

C Fern Heffernan
5, 1620 Camosun Street
Victoria, BC V8T 3E6

June 30,2020

Leanne Taylor
Senior Planner
City of Victoria
City Hall
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Dear Leanne,

Re: Proposed rezoning of Fernwood (Gladstone Ave, Caledonia Ave, Vining St, and Grant St) Rezoning No. 00715

Victoria needs affordable housing.

I have several concerns regarding the rezoning.

My first concern is if the area is rezoned, can the city and the architects scrap the plan and put up a six-story, concrete apartment block?

If the answer is yes, I will say absolutely NO to rezoning this area.

I need the assurance that plan layout presented would be the one followed including building locations and the green spaces indicated.

I do not want the apartments higher than Vic High.

I conducted a web search of Vic High and found this statement:

Victoria High School, commonly referred to as **Vic High**, is a [high school](#) located in [Victoria, British Columbia](#), Canada. It is the oldest high school in the province, and is often cited as "the oldest public high school in [Western Canada](#)."

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

I also found this statement from SD61

Victoria High

vichigh.sd61.bc.ca

Vic High is located in the heart of historic Fernwood, an area renowned for beautiful Victorian era architecture and a thriving artistic community. Our towering...*

I was unable to locate the full quotation; however, the intent is that Fernwood is a historic community, with several buildings and some gardens over 100 years old. The towering school should remain towering. Thus, no apartments or townhouses in close proximity to the school should be higher than the school.

I am also concerned that the architectural style does not fit the community. If something is to be built in the middle of a quiet, historic community, it should fit in. My view would be different if it was being built at a busy intersection, or downtown.

[*https://www.google.com/search?rlz=1C1CHBF_enCA877CA877&biw=1366&bih=625&sxsrf=ALeKk00_BRyOPNand3d6uJM2SQGAmW2R7Q%3A1593585367527&ei=1y78Xt7QH9HO0PEPjsOu2Aw&q=Vic+High+is+located+in+the+heart+of+historic+Fernwood%2C+an+area+renowned+for+beautiful+Victorian+era+architecture+and+a+thriving+artistic+community.+Our+towering*&oq=Vic+High+is+located+in+the+heart+of+historic+Fernwood%2C+an+area+renowned+for+beautiful+Victorian+era+architecture+and+a+thriving+artistic+community.+Our+towering*&gs_lcp=CgZwc3ktYWIQDFAAWABgj3BoAHAAeACAAQCIQCSAQCYAQcAQdnd3Mtd2l6&sclient=psy-ab&ved=0ahUKEwiemlCOuKvqAhVRJzQIH6hC8sQ4dUDCAw](https://www.google.com/search?rlz=1C1CHBF_enCA877CA877&biw=1366&bih=625&sxsrf=ALeKk00_BRyOPNand3d6uJM2SQGAmW2R7Q%3A1593585367527&ei=1y78Xt7QH9HO0PEPjsOu2Aw&q=Vic+High+is+located+in+the+heart+of+historic+Fernwood%2C+an+area+renowned+for+beautiful+Victorian+era+architecture+and+a+thriving+artistic+community.+Our+towering*&oq=Vic+High+is+located+in+the+heart+of+historic+Fernwood%2C+an+area+renowned+for+beautiful+Victorian+era+architecture+and+a+thriving+artistic+community.+Our+towering*&gs_lcp=CgZwc3ktYWIQDFAAWABgj3BoAHAAeACAAQCIQCSAQCYAQcAQdnd3Mtd2l6&sclient=psy-ab&ved=0ahUKEwiemlCOuKvqAhVRJzQIH6hC8sQ4dUDCAw)

My approval depends on the answers to my concerns.

Sincerely

]

C Fern Hfferman

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing to express my opposition to the Caledonia plan as it stands now.

1. PROCESS

Not so long ago, Victoria's CALUCs wrote to the city asking that approval of large developments that do not follow OCP guidelines not be approved through amendments to the OCP. Unfortunately, that request has been ignored in this proposal. This is a very complex project that needs a full review, not sweeping it through as a means of avoiding robust land use and community discussions.

I have pasted in two sections from a longer article “Hard Questions about Vancouver’s New Affordability Approach”, by Patrick Condon and Scot Hein, The Tyee, 19 July 2018

“ Avoid a one-size-fits-all approach to neighbourhoods.

... How will the city ensure that new affordable housing forms are contextually appropriate to each neighbourhood and easily approvable? How will the city ensure that each neighbourhood accommodates its “fair share” of new units? How will the city acknowledge, and credit, those neighbourhoods that already contribute affordable capacities?

“Recognize citizens as responsible leaders in change.

Meaningful stakeholder involvement is the best way to share challenges and achieve creative solutions. A successful stakeholder process invites citizens to become champions for change over the long implementation time lines required for thoughtful city building. Hastily prepared Making Room policies, without meaningful stakeholder involvement, would forgo the opportunity to tap the passions, talents and shared sense of responsibility by Vancouverites. Let’s take a chance on citizens rising to the challenge of creating stronger neighbourhoods. Let’s require that making room only happens in the form of a citizen directed city-wide plan.”

a The current proposal did not come close to being an open, transparent, and collegial process that engaged the community from the start. It was presented holus-bolus in well-known developer strategy involving slick graphics with no opportunity for residents to do anything but tweak small and non-essential details.

The complex and confusing land swap between the City of Victoria and School District #61 was barely explained. The “consultation” meetings were hosted separately by the City, the School District or the CRHC. If residents asked questions about the arcane relationship among the three, the proponents declined to answer saying it wasn't in their bailiwick. The three entities behaved like three separate

silos. This made it impossible for neighbourhood residents to get straight answers. Clearly the proponents were not there to listen and respond to citizen concerns.

In general, the community members at the “consultations” found the proposal too large, too tall, and not in keeping with the neighbourhood. When residents asked if the proposal could be scaled down, the response from CRHC was a flat “NO, that's the math”. If “the math” is the only consideration, then something's rotten in the state of Victoria / Fernwood.

This project is being shoe-horned onto Vic High's limited school grounds. The proposal will be built on the former Fairey Tech land which we were promised would be replanted and greened. That promise has not been kept. Since it's been left a rubble field, we're now told it's open for a mega-development.

2. AFFORDABILITY

I respect those in favour of this proposal in that most support the idea of “affordable housing”. I too, am deeply committed to low income housing in a city that is becoming an ever more expensive place to live. Unfortunately, I'm not sure that many supporters understand how limited this project is when it comes to low income housing. I am pasting in a copy of my letter to the Times Colonist on May 21, 2020 in case some of you missed it:

“Caledonia project not affordable enough”

Dear Editor:

Recently, city council voted to send the Caledonia project to public hearing on the basis of its provision of affordable housing. Unfortunately, this project is nowhere near affordable enough. Only 18% of the proposed units are truly affordable. The rest will be middle-income suites in five-storey buildings. This proposal is not supported by Fernwood's neighbourhood plan and the city's official community plan. Vic High's green space, already less than what is required by the Ministry of Education, will be further reduced.

Other schools in the school district have a great deal more green space proportionately.

Let's keep the existing 18 units on the site and approve a smaller project with more low-income suites than the current 154-unit proposal provides.

Then let the Capital Regional Housing Corp. build the middle-class housing that makes up the bulk of the current Caledonia proposal on the extensive lands of these other schools.

Vic High is our inner-city high school. This project is a Trojan horse, touting its “affordability” while ushering in a whack of middle-income housing. We need housing at all levels but it is patently unfair to dump this project on Vic High's scant land.

Let's go for some equity here.

Dorothy Field,

Victoria”

There has also been misinformation spread at top levels. A federal housing representative claimed that there will be “32 new homes for people with very low income”. Yes, but in fact, there will only be 14 additional units, less than half the number of current subsidized units. The current 18 units will be demolished because they suffer from leaky condo syndrome and thus

their tenants have struggled with severe mould issues for decades. The whole project will create 154 suites. If you do the math, that means only 20% of the proposed suites will be subsidized and truly affordable to those most in need. The new subsidized suites will also be smaller than the current suites. Those resident in the former units have had to live with severe mould issues over the last decades. The CRHC cites the high cost of remediation as their reason for doing nothing. Given this, I am concerned about the CRHC's poor record on insuring tenant health and safety.

3. ADDITIONAL ISSUES

a. There is much concern that the proposal doesn't consider the additional stress to the neighbourhood posed by the Caledonia project. It would come on top of the several new towers built or still in construction near Pandora and Cook, plus the proposed development where the co-housing was planned and failed. All of these are already on line to feed students into our over-stressed neighbourhood schools, George Jay in particular.

b. Vic High already has safety issues with traffic on Fernwood's narrow streets, given the congestion when kids are being dropped off or picked up. Residents have brought this up but to my knowledge it has not been addressed. Nor is the fact that narrow Chambers Street has already become a speedway for cars avoiding the stops on Cook. 154 additional units will surely make this worse. All this has been deemed irrelevant. In no way can this be seen as recognizing "citizens as responsible leaders in change".

c. This project opens the way for densification all the way to Cook Street. Small, relatively affordable houses will come down and, with densification, the land values will increase, edging out current middle income residents.

4. EQUITY

Regarding equity, Burnside Gorge, Quadra Hillside, North Park, and Fernwood are expected to take any development with "affordable" or social service components. Neighbourhoods such as Rocklands and Fairfield are not asked to accept these developments. Why not? Since much of the new suites are for middle income people, more affluent neighbourhoods should be willing to accept "missing middle" developments on their green space.

It makes sense for those with low incomes to live closer to downtown and the services they need, but middle income folks can manage a bit more commute, by car, bus, or walking, with a fair amount of ease. Clearly, we need a better public transit system to get people out of their cars. That should be part of the

thinking rather than
neighbourhood.

plunking a proposal of this size into one close-to-downtown

I suggest again, that the middle income suites be built on the generous school grounds of schools that are farther out and better endowed. The above named less prosperous neighbourhoods already house the various agencies, co-op housing, and other services geared to those with lower incomes or complex needs. The current design, with small modifications, could be kept and moved to another location. Thus design time would not be lost. If all of us are really to be seen as equals, more prosperous neighbourhoods need to take some of the gift of increased density. That's equity.

5. COMMUNITY FALL OUT

Among the fall-out of the Caledonia proposal is a deep split within the Fernwood community. This could have been avoided had we had chances for real discussion with an openness as to what the word “affordable” means and the actual numbers of truly affordable suites. We needed firm figures from the start on salary ceilings and the project's financial requirements. The word “affordable” has become meaningless. The very rich can afford houses worth several million dollars. I expect that when the city uses that word, it means within reach of those with the greatest need. This is not true for 80% of the planned suites.

6. 6. CLOSING

Residents felt and still feel that this is a done deal, one without any real or substantive attempt to engage us. Consultation only counts if citizen input is taken seriously. “Consultation” when all but the minor details are already set in stone is no consultation at all. It is window dressing.

I suggest that the complex interrelations of the existing community with the proposed new community hold numerous consequences that have not been seriously studied. I suggest deeper studies of the traffic issues and school population impacts on the community beyond the boundaries of the Caledonia project be done.

I've lived in Fernwood for the last 16+ years. I love this neighbourhood and the vibrant mix of people who share it. We are not NIMBYs here and this is not a NIMBY argument. I, like so many others, want the best for all of us here. We want our vision, our energy, and our care for our students to be taken seriously. We don't want to be sacrificed on the altar of a too quick fix that doesn't pay attention to Fernwood's and Victoria's needs.

A project which might have been received with great celebration has left many of us deeply mistrustful of the process. This needn't have been the case if the process had been open and transparent. As I've indicated, this has not been true for the project to date.

I have no doubt this project will go through. The City, School District #61, and the CRHC have made it clear that they are behind it. They've spent way too many hours cobbling this together to let it fail now.

I ask you: SLOW DOWN. THINK AGAIN.

Think with the broad scope necessary to strengthen and enliven our communities at all levels. Think about the issues of real affordability, densification and its impacts, as well as true citizen consultation.

I ask you to prove us wrong.

Respectfully,

Dorothy Field
1560 Gladstone Avenue
Fernwood, Victoria

From: gabriel gaultier [REDACTED]
Sent: June 30, 2020 5:35 PM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: Rezoning Application REZ00715

Attn: Leanne Taylor

C/o: The City of Victoria

Re: Rezoning Application REZ00715

As the City is requesting feedback, please accept this input regarding the proposed rezoning application to a portion of the Fernwood community currently consisting of 1235 Caledonia Ave, 1211 Gladstone Ave, 1230 Grant St, 1219 Vining St, and 1218/1219/1220/1226 North Park St.

In short, we are in support of building and managing safe, affordable, inclusive, and structured housing to support our economy and those in need of under market and/or subsidised housing, however; we are adamantly opposed to the proposed rezoning application.

1. Make it work with existing zoning. We have been to the community meetings put on by the Capital Regional Housing Commission and there was overwhelming concern with the significant increase in density in this one pocket of our community. People want to support the housing initiative, but on a more reasonable scale. Yes, there is underutilized land, but it is in a residential neighbourhood, with existing zoning that was prepared and agreed upon by community members in the Official Community Plan, so any existing zoning should be respected and adhered to. The current zoning limitations would allow for 78 units, so the request to more than double this with 154 unit density is quite frankly outrageous. We would like to recommend that the proposal come back to the community with a much more reasonable revised plan that can meet the concerns of the citizens while still working toward achieving the shared vision of affordable housing.
2. Approving zoning for projects that are driven by government initiatives (i.e. the Capital Regional District's jointly funded Regional Housing First Program) will be construed as favouritism. This change in zoning will set a precedent and be the catalyst for

additional rezoning applications to our already densely populated neighbourhood. Unless the residents in the community come together to revise the community plan in favour of this type of rezoning in our community, we do not believe it should be up to the government to be able to overturn such community interests and beliefs for the sake of benefiting an initiative in which they are directly benefiting from.

3. We don't have the facilities to accommodate the influx of this magnitude. Another common voice of concern at these community input meetings was – how will we support these new community members if we don't currently have enough services to support the existing ones? There is especially a concern for the services for young children and families. The two existing childcare facilities have nearly two year waiting lists and George Jay Elementary is exceeding capacity and can't serve the existing population of the surrounding neighbourhoods. Changing the zoning, not only impacts existing families that require these services, but it also limits options for the proposed new residents who may have no options to look outside their community for this type of support. The rezoning application letter addressed to council in September 2019 mentions that this project addresses the OCP objective of ensuring "residents can enjoy convenient access to basic needs, community parks and amenities" and this is not the case.
4. The project planning team has not addressed existing public consultation concerns. If rezoning is the last step before development approval, then the CRHC needs to take a step (or two) back to first address existing concerns. Although they claim that they are meeting the OCP plan by "actively engaging citizens and community stakeholders and valuing and respecting their contributions", to many, they have not attempted to meet this need. Some examples are in relation to reducing the overall density, coming back with a plan that limits the number of stories from 5 to 4, creating social and community spaces that can facilitate services and or provide amenities to a broader community base, providing significant traffic calming measures on particularly on the already challenging Caledonia and Chambers streets, and

The best intentions of affordable housing should not overshadow existing community plans and neighbourhood concerns. Residents have repeatedly expressed concerns on traffic, density, services, and changes to zoning and although it seems like the CRHC has heard these concerns, they are not coming back with any significant or meaningful changes to their plans. From speaking with many neighbours in the community, the consensus is that the CRHC doesn't feel much of a need to drastically change their plans, as they already have the support from the City of Victoria and School District 61. What is the point of public engagement and consultation, if it

is only seen as a façade falling on deaf ears to push through a plan that was already destined to be approved? Hopefully this letter will help those involved in this project reflect on that and come back to the community with our concerns taken more seriously by way of drastic revisions and more in depth holistic partnerships to gain the trust and support of our resilient community.

From: Peter Renner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: June 5, 2020 5:00 PM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: Proposed development at 1211 Gladstone Avenue

I support the development of affordable housing and wish to raise two initial concerns.

1. Density. The letter states that the Urban Residential designation goes to 1.2:1, yet the proposal is for an overall density of 1.29:1. Which is to be?

2. Natural spaces. According to the Parks and Open Spaces Master Plan (2017), this city “supports health and wellness for all”. An article in *Children, Youth and Environments* reinforces this stance by stating that in our “rapidly urbanizing environment, nearby, accessible natural spaces allow children to interact daily with nature, resulting in physical, cognitive, psychological and social health benefits” [10.7721/chilyoutenvi.22.2.0164](#). Unfortunately, the proposal omits any mention of open/green/play space for 158 families and their children. Two nearby parks, Stevenson and Haegart, won't meet their legitimate needs.

Submitted by Peter Renner
Owner, 1140 Grant Street

From: Hope Hickli [REDACTED]
Sent: June 6, 2020 7:48 PM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: 1230 Grant Street, etc. multi-unit residential building

Hi,

I am a homeowner on Spring Road in Fernwood. I'd just like to offer my voice of support for this development. We need more affordable housing in this city, and more density as well.

Assuming all the units are affordable (which, from what I could see, they are), I am in favour.

Thanks!

Hope Hickli
[REDACTED]

From: Joanna Pettit <[REDACTED]>
Sent: June 6, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: Feedback on proposal to amend the OCP (Caledonia Project)

Please reconsider the plans for this proposed four and five-storey development. It is not in the best interests of the neighbourhood because of the height and the density adjacent to Victoria High School. The proposal includes four and five storey buildings in an area of one and two story homes. While I don't understand the meaning of the density ratios in the letter I received, I do know that 158 dwelling units is far too dense for this area and will irrevocably change the feeling of this neighbourhood. As residents of Yukon Street we are concerned about the traffic resulting from such density. Not to mention the looming facade of a five storey building across Grant Street.

We support affordable and below-market housing, but we do not want to see four and five storey buildings on this piece of land. Please revise this proposal to be in keeping with the neighbourhood plan.

Sincerely,
Joanna Pettit
1221 Yukon Street
Victoria BC V8T 1B6

From: Paul Crozier Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: June 6, 2020 2:14 PM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: Fairy Tech deveolpment in Fernwood area

Linda Taylor:

The only objection I have to the development is the height. Five storeys (sp?) is too high! Three is more in keeping with the buildings in the area.

Paul Crozier Smith

1148 Balmoral Rd.

From: zebraplus [REDACTED]
Sent: June 6, 2020 1:05 PM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: Development concerns at 1211 Gladstone ave.

Dear Leanne,

I reside at Cook and Caledonia. I am a realtor with over 15 years of experience. I came up from a poor family that used to live exactly in the type of development that is proposed to be build at 1211 Gladstone. I am against this development because it is not the right place for it. It is best used to place a public facility such as new crystal pool that require substantial size of land to develop. The development that is proposed will assist individuals with lower-income. This is a great idea, but a bad spot for it. As mentioned above when I was growing up and lived in Montreal and such a development, even though, it was beneficial financially, people hated residing there and were trying to get out as fast as they could. When you focus multiple buildings in a development around low income residence, it create a stigmas of assumed bad nature individuals living there, it assumes crime and drug use for every member of that community. The best solution to it is when you scatter such buildings through the city so that they do not stand out, so no stigma, and still serve their purpose of helping individuals with lower-income. Even better solution that I have seen in other countries, is when developers are required to provide a certain percentage of units to a low-income individuals either permanently or temporarily. This is even better solution to prevent stigmas and for individuals not to be singled out as being worse off financially or otherwise different then others.

You may wonder, why aforesaid stigmas and being singled out are important. This is the basis for being bullied at school, being denied employment and other benefits when employers will see where the candidate is residing. At the beginning of the project people will love living there, but after 4 years or so, because the world around reacts to people in such development with prejudice, stigmas are born , people start to be ashamed to live in the environment they're in, good people start to move out, leaving vacancy for more of crime oriented individuals to move in.

In few years, this development will become a problem, instead of the benefit it is being proposed for. As I have seen from personal experience, and you most likely aware, many individuals with financial needs tend to be substance users, who will qualify to reside at the proposed development. One quick way for such individuals to make money is to remix a dose and split it then sell it. Now, the fact that a high school is full of vulnerable kids and it is NEXT door, makes it a sweet distribution opportunity.

I apologize for creating a negative light for this development. Most people see optimistic opportunities for such developments, while silencing concerns. I see the true and potential outcomes based on what I see around the city and my personal life experience.

As I mentioned above, being the next door resident to the development, I am completely and absolutely against it. It will have a better use for new crystal pool or another public facility.

Thank you

Yuri King [REDACTED]

--

Sent from myMail for Android

From: Rena [REDACTED]
Sent: June 9, 2020 11:30 AM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: 1211 Gladstone Ave. Rezoning No. 00715

I have been a resident of Fernwood and a close neighbour of the properties under discussion for over 40 years. I have a number of concerns about the development, which are listed below.

Along with many other community members, I am concerned by the size and scale of this project. More than 150 units are being planned, of which only 20%, or 32 units, are designated as low income housing. Since 18 households were demovicted from the property, this will provide only 14 new subsidized units on this property. While all 158 units are intended for people with "low to moderate incomes", this is defined as 50% with household income up to \$64,000 and 30% with income up to \$74,000. According to the Victoria Foundation, Victoria's median income is closer to \$45,000.

Adding this level of density to the neighbourhood, with a very low proportion of new subsidized units, will put pressure on social amenities, especially for seniors. Traffic on Chambers Street will be dramatically increased. Pressure for increasing density will be intensified by approval of this project - for example, the project at the corner of Chambers and North Park, which Allan Lowe has suggested may be upscaled after this project goes ahead.

I also have strong objections, shared by many community members, to using land designated for public education to build housing which will benefit few low income residents.

There was no public consultation or dialogue prior to the announcement received this week. At an information session last year, representatives of the various entities could not respond to questions posed, e.g. around traffic mitigation, and presented misleading drawings, e.g. depicting a paved fire lane as a narrow grassy path between tall trees.

I object to perceived conflicts of interest between the Capital Region Housing Corporation and the Victoria Council.

I object to any amendment of the OCP to accommodate this plan, especially the five story building.

I await the public hearing.

Rena Miller

From: Quinn Yu <[REDACTED]>
Sent: June 10, 2020 10:50 AM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: 1211 Gladstone Avenue - Rezoning Application

Hi Leanne,

Thanks for your letter dated June 2, 2020 regarding the proposed official community plan amendment for the 1211 Gladstone Avenue corridor. As a resident on the adjacent Caledonia Avenue and an active community member, I appreciate the opportunity to provide some feedback and thoughts.

1) Based on the documents on the www.victoria.ca/devtracker, I see 114 parking spots and required, and 117 parking spots are provided. As you likely know, the neighbouring roads and properties are primarily designated multi-family residential with multiple cars per household. This creates quite a bit of pressure on parking, and I don't believe 114 parking spots is sufficient for a 158 dwelling unit. Unless the City intends to use public policy and municipal parking rules to enforce parking matters, the disconnect between dwelling units and parking spots inherently creates a pressure on parking in the neighbouring areas.

2) I support the concept of affordable and below-market rental dwelling units. As your letter notes, the OCP originally identified these properties are public facilities, institutions, parks/open spaces; is there no way to provide affordable rental units alongside public facilities/institutions/parks? Perhaps mixed-use to a certain extent? I am concerned the City is valuing residential units over spaces for recreational, institutional, and educational. I encourage the City to be future-oriented and consider the impacts of building only residential dwellings with no spaces for other use. The City of Richmond and the City of Surrey are both good examples and jurisdictions to research should your team seek some examples of mixed-use developments that have had a significant impact to positively growing a community. In particular, the City of Richmond's mixed-use development around the Olympic Oval has become a case study for urban planning and development.

3) Can you advise how the 158 dwelling units will be managed? For example, will there be an onsite manager who will help enforce rules and manage the occupants? Is this something the City is willing to require as part of the development approval? There are significant implications to having an unmanaged development of this size - especially in an already crowded space where everyone is sharing the air and the roads.

4) Are there any considerations the City has during the construction phase? For example, when heavy machinery and equipment is transported, there is damage caused to the roads and private property. This was very apparent during the 1008 Pandora Avenue construction, where Pandora Avenue and Vancouver Street had significant concrete damage to the public roadways. I note those roads are still not repaired at this time. Perhaps the City can require the developer to repave the designated road intended to bring supplies in and out?

Let me know if you'd like further clarification or have any questions on my feedback and thoughts.

Thanks,
Quinn

-----Original Message-----

From: Terrence Leah <[REDACTED]>

Sent: June 16, 2020 1:47 PM

To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>

Subject: Re: Rezoning No.00715

Thank you. From what you have said the start date has not yet been confirmed? Could you please confirm you do not have a planned start date and if you do, what is it? What's planned there is a bad very bad idea because of what's going to happen with the traffic and parking. There's already so many non residents taking up spots on Caledonia even right now at this moment. Caledonia is going to be like the Indy 500. You yes you are ruining the neighborhood. How would you and the elected like this past your front door. If you look in the rental adds you would see there is no longer a rental shortage due to the Airbnb situation. There is obviously money being exchanged here. I went to a city meeting on it where the residents tried to voice their concerns and it was like talking to the wall. The mayor was late, and busy texting, so were half the other officials. It's like the tax paying workers no longer matter. Any resident who tried to say a valid point was shut right down. It was pretty obvious who was to financially gain from this project. It's so frustrating to see council so out of touch with how they are affecting the people who work so hard to pay the way for those who feel entitled just because.

From: Jeff Dean <[REDACTED]>
Sent: June 26, 2020 8:28 AM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: Rezoning No.00715

Hi Leanne,

I am opposed to the change to the bylaw.

Have a happy Canada Day!

Best regards,

Jeff Dean
1216 Pembroke st.
Victoria, B.C.
V8T 1J8

Response to City of Victoria, regarding the OCP amendment for the upcoming Caledonia Project
Attention: Leanne Taylor, Senior Planner
June 19, 2020

Writing from the perspective of Fernwood residents for the past 17 years, senior, and strata owners, we have mixed feelings about the upcoming changes to our neighbourhood. This appears to be a fairly significant change to the OCP, that could have future ramifications on development in Fernwood. We do support an increase in affordable housing opportunities for Victoria. It has been an area that has been neglected for many years. However, this project seems to be pushing the limits of density and urbanization, that could change our neighbourhood from what we all enjoy about living here, a sense of slower pace, a residential feel, less dense than the downtown, and easy access to interesting amenities, and a balance between urban and community feel.

We are not professional urban planners, but the significant increase in the density ratio and the change from residential housing to urban housing is unsettling. The proposed project seems more fitted for downtown than it does for our residential neighbourhood. Our concern is that this will open the doors to more urban development in Fernwood, continued higher density development, and permanently change the ambience, character, and neighbourhood feeling that we have here. We would be more comfortable with a smaller project, that created less density, and created additional green space (something we saw very little of in the recent downtown development process). The development seems to be trying to pack as many homes into the space as possible. We would also be good with leaving some land to the school district for future needs.

For us it will probably be a loss of quality of life. For the City of Victoria and for prospective renters it could be considered a win/gain, as the City sees an increase in affordable housing as an important agenda item. It looks like Fernwood will be becoming an extension of the downtown, something many of the residents would not be happy about.

Over the years living here, we have seen some very positive changes in Fernwood. ...and we would hope that can continue for future residents as well as the current ones. It has become a safer neighbourhood, an increase in better amenities, a younger demographic of residents, upgrades in property, and less party and drug houses. This project may be a tipping point where we begin to see a reversal in quality of life...Why not try to move ahead with smaller steps? Allowing the residents time to absorb and assess the changes. Rather than go full steam ahead and hope for the best. I think it stands a better chance of success if the project were a smaller footprint.

On another note, after walking by or through Spring Common every day for many years, I can say that this property is highly underused and needs a re- think or re-design. It virtually has almost no community use or activity. It would be better off as a simple green space or park.

Josh and Nan Keller
[REDACTED] Chamber St
Victoria

I am pleased to see we are following UN's Agenda 21, which encourages the use of the same language and catch phrases in all urban planning meetings throughout Canada, the U.S. and Europe and has been extremely helpful in crafting this rezoning proposal.

It is important to reduce green space in the inner city, to increase vehicle traffic on narrow streets, to increase density by decreasing living space within housing units, to create larger, more anonymous communities, all affecting mental health and in particular, to ignore or manipulate OCP's, rendering them meaningless.

I understand that although no similar initiatives have previously reduced housing prices in the Capital Region, it is still beneficial to make that assertion.

With all this in mind, as an affected property owner, I support the proposed changes to the Grant/North Park/Vining/Gladstone/Caledonia Avenue development.

Alyson Culbert

 Chambers Street
North Park Street

Please do not at any time or in any place record or relate the last paragraph, without including all other paragraphs for context.

-----Original Message-----

From: m knowles [REDACTED]
Sent: June 27, 2020 4:11 PM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: 1211 Gladstone Ave et al proposal

Hi Leanne

I have lived in the Wedgewood Estates apartment building on Chambers (between Pandora and Balmoral) for the past 5 years, having living in Oak Bay for 22 years prior to that. I am responding to the notice dated June 2, 2020 that I received from the City of Victoria regarding the proposed Official Community Plan amendment for 1211 Gladstone Ave. et al.

I am adding my comments to the summarized comments that were received through public consultation (under '2.1- CALUC Meeting & Open House') of the "Caledonia Rezoning Application" package dated September 2019.

I understand that this proposal has been the dream of many people in Fernwood for some time. I am not opposed to the development itself, but am concerned that the addition of 158 units in an area of single family homes all at once could have a significant effect on the neighbourhood. I notice that there is also a proposal to add an additional 21 units of multi-family units at the corner of Chambers and North Park St. that will further affect the neighbourhood. The cumulative effect of these additions over a short period of time, could be very disruptive.

I was happy to see that a proposed 5 storey building, which would be out of scale for the neighbourhood is now proposed to be only 4 storeys, which is more in keeping with the apartments further up Chambers Street. I hope that is still the case. It is also important that the new buildings do not affect the community gardens at North Park and Chambers.

My main concern is the potential effect of the addition of all these units on the traffic in this area, particularly on Chambers Street, which already has problems with the current population, not too mention the fact of traffic coming from Pandora to cut over to Caledonia. It's a bit of a rabbit warren with one-way streets, dead-end streets, and narrow roads. There is often no more than one-lane of traffic right now on Chambers, depending on where cars are parked or if there are large trucks, such as recycling, on the road.

I predict that there will be congestion at Caledonia and Chambers where vehicles will be accessing one of the underground parking garages in the new development. One of the diagrams shows egress to Cook Street via North Park and Grant as well, but that is more fiction than fact. Grant is really no more than a lane with very limited two-way traffic, and Cook Street is already congested during the day. Caledonia and Vining running east off of Chambers are more lanes than streets. The second parking garage exits onto Grant Street, which is also narrow, as well as being adjacent to Victoria High School. This will lead to more traffic on Fernwood off Grant, another potential bottleneck.

Parking will also be an issue, given the reduced number of parking spaces for the proposed units for both the developments noted above. It is true that the area has a high walkability score, but the fact remains that most households have at least one car in order to travel effectively within the greater Victoria area. With the loss of Wellburns, I use a car to get my groceries as I do not enjoy walking to the

new Save-On Foods Store on Vancouver and Pandora. The shops on Yates street are too far for me to walk to.

Our transit system does not work for everyone and not everyone can ride a bike, let alone use one to commute to work or do all their errands. I can see the bike lanes on Pandora east of Cook Street from my apartment and they are not well used, despite having been there for many years. I rarely see more than one cyclist at a time.

There may be a proposal to have a car-share available for residents. If so, that would help.

Parking in this area of Fernwood is at a premium. There is very little street parking available for visitors, and the parking that is marked "Residential" is generally fully occupied.

Wedgewood Estates has 60 units over 4 floors. There are 55 parking spots behind the building, 3 of which are designated for Visitors. The other spots are always fully occupied despite the fact that a number of residents use bicycles as their only mode of transport. The parking lot can be accessed from Pandora and also Balmoral.

Another concern is the impact of where workers will park during construction of the Gladstone development, especially if upgrades to Victoria High School are going on at the same time, since there isn't street parking available. That could really upset neighbours - especially if the construction is drawn out, like a number of projects nearby on Johnson St.

There has been a 6-storey condo being built at Johnson and Chambers over the last few years. I no longer try to access Johnson Street during the week, as I have had too many near misses from trying to turn left from Chambers. There are either trucks or garbage bins obstructing the view west on Johnson. I now go east on Balmoral, cross Camosun gingerly, as there are always vehicles parked on that street, and go up to Fernwood, in order to head SE from my apartment.

If I am heading NE, I go north along Chambers winding my way to Fernwood Road, since Chambers does not go through directly to Bay.

Finally, I could find no mention of how the proposed development and the loss of part of the parking lot off Gladstone might affect the operation of the Belfry Theatre on Gladstone and Fernwood. True, it is not a direct neighbour, but it certainly has been a vital part of Fernwood for over 40 years. It needs parking for its patrons, who come from far and wide, to not only enjoy the theatre, but also patronize the restaurants, cafes and pubs in the area. I wonder if they have ever been consulted.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide some feedback.

Sincerely,
Marcia Knowles

June 29, 2020

Attention: Leanne Taylor, Senior Planner

Regarding: OCP Amendment for 120 Grant Street/ 1209, 1218, 1219, 1220 and 1226 North Park Street/ 1219 Vining Street/ 1235 Caledonia Avenue/ 1211 Gladstone Avenue

Dear Ms. Taylor,

I am writing in regard to the request for OCP Amendment associated with the development at the location specified above. I am a neighbour living at 1220 Pandora Avenue. My apartment building is located between Pandora and Balmoral Avenues, one block from the development site.

I have concerns about this project and as a neighbour do not support the request for OCP Amendment. One of the reasons that the OCP exists is to protect the character and livability of the neighbourhood. I am deeply concerned by the precedent this would set for high density buildings greater than 4 storeys in our neighbourhood. Already there are many recent builds, recent applications, and recent planned developments that are high density, pushing at the boundaries of the residential areas in Fernwood.

What Fernwood needs more than anything is family dwellings. The current zoning for 1211 Gladstone Avenue and 1209-1215 North Park Street supports duplexes and attached dwellings. I would be in favour of converting the remaining properties, which are currently non-residential, to the Traditional Residential zoning to allow for the creation of more townhouses in the space. I would also support an OCP variance allowing three storeys for all townhouse units.

As someone who dwells in an apartment, I can tell you, it is hard to get to know your neighbours. It is hard to feel a part of something. People who need affordable housing are also in need of community connections. They need to be a part of the neighbourhood – to have homes that are integrated into the neighbourhood where they can walk among the existing streets, rather than living in a large structure with an internal courtyard that discourages people from wandering beyond the limits of their property. They need to be able to put down roots and feel like they belong. That begins with good design.

Housing is urgently needed. However, it is also essential to preserve the walkability, sight lines, accessibility, and serviceability of our community. And it is essential that we do not allow large scale developments to encroach on our neighbourhood simply because we are adjacent to downtown.

I hope that you will seriously consider the implications of the proposed OCP amendment in terms of:

- 1) What matters (more than just creating the largest number of units possible) is the quality of life you are enabling with housing. Gentler density will allow for more families, more personal and shared green space, and more integration with the existing dwellings.
- 2) The implications for over-development in Fernwood. Ultimately, this opens the door for future large developments which would not be affordable housing, making Fernwood even less accessible to future residents than it is now.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Dr. Kristin Atwood, PhD
403-1220 Pandora Avenue, Victoria BC, V8V 3R4
[REDACTED]

From: Nancy [REDACTED]
Sent: June 29, 2020 11:03 AM
To: Leanne Taylor <ltaylor@victoria.ca>
Subject: 1211 Gladstone

Dear Ms. Taylor,

I own the property at 1911 Chambers. I have reviewed the information on the proposed development and I have a few questions and comments. I found it very confusing to read and understand, so I hope you can clarify some of this for me.

First, my particular concerns. What will happen to the beautiful trees that currently back our property at 1911 Chambers and provide some visual screening and privacy? Will they be preserved? Replaced? I cannot see what is being done to give us some space/privacy from this massive development.

I cannot work out what happens at the end of Caledonia. There seems to be some kind of guardrail. Is there an entrance to an underground parking garage? If so, what is the expected traffic? How many parking spots are in that garage? I can't see that information.

I think the buildings themselves look very nice as proposed.

However, my real concern, which I have stated before, is that if this development goes ahead, you will be taking land away from a school and that land, once gone, can never be reclaimed. This is a school with a growing population and my understanding is that there was a promise to the neighbourhood that these lands would be preserved. It seems both short-sighted and unfair to the students who will attend Vic High that their school grounds should be given over to a housing development.

This development is quite literally in my back yard, so I hope you will take the time to help me understand what the impact will be.

Regards, Nancy Weatherley