neighbourhood. It's an important commercial hub. But even as sad a space that parking lot is (LD) there are people hanging out drinking coffee, people are walking their dogs. It's fantastic. If you guys can manage to keep that, that's what we want to see. This development is going to be in the city much longer than anyone here is going to be alive. It's gotta be vibrant, it gotta be a place where people spend time. And we'll see. We're disappointed by developers frequently in the city. The jury is still out. The design principles look good. I'm not frightened by the pictures I see. I don't think they're ideal. My understanding is that in the existing plans, the higher density is meant to be along Yates St not so much along View and yet your drawings show at least one very tall dense building close to View.
- You've been blessed with a large canvas and this might be a once in a lifetime opportunity for a lot of the architects and designers working on this. Don't blow it. Don't come up with something that is monochromatic and boring to look at. All the five towers are going to look alike. When you look across to the north of Yates towards Vancouver, you've got glass and it's not interesting to look at architecturally. Whatever complaints we might have about Yello or the Jukebox, at least they're interesting buildings and they provide some interest. The Yello even has a large art piece on the top of it. Think outside the box and be creative and try to create some interest from not only the street but also for the people looking at it from neighbouring towers.
- There are a few things I like about this and am happy with the trade off of going up higher in order to provide more public space at ground level. What I've noticed in other cities where 25 storeys is a small building, I agree that I don't see it. What I see is my relation to the building on the street and the open space that's available on the street and once I go up a few levels, it's pretty much gone unless it's looming straight up from the street. My question, this location has excellent transportation by bike and by foot and I would hope that you do more than what the City requires as a minimum. If you have two or three people living in a unit, and if they get around primarily by bike, you'll have two or three bikes in that unit. So it's important to design it at the front or at the very least design your parking space to flexibly move it from car to bike storage. The other piece related to cycling is to think about access from when people leave from bike storage to Vancouver, which will have one of the AAA bike lanes. Give people a safe route even though it's a short distance.
- The green space that's being offered is a bonus that we haven't seen from many developments. In my mind, the City has over-saturated this small area of Harris Green

and hasn't had anything other than a couple of projects that offer anything. We have midblock walkways that look like alleys and so this green space is very important. That should set the standard for the rest of the buildings that the city has on the block already.

- The boulevards on both Yates and View have mature trees that should be preserved, including the cherry trees that came into bloom a couple of weeks ago on View. We seem to be losing more and more green space and opportunities for green space with each new development; particularly trees and green space open to the public view.
- I'm a resident at Regent's Park and I like a lot of what I see. Green space is important. It was important during our selection process of where we decided to buy, renovate and live. I'm concerned about what I would call the architecture and the distance from the sidewalk. With everything going up, apart from the Jukebox, has just been boring boxes. We face Yates, and when you look out, everything going up are boxes. What are you guys going to be doing? I know it's early on, but boring boxes right up to the edge of the sidewalk, we just don't need any more in Harris Green. It is Harris Green, or it used to be Green.
- I'm also from Regent's Park. These gentlemen were at our building last night for a meeting with our residents and a great number of serious issues were identified. I'll review them. First, the developer suggests that the main entrance on the London Drugs site will be from View St. The other building on the Dodge site will also be on View St. Right now the traffic on View St is heavy. The entrances to Regents Park East, Regents Park West, The Jukebox and so are all from View St. There is no way all this extra traffic can be managed on View St. Perhaps an entrance from View St and an exit on another street would work. Second, the closeness of the buildings to the sidewalk is a problem. Push the buildings away from the sidewalk. Third, the public space. Who can guarantee that the public space won't become another tent city? We have lots of green space at our buildings and we have people sleeping there regularly. We have problems controlling it. They are used as bathrooms and are abused. Fourth, damage caused by skateboarders. We spend a lot on repairs for the damage done by skateboarders. Be careful with your design. Fifth, build a midblock walkway between the existing Regents Park property and the Harris Dodge site, because the one we have now is not well designed and not useable for the people who need it most.
- There's going to be development across the street at the Chrysler lot, fire hall and across the street at Yates and Cook will be developed as well and down the street at Pluto's as well. I'm concerned about the amount of traffic coming in and out.
- I have a unit on the other side of Yates St, so after those two buildings go up, they will perfectly block my view and that is the ocean view. Those buildings will also block all the sun for the other side. I think that buildings closer to the ocean should be lower and moving away get higher. This building will be a monster in front of the others. And this will lead to other bigger buildings being built. Victoria is a beautiful little city and I don't like that design.
- Thanks Starlight for the presentations. We went to the presentation at Mazda (Fire Hall) and there was no real interaction, it was, this is what they're building and like it or lump it. We have not had that experience with Starlight. I have a concern. We live in 1020 View on 14F facing east and looking at this picture, I'm going to have no sun and looking out my window, all I'm going to see is your building. There are 17 floors of owners who aren't going to see anything, except someone else's balcony. I have an objection to the boundaries that have been created to keep the tall buildings within. There are so many buildings going up around us. I'm going to be a rat in a cage. Ten years we can look forward to of construction. Why are we pushing all of these high rises into the area? Why do we not extend it, not to 25F but 10F every 5 blocks, out into Fairfield and other neighbourhoods? Spread it out, so you can have families in buildings with green space around them so kids can play and go for walks without being run over. It's been constant construction for the last 5 years and I think it's to the detriment of the city.

- We made a conscious choice to be here in 2007. Be downtown. Put our assets in a place we'd spend the rest of our lives. That investment in that asset is one of the biggest decisions we make. If that asset is now going to be compromised, that's a question. As I look at this and listen, because my unit is going to be impacted as well. My view will be zip. And I thank you for the warning, because I think I'm going to be selling because I don't think this is fair. It raises the point, notwithstanding what you intend to do; it has a consequence and a cost. Community means common unity not you're more important unity; it has to bridge all those things. Be very careful what you offer, say and do, but I know there are going to be a lot of people who aren't going to be very happy and I'm one of them.
- Apparently there were 59 building permits issued in 2018 for new rental housing in Harris Green, do you know how many units those 59 permits represent? So we're talking about 1200-1500 rental units for this project and there are already 59 building permits already issued and nobody seems to know how many that represents.
- The public engagement process asking participants to create balance between built form and open spaces was designed with constraints. Participants were obliged to use all the building heights provided by the applicant and they were not able to eliminate any height/density, so to represent that the community preferred any particular massing is misleading.