

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 10:21 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fw: Fernwood CALUC - Caledonia Project Update  
**Attachments:** CALUC 2021 Q&A Final for Web.pdf

---

**From:** Kimberly Lemmon [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 21, 2021 11:29 AM  
**To:** Alieda Blandford [REDACTED] Fernwood Land Use Committee [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Tamara [REDACTED]; Rob Whetter [REDACTED] Don Elliott [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Rob Fowles [REDACTED] Andy Orr [REDACTED] Victoria Mayor and Council  
<mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>; Jamie Gripich [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Fernwood CALUC - Caledonia Project Update

Good Morning,

Thank you for hosting the CRHC and our consultant team to present an update on the Caledonia Affordable Housing Redevelopment. We are excited that the project is moving forward to a public hearing of council next week on October 28<sup>th</sup>. As part of our preparation for the meeting, we are sharing additional information on our project webpage: [www.crd.bc.ca/caledonia](http://www.crd.bc.ca/caledonia)

To provide a concise and transparent means of answering the questions that resulted from the July 8<sup>th</sup> CALUC meeting, we have prepared an FAQ document. This document is attached to this email for your reference and will be posted on our webpage shortly for the broader community to refer to.

Thank you again for your time. Please do not hesitate to reach out should you have any further questions of our team.

Cheers,

**Kimberly Lemmon** RPP, MCIP | Manager, Planning & Development  
Regional Housing | Capital Regional District  
631 Fisgard Street, Victoria, BC V8W 1R7



**From:** Alieda Blandford [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 23, 2021 12:02 PM  
**To:** Kimberly Lemmon [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Lauren Miller [REDACTED] Fernwood Land Use Committee [REDACTED] Tamara [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Rob Whetter [REDACTED] Don Elliott [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Rob Fowles [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Fernwood CALUC - Caledonia Project Update

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Good morning,

Thank you for attending our Land Use meeting on July 8.

We did have some questions from community members in the chat that we had intended to send you in the hopes these questions could be answered.

1. With increased underground parking, is there a greater loss of mature trees?
2. Is the playground for the public or only residents who live there?
3. I am curious what happens after the 60-year lease is up? Will the housing still be managed by CRHC?
4. How many people are expected to be occupying all the buildings? [Answer: 287 bedrooms]
5. Who is requesting the 8m easement?
6. Will the widening of Grant Street for maintenance service access (garbage and recycling trucks) cut substantially into Haegert Park?
7. What is happening with the existing trees on Grant Street at the end of the track? Will they be staying or going?
8. With underground parking, what is the potential for blasting damage to nearby homes? Who is responsible for any damage?
9. Is the current plan in alignment with the Fernwood community plan?
10. What is the average lifespan of an affordable housing unit? What are you doing to ensure you are spending taxpayers dollars wisely and maintaining the proposed infrastructure?
11. What will the new configuration of Vining & North Park streets east of Chambers be?
12. What will the direct impacts be on the Compost Education Centre and the Chambers St. Allotment Gardens? What steps will be taken to mitigate these impacts.
13. What will be the direct impacts on homes adjacent to both Vining & North Park. How will these be mitigated?
14. What will the total cost of the widening and associated measures be? How will this be allocated between the City and the CRHC? How will the CRHC absorb this substantial, unanticipated cost? And will this have any impact on the housing project itself?
15. What is the anticipated impact on ongoing Chambers St. traffic calming initiatives? Given that Caledonia & Chambers will become the Emergency Vehicle access route, how is this anticipated to impact already excess traffic loads on these residential streets?
16. Other than the 18 families who lived in the former Caledonia Housing, what preference, if any, will be given to Fernwood residents in allocating homes in the new housing project? How will this be accomplished?
17. Will the underground parking spots come with the units or do they need to be rented? If so, where will the street parking be that serves the development?
18. Can you confirm that the 8 metre greenway is NOT for fire access? Is it really just a one block path 27 feet wide?
19. Can you speak to the sound insulation between units?
20. How long from start to finish will the construction take?

Thank you for any information you can provide.

Sincerely,

Alieda Blandford  
Fernwood CALUC Co-Chair

On Thu, Jul 8, 2021 at 3:14 PM Kimberly Lemmon [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Alieda,

Thank you for reaching out. There will be three of us presenting the Caledonia Update tonight – myself, Rob Whetter (our architect) and Tamara Bonnemaïson (our landscape architect) and then fielding questions together. I have attached a PDF of the presentation slides for tonight in case there are any technical difficulties that don't allow me to share my screen over zoom.

Cheers,

**Kimberly Lemmon** RPP, MCIP | Manager, Planning & Development, Regional Housing | [REDACTED]

**From:** Alieda Blandford [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 08, 2021 2:48 PM  
**To:** Kimberly Lemmon [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Lauren Miller [REDACTED] Fernwood Land Use Committee [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Fernwood CALUC - Caledonia Project Update

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hi Kimberly,

Just wanted to ensure that you had the link for tonight's land use meeting at 7:00:  
[REDACTED]

Zoom link:  
[REDACTED]

The agenda is quite full, so we are hoping you can present the Caledonia project updates from about 7:05 - 7:20 in order to allow time for questions and discussion afterwards. (Our next agenda item begins at 7:40).

Thank you and see you this evening!

Best,

Alieda Blandford  
Fernwood CALUC co-chair

On Tue, May 25, 2021 at 6:01 PM Kimberly Lemmon [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Alieda,

July 8th works just fine for me. Thank you for checking.

Mobily Yours,

Kimberly Lemmon  
[REDACTED]

On May 25, 2021, at 3:28 PM, Alieda Blandford [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Kimberly and Lauren,

I just wanted to follow up with you regarding an update on the Caledonia project at our Fernwood CALUC meeting on June 3 at 7:00.

We have a few other developers (including BC Housing) vying for spots at our June 3 meeting, and wanted to touch base to see whether you were quite interested in coming to present in June, or whether you would be OK if we bumped you to the next meeting on July 8?

Please let me know if you have a strong preference.

Thank you,

Alieda Blandford  
Fernwood CALUC Co-chair

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or their employee or agent responsible for receiving the message on their behalf your receipt of this message is in error and not meant to waive privilege in this message. Please notify us immediately, and delete the message and any attachments without reading the attachments. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. Thank you. Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or their employee or agent responsible for receiving the message on their behalf your receipt of this message is in error and not meant to waive privilege in this message. Please notify us immediately, and delete the message and any attachments without reading the attachments. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. Thank you. Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Capital Regional District | October, 2021

*\*the following questions were a result of the most recent meeting with the Fernwood CALUC*

### Affordability

**Q: How many of the units are subsidized housing, and how does one qualify for subsidized housing? How many of the units are below market rent?**

**A:** The Caledonia Development will offer 158 new affordable housing units to very low and low to moderate income individuals and families. The development is primarily funded through BC Housing's Community Housing Fund that determines the rental breakdown and design requirements. In alignment with the CHF program, 20% of the units will be offered at deep subsidy rates for those on income assistance, 50% of the units will be rented as Rent Geared to Income (RGI) whereby monthly rent does not exceed 30% of a family's gross monthly income and the remaining 30% of the units are offered at below market rents.

For information on applying for Subsidized Housing (deep subsidy and RGI) please follow this [link](#).

For information on how to apply for Affordable (below market) Housing follow this [link](#).

**Q: Has there been discussion of the benefits of mixing subsidized housing with full-market housing?**

**A:** As a non-profit social housing operator, the CRHC does not develop market housing.

### Easement

**Q: Was it the CRHC that determined an 8m easement was needed on the school district's lands?**

**A:** An 8m easement was requested by the City of Victoria during the rezoning and development permit review process in compliance with the City of Victoria Greenways Plan and the Official Community Plan. The land is being dedicated to the city by way of a Statutory Right of Way to permit public access and is being constructed by the CRHC as an off-site obligation connected to the Caledonia housing development.

**Q: Can you confirm that the 8 metre greenway is not for fire access?**

**A:** The 8m easement area is a 'People Only Greenway' defined in the [City of Victoria Greenways Plan](#) to provide a pathway connection with intended use by pedestrians, bicycles and other non-motorized rolling traffic. There will be no vehicular traffic permitted unless there is an emergency or parks maintenance requirement by the City.

---

For more information please visit [www.crd.bc.ca/caledonia](http://www.crd.bc.ca/caledonia)

Capital Regional District | October, 2021

### Density and Zoning

**Q: Is the current development plan in alignment with the Fernwood community plan?**

**A:** Our understanding is that the Fernwood Neighbourhood Plan was adopted by Council in 1994 and is currently undergoing a review and update by the Community Plan team through their Village & Corridor Planning work. As part of the rezoning and development permit process, it was determined that the OCP required an amendment to identify the lands as suitable for residential development. The project's height and density is in alignment with the Urban Residential OCP Designation and is sensitive to the existing form and character of the Fernwood community. Caledonia is proposed to be a comprehensive re-development that increases density for affordable rental housing through sensitive positioning of buildings on the site. The Rezoning and OCP amendment will allow for this provision of additional affordable housing from 78 to 158 units while still permitting ample greenspace.

### Parking

**Q: With increased underground parking, is there a greater loss of mature trees?**

**A:** There are 27 mature trees being retained and 121 new trees being planted as part of the Caledonia development. Of the 31 trees being removed, only 2 are Bylaw protected. A robust [Tree Preservation Plan](#) has been prepared based upon a visual inspection, survey and report prepared by a certified [Arborist Report](#).

**Q: With underground parking, what is the potential for blasting damage to nearby homes, and who would be responsible for any damage?**

**A:** As most of the material to be removed is till, there is anticipated to be very little blasting of bedrock. However, some limited bedrock removal will occur with the CRHC and all contractors are required to have appropriate liability insurance. CHRC may also engage individual homeowners should considerable bedrock removal be taking place in the immediate proximity of their homes.

Capital Regional District | October, 2021

**Q: Will the underground parking spots be assigned to specific units? Is there street parking for the building?**

**A:** The Caledonia Development proposes an underground parkade that meets the City of Victoria requirements for parking. The underground parkade will contain 117 vehicle parking stalls and 224 bicycle stalls. Vehicle stalls are rented to tenants at a low monthly cost as a first come, first served offering. There is no charge to tenants for use of the bicycle parking area. Street parking is not controlled by CRHC or any other private owner/operator in the City of Victoria.

### Local Land Use and Traffic

**Q: Will the widening of Grant Street for maintenance service access cut into Haegert Park?**

**A:** A turnaround at the terminus of Grant Street has been designed to reduce asphalt and impervious surface treatment and will include reseeded grass. A copy of the design can be found [here](#).

**Q: Will Gladstone be closed at Fernwood?**

**A:** No, Gladstone and Fernwood will not be affected. The roads to be closed are a portion of North Park and Vining Street. However, the portions of road that will be closed are not physically constructed, but legally owned by the City of Victoria within the Caledonia development boundaries.

**Q: What is the anticipated impact on ongoing Chambers St. traffic calming initiatives?**

**A:** This is a City of Victoria initiative unrelated to CRHC's Caledonia Project. The City has undertaken a study and analysis of traffic calming on Chambers.

**Q: What will be the direct impacts on homes adjacent to both Vining & North Park? How will these be mitigated?**

**A:** The CRHC has hired a Construction Manager who will be responsible for handling any issues that arise during construction.

**Q: I support patios but am concerned that the road may be reduced to a one-way?**

**A:** There are no one way roads planned in this development or on the surrounding streets.

Capital Regional District | October, 2021

**Q: Will the developer take on the costs associated with any renovation to the street or boulevard?**

**A:** Costs incurred as a result of the development is required to be borne by the developer, although Municipal Councils have the ultimate decision making authority on waiving or requiring the off-site improvements. All of our requirements are stipulated in the [City of Victoria subdivision bylaws](#) and have been secured by section 219 covenants registered on title.

### Building Attributes and Features

**Q: Is the playground for the public or only residents who live there?**

**A:** The playground is proposed for resident use; however, access will not be restricted to others who want to use the space to gather and meet their neighbours.

**Q: I am curious what happens after the 60-year lease is up? Will the building still be managed by CRHC?**

**A:** While it is highly speculative to look into the changes that could happen in the community over the next 60 years, typically when a lease term ends the two parties would negotiate another lease term or the property is returned back to the owner (School District 61).

**Q: How many people are expected to be occupy the new development?**

**A:** Based upon the National Occupancy Guidelines and CRHC tenant policies, units will be rented to individuals and families who qualify based on income and family size which cannot be determined at this time.

**Q: There appears to be a difference in the square footage calculations for the same units. For example, a 3 bedroom unit in the townhomes is larger than in the apartments. Why is this?**

**A:** The building design must be in alignment with BC Housing Design Guidelines, which identify target dwelling unit floor areas depending on the unit type. These unit sizes differ between townhouses and apartments.

**Q: Will there be sound insulation between units?**

**A:** The new walls and floors will be designed to industry best practices for sound isolation. While building codes require a minimum sound insulation level for all new projects, the assemblies that will be used for the Caledonia project will significantly exceed the minimum standards to ensure the liveability and comfort of CRHC tenants.

Capital Regional District | October, 2021

**Q: How long will the construction take?**

**A:** Construction of the Caledonia development is estimated to take 30 months to construct.

### Landscaping

**Q: Will the existing trees on Grant Street near the end of the track be retained?**

**A:** The Caledonia Redevelopment does not include the portion of lands surrounding the track or the trees adjacent Grant Street. Any impact to the trees would be as a result of SD61 construction underway as part of the Vic High seismic upgrades.

### Additional Questions

**Q: Will preference be given to Fernwood residents in the new development?**

**A:** The Residential Tenancy Act governs all CRHC tenancies, which stipulates all current tenants must be given right of first refusal to move back into the redevelopment. However, tenants must meet the eligibility requirements for the redevelopment based on income and family size. As a condition of the funds received from BC Housing, CRHC is required to identify eligible tenants for the deep subsidy and rent geared to Income units through the BC Housing Registry. For the affordable units tenants will be selected in accordance with CRHC's Tenant Eligibility Policy.

**Q: When did land negotiations with SD61 begin?**

**A:** CRHC has leased the existing Caledonia townhouse lands from SD61 since 1992. Leasing a larger portion of consolidated land that is underutilized from SD61 will enable CRHC to provide 158 units of housing for very low and low to moderate income individuals and families. The school district's decision on the land exchange can be found [here](#).

**Q: If the townhouses were built in 1992, why do they need replacement?**

**A:** The existing Caledonia complex was built in 1992 and a building condition assessment completed in 2017 identified that the property requires a complete building envelope remediation that was very costly to undertake. Therefore, the property was identified as a suitable candidate for redevelopment to provide 158 new, energy efficient suites and amenity space.

# Fernwood CALUC

## Questions and Answers

Capital Regional District | October, 2021

**Q: Will the Caledonia Development impact the Fernwood Community Allotment Gardens?**

**A:** The Caledonia Development review process at the City necessitated a widening of Vining Street to allow for emergency access and a partial closure of the north side of North Park Street adjacent the Gardens. The CRHC is obligated through a covenant registered on title to reconstruct the garden area in consultation with the Fernwood Community Allotment Gardeners, the Fernwood Community Association and the Compost Education Centre.

## Madison Heiser

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 10:21 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fw: concern re. Caledonia project

---

**From:** Anke van Leeuwen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 22, 2021 9:32 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** concern re. Caledonia project

Hi Mayor and Council

In principle, I support the Caledonia project planned for 2 blocks away from me. I like the mix of housing offered, the percentages of supportive and affordable units, the plantings, the public pathways and the community space.

Yes, the development is too dense for our community, but the consideration that we need the housing weighs heavier for me.

**What I can not support is the lack of a balcony for the studio units.** People living in the tiny units especially need the little bit of private outdoor space that a balcony would provide!  
I had the following response to my query about this, from

[REDACTED]

*"The studio units on levels 2-5 in the apartments do not have full balconies.*

*They either have a Romeo & Juliet balcony or large windows."*

I think it is inhumane to stick someone in a box like that.

Can you please send the proposal back with the requirement that the design adapt the inclusion of balconies for all studio apartments?

Thank you for listening,

Anke van Leeuwen  
2-1256 Denman St.  
Victoria BC  
V8T1L8

## Madison Heiser

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 10:21 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fw: public hearing on the Caledonia Project

---

**From:** Dorothy Field [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 22, 2021 11:28 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** public hearing on the Caledonia Project

To the Mayor and Council:

I have made various submissions regarding the Caledonia Project.

It boils down to this: School land is precious. Our population is increasing. In the Vic High catchment, density is increasing, in towers and in 4-5 storey buildings. We don't know when the Vic High land will be needed to expand the school but that time is coming. In the meantime, the green space is of great importance to students and neighbours.

We need to think long term. Please protect Vic High's green space into the future.

Dorothy Field

1560 Gladstone Avenue, Victoria V8R 1S5

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 10:25 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fw: Caledonia St. Development Public Hearing

---

**From:** Bill Goers [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 25, 2021 12:48 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** Caledonia St. Development Public Hearing

Mayor and Council, City of Victoria,

I'm writing you about the Caledonia St. Development, which is going to public meeting this Thursday, October 28th.

I have two observations:

-The ongoing question about improvements to the Victoria High School playing field. The housing development, as I understand it, because of parking, will disallow the playing field to include an olympic sized playing field. For a council that has modernized parking bylaws, to allow for more bike, human and green spaces, losing a playing field for the sake of parking seems several steps backward. Please reconsider to find a way to include in this council's legacy an initiative that favors students and people over cars.

-As members of the CRD housing committee, Lisa Helps, Ben Isitt, Jeremy Loveday and Geoff Young all have the optics of being both the developer and the decision makers on this project. I respect all of you four members, and personally, I think you would be fair, but the optics here looks like a closed loop, kind of like being both lawyer and judge on the same case. I seem to remember Lisa recusing herself on this development previously because she lives close to the project, but as the chair of the CRHC...??

You, the entire council work really hard and long for us. Thanks for your service!

Bill Goers

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Anthony Hopkins [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 26, 2021 8:56 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Cc:** Ben Isitt (Councillor); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Victoria Council meeting regarding Proposed Zoning change to 1230 Grant Street

Date: 2021/10/26

Hi City of Victoria Council,

My name is Anthony Hopkins, a resident of Fairfield.

In relation to the Council meeting on the evening of October 28th, 2021, in regards to the 1230 Grant Street Notice proposed zoning changes, I ask that they be voted down.

I say this as without Vic High having the space needed to revitalize and renew their track and field from the sad state it is in to a new, 8 track setup and the associated revisions to encourage sports at the school, you are relegating students (current and future) to a 2nd class opportunity, when compared to other high schools in the CRD.

Additionally, allowing the proposed zoning changes to go through, does a number of things:

1. Encourages what I call an "education desert", similar to a food desert; this is where residents of neighbourhoods have to subsist on obtaining food from corners stores and fast food restaurants, versus having access to fresh food at farmers markets and grocery stores. In the same fashion, not allowing Vic High to have a proper track and field in equal measure to other high schools in the CRD, means that students will likewise not have access to facilities they need and deserve at school to thrive. It also makes parents of perspective students of Vic High, wary of sending their children there, as the opportunities are sub-par to those of other schools.
2. By there being a lack of a proper track and field and a full and vibrant school at Victoria High, by extension, the Council and SD61 and others, are encouraging residents to be additional causes of climate change related impacts through having to drive longer distances to either facilities or schools that do provide these amenities.
3. It does not encourage more collaborative, honest and inclusive discussions between the City Council, School Board, Vic High and the alumni and residents to happen. It just says, here deal with it. It also doesn't encourage families to actively want to send their children to Vic High; but do so grudgingly, as the only option.

If you want Vic High to be the sole high school for most of the City of Victoria, be better then approve the proposed land rezoning and work to determine a Vic High and neighbourhood that is vibrant, affordable and inclusive to all who want to live there and look long term. Vic High isn't going anywhere, let it be the place students of all interests, want to go.

Thank you hearing my comment on this important topic.

Sincerely,

Anthony Hopkins

403 - 928 Southgate St.  
Victoria, BC; V8V 2Y2

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 10:28 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fw: Support for CHRC Caledonia Affordable Housing Development

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Sent:** October 26, 2021 11:49 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** Fw: Support for CHRC Caledonia Affordable Housing Development

---

**From:** Hannah Rabinovitch [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 20, 2021 10:26 PM  
**To:** Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** Support for CHRC Caledonia Affordable Housing Development

Hi Mayor and Council,

Writing to you as a resident and home-owner at 947 Caledonia Ave to express my unequivocal support for the CHRC Affordable Housing Development. CHRC operates the affordable housing development down the block from my house and they are a wonderful neighbour and provide much needed affordable housing to my fellow community members and neighbours. Please vote to support this project that will provide hundreds of units of affordable housing to families in need in a great location. Opportunities like this don't come up too often, we can't afford to miss it.

Thank you,

Hannah Rabinovitch

1-947 Caledonia Ave, V8T 1E7

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Jeremy Schmidt [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 26, 2021 5:45 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Cc:** Jeremy Schmidt  
**Subject:** 1211 Gladstone Avenue (the Caledonia project)

Dear Mayor and Council,

### **My Background**

I am a current and recent resident of Vic West. Prior to that time I resided beside Central Middle School for a number of years. I never really knew what neighbourhood to say I lived in - Harris Green, Fernwood, Rockland, or Fairfield. But I always felt most connected to the Fernwood Community. During my years of living there I followed the developments around the Vic High revitalization closely, and prior to that I lived on Scott Street on the border of Oaklands and Fernwood. Apparently I like to live on neighbourhood borders.

In my previous 10 years in Victoria, I have lived in seven different rental units (I recently bought a condo, so finally I feel I have housing stability.) I've lived in basement suites, condos, micro condos, and shared detached houses with several roommates. I've been sale-evicted two times, had to move once after a basement suite flooded, and had to move another time because I was told I had to be a full time student to continue renting there (which in retrospect I should not have accepted as fact.) I've moved other times because the rent was becoming increasingly unaffordable.

### **Reasons for support**

It is through this lens as a longtime renter that I strongly support the purpose built affordable rental project you are considering. I understand completely the stability that it will provide to both individuals and families who are in need in our city. As a result of my experience living in that area and frequently travelling by foot and bike, it is a fantastic spot to add density: schools and walking distance to shops in both North Park and Fernwood. Downtown and Oak Bay Junction are also walkable and provide many further amenities. Public transit is available on a number of nearby roads.

This project provides an excellent mix of units appropriate for families and for those who need accessible units. The minimum 14x3 bedroom, 8x4 bedroom, and 15x accessible units is not something we see often from for-profit developers because it is less economically feasible. I think we need to take opportunities like these to add these types of units to our rental stock. With 20% of the units being set aside for deeply affordable subsidies and 50% for those in the \$35k-\$85k range, this will provide housing for those most in need and who are struggling to find suitable housing on the open market that does not strain their resources.

Based on the correspondence I have reviewed so far, there seems to be some who believe that this proposal is still not affordable enough, but also some who think that because it is affordable it will attract the "wrong" type of people to the neighbourhood.

I hope, and know, that the Council will see through these arguments for what they really are and compare what is being offered here by the CRHC to reality. I believe that projects like this one are as close to "truly affordable" as we can achieve given the complexities and costs of development in the City. The people this development will serve are equal residents in our City and do not deserve to be othered. I personally would qualify for some of the units and so I find such suggestions insulting. I think this demonstrates how some of these commenters - typically long time comfortably housed individuals - do not understand the current housing challenges we face.

While my preference is to see tenant displacement minimized, having been displaced several times myself, I reviewed the tenant assistance plan in Attachment H and all things considered I think the tradeoff for this project strikes a supportable balance.

Lastly, without reiterating all of his points, I will just say that I echo all of the reasons provided by Dr. Rob Gillezeau in his correspondence with respect to the urgent need to get projects like this built.

### **Land swap**

I note that much of the opposition to this housing seems to stem from what is seen as a loss of school district land - the "land swap." I have read the letter from Mr. Rantucci and see that "the land exchange itself is not a factor that should be considered by Council during the rezoning process." However, because it appears to represent the thrust of the opposition and as it will inevitably be raised by the public in the public hearing, I will provide a few thoughts on that subject.

I believe that this proposal strikes an appropriate balance between the needs of the school community and the needs of the overall community in terms of housing. I am glad that the School District, with its municipal and regional partners, was able to find this solution.

While many adult neighbours and Vic High alumni lament the exclusion of a new turf field/8-lane track/stadium, it should be noted that during engagement, *current* Vic High students and other *current* students in the district did not rank the turf and track option (i.e. all 5 phases of the stadium plan) as a top 3 priority, while alumni did. See survey results here: <https://www.sd61.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/91/2020/03/Vic-High-Potential-Amenities-Summary-Engagement-Report-020620.pdf>

The School District is in fact moving forward with all of the top 3 priorities identified by the two separate student groups: astronomy observation deck, improved memorial stadium (a separate option from 'new turf and track'), improvements to the current theatre, and new spaces for physical education and health learning. The recommendations based on the survey are here: <https://www.sd61.bc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/91/2020/03/VICTORIA-HIGH-ENHANCEMENTS-AND-AMENITIES-RECOMMENDATIONS-Approved-1-5-Handout-Reg-Open-2020-03-09-E1c.pdf>

It notes that the new track and turf option would "require all of the amenity funding and more."

If this affordable housing project is voted down, it will not result in the construction of the 8-lane track and turf, which was said to require approximately \$7,000,000. When it came time to make decisions, I believe only \$500,000 had been raised, which I believe included the anticipated matching funds from the City. In the absence of this affordable housing project, that money would still not be available and the Vic High project is already proceeding as planned. To reject it for reasons related to this matter would not benefit anyone or achieve anything for any stakeholders.

Thanks,  
Jeremy  
160 Wilson St

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 26, 2021 3:37 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Support for the Caledonia project

This is exactly the type of affordable housing that we need — centrally located with many amenities so that residents can access everything they need without needing to own a car.

If this location is not deemed acceptable by the neighbourhood, I encourage Mayor and Council to look at the city-owned 940 Caledonia parking lot as an alternate location. We need housing, and surface parking is so 1960s.

Full support for the project and look forward to seeing more like it in the area.

Sincerely, a North Park neighbour.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Lisa Matthauss [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 26, 2021 8:30 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Caledonia Housing Project

I received a notice in my mailbox about this project as I guess my house is within a certain distance of the project. I'm writing to **confirm my strong support for the project and encourage Victoria City Council members to vote in support** of, specifically:

- OCP Amendment Bylaw (No. 36) - No. 21-065
- Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1234) - No. 21-064, and
- Development Permit Application No. 000567.

Our community and our city continue to face an affordable housing crisis. To solve it, one of the things we absolutely must do is make room for a diversity of people and homes, especially on those exceedingly rare sites – such as this Caledonia site –where publicly-owned land can be used to create true levels of affordability.

I will welcome this development, the residents that will ultimately live there and the neighbourhood amenities that will accompany the project, like more daycare spaces and community program space.

I look forward to seeing this project get underway.

Lisa Matthauss  
2201 Fernwood Rd  
Victoria  
V8T 2Z1

---

Lisa Matthauss

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 10:28 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fw: Support for Caledonia project

---

**From:** Marya Nijland & Philip Symons [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 26, 2021 10:46 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** Support for Caledonia project

Dear mayor and councilors:

Thank you for your recent newsletter with the message about the "missing middle" of housing.

I support the Caledonia housing project near Vic. High, and am sorry to hear of the opposition. The project will go a long way to filling in that missing middle. I also work with an organization that supports that project.

Philip Symons

1394 Vista Heights, V8T 2J3, Victoria

--

This email has been checked for viruses by AVG.

<https://can01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.avg.com%2F&data=04%7C01%7Cmayorandcouncil%40victoria.ca%7C258a2d2af6d2421d043308d998a880c1%7Cd7098116c6e84d2a89eedb15b6c23375%7C0%7C637708671751651056%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjojMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ikh1aWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=T0i0zkcd8C33F%2FQ7%2FhPb%2FNr8KmgH9A5NMASQY%2F%2B4iGI%3D&reserved=0>

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Robert Clarke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 26, 2021 4:24 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Public Hearing october 28 2021 for 1211 Gladstone Avenue etc

October 26, 2021

Dear Mayor and Council,

RE - REZONING APPLICATION # 00715 (west side of Victoria High School)

I oppose the current proposal.

The existing townhouse complex at 1211 Gladstone Avenue - called "Caledonia" - should be renovated, not demolished. Renovation would mean continued use of these buildings for excellent lower-income housing into the future. Please note that these buildings are only about thirty years old!

Another concern is that - in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood - there should be a three-storey limit on any new buildings.

Historically, I understand that when 1211 Gladstone was built by the Capital Regional Housing Corporation (CRHC), the land use committee of Fernwood was very involved in achieving such a valuable asset to the neighbourhood. Now, only three decades later, for the CRHC to want to tear it all down and build six storey apartment buildings is very disheartening.

To me, 1211 Gladstone is the type of housing that is appropriate for the community. The idea of demolishing excellent housing like this is wrongheaded and unethical.

The CRHC should be told:

- a) that the current proposal is unacceptable,
- b) that their townhouse complex (1211 Gladstone) should be retained, and
- c) that revised proposals for the rest of the area should not exceed three storeys.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Clarke.

(1331 Grant Street)

October 27, 2021

Mayor and Council  
Legislative Services,  
#1 Centennial Square,  
Victoria, BC  
V8W 1P6

Re: the proposed changes to 1230 Grant Street, 1209-1215, 1218, 1219, 1220 and 1226 North Park Street, 1219 Vining Street, 1235 Caledonia Avenue and 1211 Gladstone Avenue:  
Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2012, Amendment Bylaw (No. 36) - No. 21-065  
Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1234) - No. 21-064  
Development Permit Application No. 000567

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am/We are writing to you to express my opposition to the items listed above due to the following issues:

### **1) Lack of Transparency by City and SD61**

The scope of “stakeholders” is not limited to Fernwood. Vic High’s catchment area includes James Bay, Fairfield, Rockland, Fernwood, North Park, Downtown, Hillside/Quadra, and Burnside/Gorge neighbourhoods.<sup>1</sup>

**The families of current and future Vic High students who live in Vic High’s catchment have not been informed about the land-use conflict and the negative impact that the CRHC proposal imposes on Vic High.** Council has played a direct role in this lack of transparency, especially in not disclosing material facts during the consultation process in 2019.

Therefore, Council has a responsibility to include the opinions of members of the public living within the entirety of Vic High’s catchment area when considering the proposed rezoning of Vic High land. Council must also consider the opinions of Vic High’s alumni and the general public, who were encouraged to donate to the Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project in partnership with the City of Victoria.

### **Council’s Direct Involvement in Withholding Information from the Public:**

Starting in 2017, Council participated directly in land-use negotiations with the District, involving transfers of land that trigger the proposed lease. This information was withheld from the public during Vic High’s Seismic Upgrade consultations in April 2018.<sup>2</sup>

Council also participated directly in the negotiation of the proposed 8m easement without disclosing this proposed use of Vic High land to the public, or disclosing the negative impact on Vic High.<sup>3</sup>

In doing so, Council entangled themselves in a conflict of interest, as they were simultaneously bound by their 2014 commitment to support Vic High’s Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project that requires the

---

<sup>1</sup> Vic High’s catchment area: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

same land.<sup>4</sup> To suggest that Vic High students must now compromise the quality of resources at their school to accommodate Council's demands for Vic High land is unacceptable.

## 2) Disregard for Policies & Regulations re: Disposal of Public School Property

**Reference: Ministry of Education's Policy regarding land disposal:** <sup>5</sup>

*The Policy requires that "a board must confirm that the board will not require the land or improvements for future educational or community purposes."*

Key Points:

- The District has admitted that **no studies were conducted** prior to negotiating the proposed disposals of Vic High land to *confirm* that the land in question is not needed for educational or community purposes: <sup>6</sup>
- At the November 12, 2019 consultation, **the Board withheld data about projected growth in Vic High's catchment population** that is estimated to reach 1,390 by 2031, using now outdated studies.<sup>7</sup> Population growth is a key consideration when determining the use of public school land.

**Reference: School District 61 Board of Education Regulation 7110:** <sup>8</sup>

*As part of the consultation process, the Board of Education shall provide:*

- *reasons for sale of the property.*
- *use of the proceeds of disposal.*
- *projected enrolment in the District.*
- *impact on District education programs.*
- *impact on community use of school buildings.*

Key Points:

- The Board and the public were given false information about the "reasons for sale of the property" and the "use of the proceeds of disposal."<sup>9</sup> All evidence points to mismanaged upgrades to Burnside School as the source of the so-called shortfall.<sup>10</sup>
- See above re: projected enrolment and population growth
- **The proposed 8m easement (negotiated between the District, the City, and the CRHC), and the CRHC proposal both have a negative "impact on District education programs," specifically Vic High's well-established plans for the Memorial Stadium Revitalization**

<sup>4</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Ministry of Education's Policy regarding land disposal

<sup>7</sup> November 12, 2019 consultation See p.8:

Compare with information boards from the April 2018 Seismic Upgrade Consultation that share this key information. See p. 4

<sup>9</sup> Vic High did not have a \$2.6M shortfall due to heritage preservation (the difference in cost between a new build and the chosen "heritage option #3" was less than \$1M, and the "new build" did not include a theatre). The "new build" was considered only for the purposes of comparison (see p.3, pp. 10-11, and p. 46 of pdf)

Yet, the District reported that heritage preservation resulted in a funding shortfall that precipitated the proposed lease:

<sup>10</sup> See

**Project and athletic programs.** This information was withheld from the public and from Vic High staff and students and their families during the consultation process.<sup>11</sup>

**CONCLUSION/ASK OF COUNCIL: I/WE ASK THAT COUNCIL HONOUR THEIR COMMITMENT TO SUPPORT VIC HIGH'S ORIGINAL PLANS FOR THE MEMORIAL STADIUM REVITALIZATION PROJECT BY VOTING AGAINST THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ZONING REGULATION BYLAW RELATED TO THE CALEDONIA HOUSING PROJECT.**

Public education is a long-standing equity measure that is intended to perform as the “great equalizer,” but this intent requires that all public schools receive unbiased structural support, not only from the school district but also from the municipal and provincial governments that play a role in public education.

The practice of streaming, flowing immigrant and socio-economically disadvantaged students to the same school, and not providing adequate funding (over time) to maintain standards of quality in regard to school infrastructures such as athletic facilities, science labs, libraries, computer labs, and more, have been revealed to have negative outcomes for students. The environment in which students learn each day impacts academic success.<sup>12</sup>

For more than five decades, the students of Vic High have been negatively impacted as a result of biases built into the systems (institutions including SD61, the City, and the CRHC) that either govern or have an influence over decisions that affect the distribution of resources across the school district. Systemic inequality is rooted in biases relative to socio-economically disadvantaged students and their communities.

Through purposeful action, decisions to dispose of, appropriate, and make available land intended for educational purposes, these institutions continue to perpetuate systemic inequality as it relates to the students of Vic High. Addressing other needs of the community cannot be achieved through disadvantaging school children without undermining Council's objective to bring equity to Victoria. As the City's only high school, Vic High merits Council's respect and advocacy.

Although the SD61 Board should never have conceived, or voted in favour of the proposed lease of educational land at Vic High, Council now has the power to remedy this damaging decision — made possible by their own direct involvement — by voting against the zoning bylaw changes for the proposed Caledonia housing project that would negatively impact the education of Vic High students for generations to come.

Thank you,

Alberto Callo  
1343 Vining St  
Victoria, BC  
V8R 1P5

---

<sup>11</sup> Images at the November 12, 2019 consultation inaccurately show the proposed 8m easement as available for “educational purposes.” See pp 10-11: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Public Hearings  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 12:12 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: Public Hearing Comment for October 28, 2021

**From:** David Sametz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 10:26 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings <[PublicHearings@victoria.ca](mailto:PublicHearings@victoria.ca)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Public Hearing Comment for October 28, 2021

**RE: 1230 Grant Street, 1209-1215, 1218, 1219, 1220 and 1226 North Park Street, 1219 [Vining Street](#), 1235 Caledonia Avenue and 1211 Gladstone Ave**

I live nearby along Fernwood Road and I fully support this development. It will provide much-needed housing for many new families and other individuals.

My only concern is that the Fernwood traffic poses a real danger to the influx of new pedestrians and cyclists that will accompany the development.

Despite numerous calls and emails to the City voicing concern, we continue to witness speeds well in excess of the posted limit of 30 km along Fernwood Road. **Hydro poles have been obliterated by speeding SUVs**, and cars speed by within inches of daycare kids walking along Fernwood Road's narrow sidewalk. Getting out of a vehicle on the side of the road with parking is treacherous; we have had many close calls with our baby in our arms, elderly parents etc.

The crosswalk at Grant has done little to slow anyone down. We see children use it on their own to get to school in the mornings and it's only a matter of time before something awful happens. Cars are using this road as a speedy cut-through despite it traversing a village square, numerous nearby daycares and assisted living centres, a school, and heavily used green space for dogs, playing children and strollers.

With all this in mind, in addition to voicing support for the development, **I would like to propose a 2m SRW between Fernwood Road and the School District to allow the City to**

expand sidewalks along Fernwood Road. Traffic calming is an urgent component of ensuring the added housing is a success and that new residents can move around this community safely.

Sincerely,

Dave Sametz

1709 Fernwood Road

V8T2Y3

October 27, 2021

Mayor and Council  
Legislative Services,  
#1 Centennial Square,  
Victoria, BC  
V8W 1P6

Re: the proposed changes to 1230 Grant Street, 1209-1215, 1218, 1219, 1220 and 1226 North  
Park Street, 1219 Vining Street, 1235 Caledonia Avenue and 1211 Gladstone Avenue:  
Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2012, Amendment Bylaw (No. 36) - No. 21-065  
Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1234) - No. 21-064  
Development Permit Application No. 000567

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am opposed to the above items.

Below is a commentary on Vic High Principal Aaron Parker's March 3, 2021 letter to Mayor and Council that may have influenced the decision-making process regarding the above items.

Principal Parker's letter can be found here: [REDACTED]

### **Commentary on Vic High Principal Aaron Parker's March 3, 2021 letter to Mayor and Council**

In March of this year, the City of Victoria Council (Council) voted on building variances associated with Vic High's seismic upgrade. Citizens expressed concern that despite a request for variances, parking, as rendered, would force the cancellation of Vic High's long-established plans Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project as a result of being displaced eastward onto Vic High's current track and field by the proposed Caledonia housing development and 8-m easement.

On March 3, 2021, Principal Aaron Parker wrote a letter to Mayor and Council in support of proposed modifications to Vic High's plans for revitalized sports infrastructure that accommodate the aforementioned housing proposal and 8-metre easement. Despite a coordinated effort to revitalize Vic High's Memorial Stadium since 2007 at the request of School District 61 and the City of Victoria (the City), Principal Parker wrote, *"Our track and cross country programs are very small programs, attracting less than 10 students per year. While I am hopeful these programs will grow, as the principal of the school and the cross country coach, I am confident a training track or running ring would be sufficient to support our current and future running programs."* The "running ring," Principal Parker referenced is the proposed two-lane walking track featured in the District's proposed modified plans. Here is an updated version of proposed modifications:

Principal Parker's statement apparently contradicts his previous public statements in support of the Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project and omits reference to three surveys, each confirming public support for the original plans for Vic High's Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project.

### **The Three Surveys**

1) In 2014, the Vic High Alumni Association (the Alumni) conducted a survey that confirmed widespread support for a competitive 8-lane metric track and full-size field. This community consultation was required by the City of Victoria Council (Council) 2014 Resolution to support the revitalization project and "move the project forward."

2) In 2018, School District 61 (the District) engaged Vic High staff, students, and the public in Vic High's seismic upgrade consultation. The widely publicized results of the survey of 1,700 citizens confirmed support for preserving Vic High's heritage building. A lesser-known fact is that the survey results also showed that the public prioritized school amenities — including sports infrastructure — *above support for heritage preservation*. See page 123 of the data from the overall results.

Note: the Seismic Consultation Summary Report **falsely claims** that the public supported "increased community access in the form of ... affordable housing." Affordable housing was not mentioned in any of the information boards or questions at Vic High's Seismic Upgrade Consultation in 2018, and responses in the 207-page overall results *do not* support this claim. I attended both open houses in April 2018 for the duration of the meetings. I spoke to both the former Secretary-Treasurer and the former Superintendent. Affordable housing was never discussed and the negotiations for the CRHC proposal that started in 2017 were not disclosed.

3) The Amenities Survey, conducted in late 2019/early 2020 under Principal Parker's leadership, is the most recent survey confirming support for a revitalized track and field. See page 4 of the Summary Engagement Report. Despite public support, in the Amenities Recommendations Report, the District did not recommend a new track and field because it would "*require all of the amenity funding and more.*"

Note: At the time the survey was conducted, the public was not yet aware of the undisclosed land-use conflict caused by the City and Capital Region Housing Corporation's (CRHC) demands for Vic High land. Why did the District survey the public about upgrades to the track and field without disclosing the land-use conflict, then claim that a lack of funding prohibited this amenity? (The claim of a lack of funding is also questionable. There is evidence that much

of the \$6M in Neighbourhood Learning Centre funds were available, but directed towards another project.)

Note: Beach volleyball courts were not included in the Amenities Survey:

The Engagement Summary Report shows that staff, students, and the public did not request this amenity:

However, “sand volleyball courts” were included in the School District’s Recommendations to the School Board (see p 3):

Note: In the Amenities Survey, the public the District reports that \$1.5M - \$1.9M would be available for amenities from the proposed lease. However, the actual amount is approximately \$700,000 since the District negotiated only \$4.3M for the proposed lease. From this potential revenue, the District must pay BC Housing \$1M and use \$2.6M to pay for expenses that evidence suggests are associated with cost overruns from mismanaged upgrades to Burnside School (not the preservation of Vic High’s heritage building). Therefore, total potential revenue from the proposed 60-year lease available to Vic High is only \$700,000 with undisclosed negative impacts on Vic High’s plans for revitalized infrastructure.

### Why?

In Principal Parker’s letter to Council, reference to these three reports is omitted. Instead, Principal Parker refers to his own “*observations and conversations with staff and students.*” He seems to advise Council that beach volleyball is of more interest, even though beach volleyball was not included in any surveys and survey results do not support this claim. Principal Parker goes so far as to seem to claim that an 8-lane metric track might interfere with the “*expansion and enhancement of other playing surfaces,*” apparently meaning beach volleyball courts, despite their current non-existence. Beach volleyball isn’t even listed as a school sport on Vic High’s website, but track & field is listed.

The District’s proposed modification to Vic High’s sports infrastructure that includes beach volleyball courts appears not be a response to surveys or requests, but a response to the proposed narrowing of Vic High’s field as a result of the CRHC housing proposal and proposed 8m easement that leave few options for amenities.

Apparently, beach volleyball courts are intended to compensate for this loss of field area, a curious “compromise” given that beach volleyball is not a sanctioned BC High School sport and, as mentioned, is not listed on Vic High’s website as a sport currently played by students.

In fact, beach volleyball is played outside the school calendar. Introducing this sport to Vic High at the expense of a well-established sports like track and field would only serve to isolate Vic High from athletic competition; track and field should be prioritized.

### **The Problem with Beach Volleyball at the Cost of Track and Field**

If the District wishes to construct beach volleyball rental facilities for summer use, why not construct the courts on the rooftop of community-access change rooms or a parking area, using Vic High's valuable real estate twice?

As one student wrote in the report from the 2018 seismic upgrade survey, *"A lot of other schools say that Vic High doesn't have good amenities which makes people not want to go to this school, but if we work to make them better more people will want to come to our school"* (p5 of pdf).

In the above-linked report, not a single student mentions beach volleyball as a desired outcome of Vic High's seismic upgrade that was to include the original plans for the Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project. One student commented, *"I believe that as students of Vic High we have the right to functional amenities and convenience in our education"* (p5 of pdf of above link).

In his letter, Principal Parker states, *"[I]t is my hope that [Council] will take our student interests into consideration in your current deliberations."* However, Vic High students were never asked if they were willing to give up an 8-lane metric track, full field, lights, and ample stadium seating in favour of a two-lane walking track, beach volleyball courts, no lights, and reduced seating. They were never asked, even though the District's Long Term Facilities Plan states explicitly that *"students be canvassed on their preference on school amenities, facilities and programming"* (p 27 of pdf).

How is it possible that a full-size field and 8-lane metric track, planned since 2007, given unanimous support from trustees in 2012, strong support from Council in 2014, and praised by Principal Parker in 2018, can be portrayed as an infringement on beach volleyball courts in 2021, without any surveys to back up this claim?

### **The BC Government's Policy Regarding the Disposal of Public School Land and District Regulation 7110**

The BC Government's policy regarding the disposal of public school land states: *"Boards of education must engage in broad consultation and in enhanced planning regarding underutilized school buildings and other property owned by boards prior to property disposition."* The impact of land disposal on school programming is a basic requirement in public consultation, but students and the public were not informed about the land-use conflict as a result of the housing proposal that interferes with plans for an 8-lane metric track, full field, and other amenities such as lighting.

The BC Government’s policy further states that “[A] board must confirm that the board will not require the land [considered for disposal] or improvements for future educational or community purposes.” Yet, by the District’s own admission, *staff did not conduct a study to determine whether or not Vic High has surplus land* — hence, the current, *easily avoided*, land-use conflict.

In 2017 when the undisclosed negotiations between the District, City, and CRHC began, a brief consultation with existing plans for Vic High’s Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project would have shown that Vic High does not have surplus land.

The Board has also not satisfied the requirements of Regulation 7110:

[REDACTED]

### **Former Minister of Education Rob Fleming’s Commitment**

On June 27, 2019 when funding for Vic High’s seismic upgrade was announced, former Minister of Education, Rob Fleming, said that it would include a renewal of sports infrastructure “[b]ecause once upon a time Vic High was the powerhouse school in sports.” As mentioned, there is evidence that several million was available through the \$6M Neighbourhood Learning Centre (NLC) funding, but that it was directed towards another project.

Unfortunately, due the District’s dissemination of unsubstantiated information combined with the withholding of key information, Vic High students continue to experience a political climate in which they are largely uninformed about the land-use conflict, although negotiations with the CRHC started in August, 2017.

Moreover, students and their families who are informed have tended to be reticent about expressing their thoughts and feelings due to fear of being labeled “NIMBYs.” One parent wrote, “The worry is looking like we don’t agree with social housing etc.” At a school with a high population of marginalized students, such a label has severe social consequences that clearly leaves students and their families who question the proposal feeling unsafe to freely express their concerns. Evidently, the student voice has been repressed.

Yet, the Alumni had already announced Phase 1 of the stadium upgrade in January 2018, including a full turf field and lighting (located on the outside perimeter of the 8-lane metric track that requires a significantly larger footprint than the current yard track). The plans note that additional parking would be located on the former Fairey Tech site. Comments from the April 2018 Seismic Upgrade consultations include anticipation of the Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project:

[REDACTED]

### **CRHC “Consultation” with Vic High Students**

Unfortunately, the only “consultation” for students regarding the proposed land transfers and housing proposal that school administrators arranged was apparently motivated by a request from the CRHC to meet with students during school hours on October 21, 2019. The apparent intent was to conduct a “public consultation,” even though the CRHC had already completed all required consultations. Although Vic High administrators reported that few students engaged with the CRHC, the presence of CRHC staff in the school remains problematic.

The request seems to have been a response to a School Board meeting at which a member of the community (not a consultant) forwarded evidence that the housing proposal would leave Vic High with less area per student than required by Ministry standards. Without a study conducted by the District, the CRHC conducted their own study of Vic High’s land-to-student ratio, concluding that the evidence was incorrect; however, the CRHC omitted key aspects of the housing proposal such as the 8m easement in order to reach that conclusion.

In an email to Principal Parker requesting a meeting with students, CRHC staff wrote, *“Since construction will take place during the time Vic High is closed for seismic upgrades, the impact [of the proposed housing] may be limited. However, all the students will [likely walk past] or look at this development at some point and it would be good to get their thoughts.”* Apparently, by “impact,” the CRHC is referencing visual impact, rather than the impact of the land-use conflict that undermines plans for upgraded sports infrastructure.

Electronic copies of the engagement materials confirm that the CRHC shared inaccurate images of the proposal with students that suggest Vic High’s track and field would not be impacted (similar images were shared with the general public). The questionnaire listed several questions about the appearance of the housing proposal, with a final question asking, “Is affordable housing important to you? Why or why not?”

### **Chronic Inequity in School District 61**

In his letter, Principal Parker suggests that Vic High students do not require a full track and field due to a lack of interest and changing demographics, but fails to contextualize his comments with regard to chronic inequity in the District. Apparently, his conclusion is based on the observation that *“Basketball, Volleyball, and Rugby regularly attract well over 100 student participants per sport”*; whereas, the *“track and cross country programs”* attract *“less than 10 students per year.”* But cross country and track and field teams often draw smaller numbers. And how could anyone expect to attract students to athletics when administrators and the District have allowed Vic High’s facilities to fall into disrepair for nearly fifty years?

A comparison with Oak Bay High School reveals just some of the problems with these comments. On Oak Bay High’s website, photos show that in the 2017 and 2018, the cross

country teams had thirteen and fourteen team members respectively, which is not much higher than Vic High's numbers, especially given that Oak Bay has a nominal capacity of 1300, exceeding Vic High's capacity by approximately 500 students (Vic High's capacity will increase from 800 to 1000 with the seismic upgrade).

Oak Bay High's track and field team, on the other hand, does have much higher numbers. An article from April 2020 states that "Oak Bay runs the biggest track and field program on the Island and possibly the province with 75 to 100 members." Even this remarkable team started from zero years ago, and only through perseverance (and support!) became the team it is today.

However, this data is more complex than would first appear. According to the District's own records, approximately 40% of Oak Bay High's population is from outside the school's catchment; the school was constructed to accommodate 500 students beyond required capacity. With this extra capacity, Oak Bay draws top athletes from other schools in the District because of their stellar facilities.

In fact, in 2016, *272 students in the Vic High catchment attended Oak Bay High, comprising 21% of the Oak Bay High student body.* (Many students from the Vic High catchment have to abandon the French Immersion program after dedicating nine of their thirteen school years to a Dual Dogwood Diploma because Oak Bay catchment students are given priority in the French Immersion program, compounding inequity within the District.)

In light of this data, *an estimated sixteen to twenty-one members of Oak Bay High's winning track team are from Vic High's catchment.* With an additional sixteen to twenty-one members and a revitalized Memorial Stadium, Vic High could have approximately twenty-five to thirty members on their own winning track team. And all of Vic High's 1,000 students should have the infrastructure they need to stay fit and healthy.

This pattern of inequity within the District must stop. As one student remarked in the 2018 seismic upgrade survey, *"Why does Oak Bay get so much more funding?(p2)."*

Vic High's outdated and worn-out facilities are a big part of the problem. As Principal Parker notes in his letter, Vic High's field is "dilapidated" with "[d]og feces [and] holes dug by pets." These conditions prohibit the development of skills for field sports such as long jump, high jump, and javelin throw. The equally dilapidated track is hardly conducive to high turn-outs.

As "Generation Pandemic" eats away at our youth's potential, we must plan to refurbish not only our sports infrastructure, but also the pride and spirit required to rebuild programming: Vic High needs a revitalized Memorial Stadium to inspire students.

**Despite barriers, Vic High current Vic High students have shown they are worthy of state-of-the-art facilities.**

Following the Island Championships in 2019 (before Covid-19 threw sports into disarray), Vic High teacher Doug Oxland stated, ““We knew there were good budding athletes at Vic High in rugby and soccer and saw a lot of untapped potential among those kids for track and field, as well, and we tapped into that and built up the program.””

Oxland shared his positive take on Vic High student potential after two Vic High athletes pulled through at the competition, one of them winning the girls’ junior high 400 metres. The article notes that “[e]very athlete who competes for Vic High is constantly reminded of how great the school used to be in sports in its glory era of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s when B.C. championships in basketball for the Totems were as common as spring rain, as were future Canadian national team stars and World Cup performers such as Ian Bridge and Brian Robinson in soccer and Hans De Goede in rugby.”

Vic High’s former glory was no accident. It required vision and dedication as well as properly maintained and upgraded facilities. In 1951, due to the grassroots efforts of Lawrie Wallace and the community in honour of Vic High staff and students who died in WW 2, the first state-of-the-art high school sports stadium in BC was constructed at Vic High.

## **Conclusion**

Both the housing proposal and the 8-metre easement displace Vic High’s parking requirements onto Vic High’s sports infrastructure. But parking was included in the original Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project (MSRP) plan and is mentioned over thirty times in Vic High’s Project Definition Report; obviously, required parking and pre-existing plans for new infrastructure should have been given priority in land-use considerations. Vic High students, current and future, should not have to make sacrifices for the District, City, and CRHC’s failure to consult the MSRP site plans.

The Memorial Stadium was constructed in honour of Vic High staff and students who died in World War 2. The legacy of this memorial is the celebration of youth potential through movement and sport such that the lives cut short in battle are never truly lost. Let Vic High students honour this tradition through excellence in sport made possible through a revitalized Memorial Stadium.

Yours truly,

Esther Callo  
1343 Vining St  
Parent of two Vic High grads



## **Support for Caledonia Redevelopment in Fernwood – 1211 Gladstone Avenue**

October 27, 2021

### **City of Victoria**

Council Members  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to express our organizational support for Capital Region Housing Corporation (CRHC) and the proposed **Caledonia Redevelopment** for the existing structure at 1211 Gladstone Avenue in Fernwood.

British Columbia Non-Profit Housing Association (BCNPHA) is the umbrella organization for the province's non-profit housing sector and is comprised of nearly 600 members, including many members operating in Victoria.

Housing affordability remains a significant challenge for renters in the city. As per the latest census there were 27,645 rental households in Victoria, representing more than half of all households. Overall, nearly half (46%) were spending more than the accepted standard of 30% of their pre-tax income on rent and utilities. More than one fifth (22%) of these renter households were spending more than 50% of their pre-tax income on rent and utilities, meaning they were forgoing other basic necessities and were at real risk of homelessness.

Furthermore, as you are likely aware, the 2020 Homeless Count in early 2020 found that 1,523 community members were actively experiencing homelessness across the city. Given the nature of the count, we know that number was only the minimum number of people without a safe and affordable home. It is also likely that the number of people in precarious housing situations and/or experiencing homelessness has increased significantly since the onset of the pandemic.

In light of the housing affordability crisis and upon your review of this project please consider the following supporting factors:

1. This project would create 158 new units targeting a monthly rent not exceeding 30% of the gross household incomes offered for a mixture of income levels reflected in the community. Each of these units are desperately needed and would provide homes for hundreds of individuals and families over the lifespan of the buildings.



**BCNPHA**  
BC Non-Profit Housing Association



220-1651 Commercial Dr.  
Vancouver, BC V5L 3Y3  
[www.bcnpha.ca](http://www.bcnpha.ca)

2. The CRHC is the largest social housing provider in the capital region with a mandate to build and manage affordable rental housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. CRHC is an experienced housing operator and will be an excellent steward of this community asset.
3. The existing Caledonia townhouse complex is nearing the end of its service life and has needed increasingly complicated repairs and maintenance. The buildings need to be replaced and this proposal includes plans for a significant upgrade to the site.
4. The site combines several vacant and underutilized lots to form a comprehensive development comprised of 5 buildings which range from 3 to 5 stories in height. The architecture looks to respect the character of the Fernwood neighborhood both in terms of scale and style.
5. The project features a number of community amenities, including large expanses of on-site landscaped amenity space. Importantly, community connections are maintained and enhanced with public pathways through the site which further increases the walkability of the neighborhood.
6. Overall, this project would be an incredibly valuable addition to Victoria.

BCNPHA would like to thank you for your time and consideration for this proposal and I urge you to approve this project when it comes across your desk.

Sincerely,

Jill Atkey  
Chief Executive Officer  
BC Non-Profit Housing Association



October 27, 2021

Mayor and Council  
Legislative Services,  
#1 Centennial Square,  
Victoria, BC  
V8W 1P6

Re: the proposed changes to 1230 Grant Street, 1209-1215, 1218, 1219, 1220 and 1226 North Park Street, 1219 Vining Street, 1235 Caledonia Avenue and 1211 Gladstone Avenue:  
Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2012, Amendment Bylaw (No. 36) - No. 21-065  
Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1234) - No. 21-064  
Development Permit Application No. 000567

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am/We are writing to you to express my opposition to the items listed above due to the following issues:

### **1) Lack of Transparency by City and SD61**

The scope of “stakeholders” is not limited to Fernwood. Vic High’s catchment area includes James Bay, Fairfield, Rockland, Fernwood, North Park, Downtown, Hillside/Quadra, and Burnside/Gorge neighbourhoods.<sup>1</sup>

**The families of current and future Vic High students who live in Vic High’s catchment have not been informed about the land-use conflict and the negative impact that the CRHC proposal imposes on Vic High.** Council has played a direct role in this lack of transparency, especially in not disclosing material facts during the consultation process in 2019.

Therefore, Council has a responsibility to include the opinions of members of the public living within the entirety of Vic High’s catchment area when considering the proposed rezoning of Vic High land. Council must also consider the opinions of Vic High’s alumni and the general public, who were encouraged to donate to the Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project in partnership with the City of Victoria.

### **Council’s Direct Involvement in Withholding Information from the Public:**

Starting in 2017, Council participated directly in land-use negotiations with the District, involving transfers of land that trigger the proposed lease. This information was withheld from the public during Vic High’s Seismic Upgrade consultations in April 2018.<sup>2</sup>

Council also participated directly in the negotiation of the proposed 8m easement without disclosing this proposed use of Vic High land to the public, or disclosing the negative impact on Vic High.<sup>3</sup>

In doing so, Council entangled themselves in a conflict of interest, as they were simultaneously bound by their 2014 commitment to support Vic High’s Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project that requires the

---

<sup>1</sup> Vic High’s catchment area:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

same land.<sup>4</sup> To suggest that Vic High students must now compromise the quality of resources at their school to accommodate Council's demands for Vic High land is unacceptable.

## 2) Disregard for Policies & Regulations re: Disposal of Public School Property

**Reference: Ministry of Education's Policy regarding land disposal:** <sup>5</sup>

*The Policy requires that "a board must confirm that the board will not require the land or improvements for future educational or community purposes."*

Key Points:

- The District has admitted that **no studies were conducted** prior to negotiating the proposed disposals of Vic High land to *confirm* that the land in question is not needed for educational or community purposes: <sup>6</sup>
- At the November 12, 2019 consultation, **the Board withheld data about projected growth in Vic High's catchment population** that is estimated to reach 1,390 by 2031, using now outdated studies.<sup>7</sup> Population growth is a key consideration when determining the use of public school land.

**Reference: School District 61 Board of Education Regulation 7110:** <sup>8</sup>

*As part of the consultation process, the Board of Education shall provide:*

- *reasons for sale of the property.*
- *use of the proceeds of disposal.*
- *projected enrolment in the District.*
- *impact on District education programs.*
- *impact on community use of school buildings.*

Key Points:

- The Board and the public were given false information about the "reasons for sale of the property" and the "use of the proceeds of disposal."<sup>9</sup> All evidence points to mismanaged upgrades to Burnside School as the source of the so-called shortfall.<sup>10</sup>
- See above re: projected enrolment and population growth
- **The proposed 8m easement (negotiated between the District, the City, and the CRHC), and the CRHC proposal both have a negative "impact on District education programs," specifically Vic High's well-established plans for the Memorial Stadium Revitalization**

---

<sup>5</sup> Ministry of Education's Policy regarding land disposal

<sup>7</sup> November 12, 2019 consultation See p.8:

Compare with information boards from the April 2018 Seismic Upgrade Consultation that share this key information. See p. 4

<sup>9</sup> Vic High did not have a \$2.6M shortfall due to heritage preservation (the difference in cost between a new build and the chosen "heritage option #3" was less than \$1M, and the "new build" did not include a theatre). The "new build" was considered only for the purposes of comparison (see p.3, pp. 10-11, and p. 46 of pdf):

Yet, the District reported that heritage preservation resulted in a funding shortfall that precipitated the proposed lease:

<sup>10</sup>

**Project and athletic programs.** This information was withheld from the public and from Vic High staff and students and their families during the consultation process.<sup>11</sup>

**CONCLUSION/ASK OF COUNCIL: I/WE ASK THAT COUNCIL HONOUR THEIR COMMITMENT TO SUPPORT VIC HIGH'S ORIGINAL PLANS FOR THE MEMORIAL STADIUM REVITALIZATION PROJECT BY VOTING AGAINST THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ZONING REGULATION BYLAW RELATED TO THE CALEDONIA HOUSING PROJECT.**

Public education is a long-standing equity measure that is intended to perform as the “great equalizer,” but this intent requires that all public schools receive unbiased structural support, not only from the school district but also from the municipal and provincial governments that play a role in public education.

The practice of streaming, flowing immigrant and socio-economically disadvantaged students to the same school, and not providing adequate funding (over time) to maintain standards of quality in regard to school infrastructures such as athletic facilities, science labs, libraries, computer labs, and more, have been revealed to have negative outcomes for students. The environment in which students learn each day impacts academic success.<sup>12</sup>

For more than five decades, the students of Vic High have been negatively impacted as a result of biases built into the systems (institutions including SD61, the City, and the CRHC) that either govern or have an influence over decisions that affect the distribution of resources across the school district. Systemic inequality is rooted in biases relative to socio-economically disadvantaged students and their communities.

Through purposeful action, decisions to dispose of, appropriate, and make available land intended for educational purposes, these institutions continue to perpetuate systemic inequality as it relates to the students of Vic High. Addressing other needs of the community cannot be achieved through disadvantaging school children without undermining Council’s objective to bring equity to Victoria. As the City’s only high school, Vic High merits Council’s respect and advocacy.

Although the SD61 Board should never have conceived, or voted in favour of the proposed lease of educational land at Vic High, Council now has the power to remedy this damaging decision — made possible by their own direct involvement — by voting against the zoning bylaw changes for the proposed Caledonia housing project that would negatively impact the education of Vic High students for generations to come.

Thank you,

Kathleen Hadley  
101-1241 Fairfield Rd.  
Victoria BC  
V8V 3B3  
[REDACTED]

---

<sup>11</sup> Images at the November 12, 2019 consultation inaccurately show the proposed 8m easement as available for “educational purposes.” See pp 10-11 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Public Hearings  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 2:49 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: Caledonia Project

**From:** Lesley Wicks [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 2:47 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** Re: Caledonia Project

Lesley Wicks, (aka Ruthi)  
2/1358 Gladstone Ave.,  
V8R 1S1

Mayor Helps and Councillors  
Re: **Rezoning application # 00715**

I'm a resident of Victoria, living close to the proposed new Caledonia project, as you can see. I wish to support the rezoning application.

Victoria badly needs affordable housing. This project will provide 158 new affordable homes in a walkable urban neighbourhood. As you know, the project has a range of housing sizes from small units to four bedroom homes. Larger housing units are desperately needed for families in our community. This project also has significant environmentally sound features.

I applaud the traffic calming measures taken on Chambers Street at Fort Street, which will now prevent traffic from short cutting through the neighbourhood. This will make the area safer for local residents and address any potential future traffic issues. Since the project is located on a major bus route, the most needed services are close by, which will reduce or eliminate the need for vehicle ownership.

We as a community talk about a commitment to Housing First. The concept of Housing First is also a priority for families. Children need stable, secure, housing in order to thrive!

As much of this land is currently a gravel parking lot there will be no loss of green space. Current residents and Vic High students have existing sports fields and nearby parks to address their needs for green space. There will also be access to the green space, which sounds very exciting, within the development as well. The project will also help (IMO) further the goals of the 'Victoria Welcome City Action Plan' by creating a much more livable neighbourhood

I wish to thank the City of Victoria for approving a beneficial and needed affordable project.

With thanks, Best regards  
Ruthi

Re: Caledonia Project Public Hearing

I am an owner at 1911 Chambers Avenue at the corner of Chambers and Caledonia, so am affected by Caledonia now becoming the only entrance to a large underground parking garage, and the proposed Caledonia project being built on the other side of my property. It's easy to jeer at a NIMBY but the reality is that few Victoria citizens will be as affected by the proposed 30 months of construction as those of us whose properties border this development.

One of the best things about the Fernwood community is its diversity. I've rarely seen a community that so harmoniously welcomes people of different income levels and ways of life and tries to support low income and homeless people. For these reasons it does make sense to locate an affordable housing development in Fernwood. However, it seems that this is being done at the expense of school children and that's just wrong. Vic High's land is being taken away in order for this very large development to encroach on school property and that feels short-sighted. Once that land is gone it will never be available again for future students in a rapidly growing community. Is there really not a more suitable location where school kids of the future won't be affected?

Second, Chambers and Caledonia already suffer from traffic congestion and the additional vehicles going in and out of a large housing development will only make it worse and more dangerous. I don't see anything in the plan that addresses this issue.

Then there's the parking issue. There aren't even sufficient proposed parking spaces for the units being built. Where will visitors and overflow cars park? Already there isn't enough parking in the area.

I ask council to think carefully about the future of students at Vic High and about the current residents in the area. The proposed project is too large for the infrastructure and too detrimental to Vic High's current and future student body.

I ask that you turn down the proposal, or at least consider allowing something much smaller in scope.

Respectfully,

Nancy Weatherley  
1911 Chambers

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Rue McDonald [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 2:03 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Public Hearing Caledonia Project

Dear Mayor, Council, and All It May Concern:

My name is Rue McDonald and I support the proposed project known as the Caledonia Housing Development because:

- I can barely afford to live in my neighbourhood anymore and this is my desired future home.
- Instead of a vacant gravel parking lot, I would love to see the proposed design and landscaping.

The Caledonia Project is a good option for young entrepreneurs/ leaders like myself who lack intergenerational wealth to continue living in this city.

Best regards,  
Rue McDonald  
2028 Stanley Ave  
Victoria, BC  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Feathers Feathets [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 1:39 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Hearing on thurs oct 28

Hi this is Rebecca I live at 1655 chambers st my phone no is [REDACTED] I wanted to please ask when building housing on grant Street where the 1802 and 1163 border is there is by the road a very old venerable oak tree that is the biggest I have ever seen and must be hundreds of years old! I please ask you to protect this tree and it' very large root ball . This definitely is a heritage tree! I walk past this venerable tree all the time thanks so much!

October 27, 2021

Mayor and Council  
Legislative Services,  
#1 Centennial Square,  
Victoria, BC  
V8W 1P6

Re: the proposed changes to 1230 Grant Street, 1209-1215, 1218, 1219, 1220 and 1226 North Park Street, 1219 Vining Street, 1235 Caledonia Avenue and 1211 Gladstone Avenue:  
Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2012, Amendment Bylaw (No. 36) - No. 21-065  
Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1234) - No. 21-064  
Development Permit Application No. 000567

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am/We are writing to you to express my opposition to the items listed above due to the following issues:

### **1) Lack of Transparency by City and SD61**

The scope of “stakeholders” is not limited to Fernwood. Vic High’s catchment area includes James Bay, Fairfield, Rockland, Fernwood, North Park, Downtown, Hillside/Quadra, and Burnside/Gorge neighbourhoods.<sup>1</sup>

**The families of current and future Vic High students who live in Vic High’s catchment have not been informed about the land-use conflict and the negative impact that the CRHC proposal imposes on Vic High.** Council has played a direct role in this lack of transparency, especially in not disclosing material facts during the consultation process in 2019.

Therefore, Council has a responsibility to include the opinions of members of the public living within the entirety of Vic High’s catchment area when considering the proposed rezoning of Vic High land. Council must also consider the opinions of Vic High’s alumni and the general public, who were encouraged to donate to the Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project in partnership with the City of Victoria.

### **Council’s Direct Involvement in Withholding Information from the Public:**

Starting in 2017, Council participated directly in land-use negotiations with the District, involving transfers of land that trigger the proposed lease. This information was withheld from the public during Vic High’s Seismic Upgrade consultations in April 2018.<sup>2</sup>

Council also participated directly in the negotiation of the proposed 8m easement without disclosing this proposed use of Vic High land to the public, or disclosing the negative impact on Vic High.<sup>3</sup>

In doing so, Council entangled themselves in a conflict of interest, as they were simultaneously bound by their 2014 commitment to support Vic High’s Memorial Stadium Revitalization Project that requires the

---

<sup>1</sup> Vic High’s catchment area:

[REDACTED]

same land.<sup>4</sup> To suggest that Vic High students must now compromise the quality of resources at their school to accommodate Council's demands for Vic High land is unacceptable.

## 2) Disregard for Policies & Regulations re: Disposal of Public School Property

**Reference: Ministry of Education's Policy regarding land disposal:** <sup>5</sup>

*The Policy requires that "a board must confirm that the board will not require the land or improvements for future educational or community purposes."*

Key Points:

- The District has admitted that **no studies were conducted** prior to negotiating the proposed disposals of Vic High land to *confirm* that the land in question is not needed for educational or community purposes: <sup>6</sup>
- At the November 12, 2019 consultation, **the Board withheld data about projected growth in Vic High's catchment population** that is estimated to reach 1,390 by 2031, using now outdated studies.<sup>7</sup> Population growth is a key consideration when determining the use of public school land.

**Reference: School District 61 Board of Education Regulation 7110:** <sup>8</sup>

*As part of the consultation process, the Board of Education shall provide:*

- *reasons for sale of the property.*
- *use of the proceeds of disposal.*
- *projected enrolment in the District.*
- *impact on District education programs.*
- *impact on community use of school buildings.*

Key Points:

- The Board and the public were given false information about the "reasons for sale of the property" and the "use of the proceeds of disposal." <sup>9</sup> All evidence points to mismanaged upgrades to Burnside School as the source of the so-called shortfall.<sup>10</sup>
- See above re: projected enrolment and population growth
- **The proposed 8m easement (negotiated between the District, the City, and the CRHC), and the CRHC proposal both have a negative "impact on District education programs," specifically Vic High's well-established plans for the Memorial Stadium Revitalization**

<sup>4</sup> [REDACTED]

<sup>5</sup> Ministry of Education's Policy regarding land disposal [REDACTED]

<sup>6</sup> [REDACTED]

<sup>7</sup> November 12, 2019 consultation See p.8:

Compare with information boards from the April 2018 Seismic Upgrade Consultation that share this key information. See p. 4

<sup>8</sup> [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] build and the chosen "heritage option #3" was less than \$1M, and the "new build" did not include a theatre). The "new build" was considered only for the purposes of comparison (see p.3, pp. 10-11, and p. 46 of pdf): [REDACTED]

Yet, the District reported that heritage preservation resulted in a funding shortfall that precipitated the proposed lease:

<sup>10</sup> See [REDACTED]

**Project and athletic programs.** This information was withheld from the public and from Vic High staff and students and their families during the consultation process.<sup>11</sup>

**CONCLUSION/ASK OF COUNCIL: I/WE ASK THAT COUNCIL HONOUR THEIR COMMITMENT TO SUPPORT VIC HIGH'S ORIGINAL PLANS FOR THE MEMORIAL STADIUM REVITALIZATION PROJECT BY VOTING AGAINST THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ZONING REGULATION BYLAW RELATED TO THE CALEDONIA HOUSING PROJECT.**

Public education is a long-standing equity measure that is intended to perform as the “great equalizer,” but this intent requires that all public schools receive unbiased structural support, not only from the school district but also from the municipal and provincial governments that play a role in public education.

The practice of streaming, flowing immigrant and socio-economically disadvantaged students to the same school, and not providing adequate funding (over time) to maintain standards of quality in regard to school infrastructures such as athletic facilities, science labs, libraries, computer labs, and more, have been revealed to have negative outcomes for students. The environment in which students learn each day impacts academic success.<sup>12</sup>

For more than five decades, the students of Vic High have been negatively impacted as a result of biases built into the systems (institutions including SD61, the City, and the CRHC) that either govern or have an influence over decisions that affect the distribution of resources across the school district. Systemic inequality is rooted in biases relative to socio-economically disadvantaged students and their communities.

Through purposeful action, decisions to dispose of, appropriate, and make available land intended for educational purposes, these institutions continue to perpetuate systemic inequality as it relates to the students of Vic High. Addressing other needs of the community cannot be achieved through disadvantaging school children without undermining Council’s objective to bring equity to Victoria. As the City’s only high school, Vic High merits Council’s respect and advocacy.

Although the SD61 Board should never have conceived, or voted in favour of the proposed lease of educational land at Vic High, Council now has the power to remedy this damaging decision — made possible by their own direct involvement — by voting against the zoning bylaw changes for the proposed Caledonia housing project that would negatively impact the education of Vic High students for generations to come.

Thank you,

Soledad Callo  
1343 Vining St  
Victoria, BC  
V8R 1P5

---

<sup>11</sup> Images at the November 12, 2019 consultation inaccurately show the proposed 8m easement as available for “educational purposes.” See pp 10-11: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2021 2:48 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: letter of support for rezoning application #00715

---

**From:** Yvonne Hsieh [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 27, 2021 11:53 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <[mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca)>  
**Subject:** letter of support for rezoning application #00715

October 27, 2021

To Mayor and Council, City of Victoria

Dear Mayor Helps and Councilors:

I am writing to express my strong support for the Caledonia Project application.

Victoria is in dire need of affordable housing, and this project will provide 158 new affordable homes in a walkable urban neighborhood. The development has a range of housing sizes from studios to four-bedroom homes. Three to four-bedroom rental housing units are practically non-existent in Victoria. Where can families with children live?

Many local faith congregations have been sponsoring refugees, some of whom have larger families. It has become practically impossible to house them. This is true also for the government-sponsored refugees, served by the Intercultural Association of Greater Victoria.

This location, close to schools, community centres, major bus routes, and other services, is ideal for tenants who cannot afford to own a car. The City of Victoria strongly encourages active transportation: another good reason to approve this application!

I urge you to vote yes to this much needed housing project.

Respectfully,

Yvonne Hsieh

#401 - 1014 Rockland Avenue

Victoria BC V8V 3H5