



James Bay Neighbourhood Association

jbna@jbna.org

Victoria, B.C., Canada

www.jbna.org

July 16th, 2021

Mayor and Council,
City of Victoria

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

Re: CALUC Community Discussion – 450 Dallas Rd.

The 450 Dallas Road proposal was considered at the July 14th, 2021, JBNA ZOOM Discussion Forum. 42-45 people participated.

A ZOOM pre-meeting was held with JBNA development Review Committee members Marg Gardiner, Tim VanAlstine, Trevor Moat and Neil Garneau on April 6th, 2021.

The proponent's team consists of Jon Stovell, Juan Pereira, and Jonathan Lim of Reliance Properties, Franc D'Ambrosio, Agnes Cerajeski and Erica Sangster of D'Ambrosio Architecture, Bryce Gauthier of GALA (Landscape), and Tanya Wegwitz of Watt Consulting Group.

The proposal is to alter an existing complex, Seaview Towers. Currently the 1960's rental complex consists of 73 units, with 57 in a tower and 16 in a 3-storey structure. The proposal is to replace the 3-storey structure with a 54 unit 6-storey tower. Parking is planned to serve the full complex with 52 parking spots underground and several above ground spots (67 spots, 85 required). Two MODO car share spots have been planned for the above-ground parking area. Bike storage is planned for underground and above ground parking areas with space for 181 bikes. The current FSR is 1.68:1 and the proposed FSR is 2.40:1. Turnover in the tower should permit on-site relocation of tenants of the lower structure to the tall tower.

Following the proponent's presentation, meeting participants were given the opportunity to ask questions or provide comments. Residents spoke about the proposal and several wrote questions in the "chat". Appended please find: Appendix 'A' Notes including Q/A and chat comments, and Appendix 'B' Correspondence forwarded to JBNA.

In general, questions and discussion centred on access to the underground parking. A few comments were made on the proposed removal of the mature tree on Lewis, tenant relocation, and the height of the proposed structure (and shadowing).

We believe that given the overall community feedback, that the CALUC community consultation obligations have now been met.

For your consideration,

President, JBNA
Marg Gardiner

Cc: Erica Sangster, DAU
Jon Stovell, Reliance
Mike Angrove, CoV Planner

Appendix 'A'

July 14 ZOOM meeting notes and Q-A/chat comments:

New lobby will link buildings together and will allow tower residents to gain indoor access to parking underground. Units range from 450-850 sqft. Green roofs provided at over bike storage to the North and over lobby entrance areas. Balconies recessed for views and wind sheltering. Building steps back from North again on 5th floor to reduce shadowing North. Roof deck is provided with extensive landscaping with amenity areas to the South side of the property to prevent overlook of neighbours. Shadow studies were undertaken and shown during the meeting.

Question and Answer session:

Note: MG=Marg Gardiner, ES=Erica Sangster, TW=Tanya Wegwitz, JS= Jon Stovell, JL=Jonathan Lim

MG: What is current zoning and what are you seeking?

ES: Seeking FSR 2.4, existing is 1.68.

MG: The plan calls for 16 people to lose their homes in the low-rise. is there a plan?

JS: We have a fairly high tenant turnover in this part of the building. We hope to gradually depopulate the 3-storey annex. We would be seeking to offer similar rents that we have now.

Existing tenants would be given preference. If no suitable or comparable unit available or wanted, will follow City's tenant relocation policy. We have not finalized rental pricing.

Chat: Square footages for each unit type?

ES: Jr1BR 450 sqft; 1BR 500-600 sqft; 2BR 700 sqft; 3BR 850 sqft.

John Willow: Strata President for Dunelm Village. Main issues our owners have is impact on Lewis traffic and on Dunelm Wynd, which is a private road. It is hard to turn off Lewis on to Dallas. Our concern is that people will use Dunelm Wynd to get to Niagara. How can you mitigate that? I like the effort to set vehicles back from Lewis/Dallas. How did you determine there is no implication for Dunelm?

TW: I was referring to impacts on the roadways, access points, and site views and how they affect safety. We see no issues with how the access ramp lines up with Dunelm. There is clear signage already that Dunelm is private. The design discourages cut-throughs because the end point cannot be seen.

Chat: How many visitor spaces?

TW: 12, one van-accessible.

Linda Carlsson: Lewis Street resident. My first concern is that you say this is zoned urban residential. The OCP shows the Dallas/Lewis corner is traditional residential. Would you please check your statement? Second issue is the tree – I don't want to see that tree removed - totally opposed to removal of the tree. Lewis residents have stated clearly they do not want a sidewalk Shadow study did not show the casting in winter. The first houses on Lewis will never see winter sunshine. 7 storeys too high given the adjoining property. This is not on a transit route – Niagara is the nearest transit street. Regarding high turnover, perhaps rents are high at this location? You have not indicated you will provide anything other than market rents. What will you charge for Jr1BR, and will rents include parking or is that extra? Please review the OCP designation.

JS: I understand your comments about rent. We are not hearing people move out because of rents being too high – there are many reasons. We do not yet know what rents will be as it will be a few years before the build is complete. This will be at market rents.

Appendix 'A' . . . cont'd

Chat: Is there any plan to beautify the existing tower building that will be retained?

JS: It is a well-established design already; we will provide ongoing maintenance and will look at deferred maintenance while construction is underway. New paint and roof work is contemplated. The real improvements are at the surface – focus on getting rid of exposed parking, refuse etc and adding good access to enhanced outside space.

Don Lindsay: Lewis Street resident. I like the building, not the height. It works well with the tower, but I agree with Linda. The tree is a major landmark. Pedestrians invariably walk on Lewis, not on sidewalks. *The steps to units off Lewis will preclude handicap access.* Menzies is a real wind tunnel. New building may amplify winds on Lewis Street. I don't think "No Parking" signs are going to work on Lewis Street – people stop there all the time to unload.

ES: The parking area off Menzies will be where loading is intended.

Chat: would rather have a view of ocean than rooftop green space

Chat: How long will demolition/construction take?

JS: We don't have a schedule yet. I would assume 3 months including strip-out. The new structure including parking would likely take 24-28 months.

Chat: What environmental standard will this meet?

ES: We are looking at Step Code 3.

Chat: Transfer of tenants to the 12 storey building; when will these moves start?

JL: We would start once we have approval (after Public Hearing). It takes a long time to rezone, obtain permits, and proceed to tender. There are 3 units in the tower now that are open. If we can't move people, then they would be able to access the Tenant Assistance Policy.

Joan Athey: I have lived on Lewis Street for 17 years. I find the wait times at Lewis/Dallas too high already – there are cyclists, joggers, and much seasonal variation. I share concerns with my Dunelm neighbours. Mostly, I object to the underground access off Lewis Street - this upsets the walking nature of the street. A parkade would be a terrible intrusion, parking gates always make noise. Why can't you use Menzies to access all the parking? If not, access in the middle of the building off Lewis would be preferable. I am strongly opposed to Lewis access. Are you narrowing Lewis Street? At the front of the property, two parking spots have been lost. Are these to be short term, or longer term parking spots? I am also concerned about noise reverberation – helicopters, Ogden Point, cruise ships, and the sound reflects off the tall tower already.

ES: Yes, Lewis will be narrowed as the City wants to add boulevards. We would work with the City to determine parking restrictions. The existing tower is quite sheer; the proposed building has much variation, different planes, inset balconies – these will all help. We have not done acoustic studies.

TW: To clarify, I indicated the average delay time turning out of Lewis is 11 seconds today, and with the development the increased delay would be less than one second on average.

MG: These traffic measures may not reflect much of the year when cruise ships are in port.

JS: Our major challenge is getting parking underground. A four-storey building would likely be unviable with underground parking.

Chat: What is difference between Urban Residential and Traditional Residential?

MG: Essentially traditional is single family and duplex homes while urban is multiple unit dwellings.

Chat: Will there be shared laundry?

ES: The new building units will have in-suite laundry.

Chat: With underground parking going around the existing tower, how sure are you that the building will remain safe? Will there be blasting?

Appendix 'A' . . . cont'd

ES: We have a structural engineer providing advice on these matters. We are not sure if blasting will be required.

Chat: Will you reduce rate to compensate for construction noise and inconvenience?

JS: That is a good idea – we will look at it.

Chat: What is the elevator setup? Will tenants need to take 2 elevators when hauling groceries?

JS: We have not allocated surface parking to units at this point. Many people prefer underground, so one more elevator stop won't really matter to most people. The old building elevator will not reach down to the parking level. It's no worse than it is now.

Chat: Where will moving vans park?

ES: At the rear.

Chat: There is a bike storage building outside, and storage space inside too. How does that work?

ES: The outside will be for the existing building. There are locations for long-term bike storage.

Trevor Moat: Can you increase the step back from Lewis further? Are the ceiling heights 9' or 8'? Are they the same as the existing building? Am concerned about shading on the house on Lewis.

ES: They are mostly 8'6", 9' on the first floor. The extra height per floor is required for joist thickness as this is a wood-frame building.

Chat: Can parking ramp come off the existing lot off Menzies?

ES: That is hard, because so much space is required. I also hear the concerns about lighting – we work hard to mitigate those effects, and I realise that access to parking are never pretty. We are sensitive to that. We are trying to get as much parking on site to minimize off-site parking burden.

Chat: Are you compliant to seismic standards?"

ES: The new building certainly will be. The old building is as-is.

Chat: I am getting tired of the trope that providing cycle and MODO parking is a solution for diminished parking availability

Current tenant: I am concerned about the use of Dunelm. I think the roof garden is overdone and unnecessary. There will be high winds. I think there is a lack of light to the units on the North end. I do not want to see that tree removed. Will this be a stand-alone building? Will it have a separate address? I think the walkway between buildings is ill-conceived. I think these units will be very expensive suites. I urge you to look at re-ramping the underground parking. Traffic comes from the city down Menzies. No one wants to make two turns to enter underground parking. It should be accessed from the Menzies lot. I don't support the traffic bump-outs on Lewis Street. Narrowing it more will encourage us to use Dunelm.

Chat: What is the soonest approval of the project could happen?

MG: 3-6 months minimum; could be up to a year.

Chat: Could existing tenants of the annex move into the new building?

JS: They have rights under the RTA and TAP.

Chat: You have three bedroom units, supporting families. There is a playground on Lewis. This is why I oppose the parking ramp off Lewis – keep it as a pedestrian-friendly street please.

Chat: There could be further development at the North end of Lewis, which is already a large apartment complex. That should be kept in mind too.

MG: How many of these units will be wheel-chair accessible?

ES: The building meets accessibility requirements, and we have units are that adaptable.

Appendix 'B'

Correspondence forwarded to JBNA concerning the proposal:

From: Renn Butler

Subject: 450 Dallas Rd.

Date: July 9, 2021 at 3:54:50 PM PDT

To: "mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca" Marg Gardiner

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I live near the proposed development at 450 Dallas Rd. I strongly request that they do not cut the big tree at the corner of Lewis and Dallas Roads. This beautiful, stately, and majestic tree adds so much to the neighborhood and is irreplaceable.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

Renn

From: Shamus Reid

Subject: Proposed Development Notice - 450 Dallas Road

Date: July 4, 2021 at 8:56:08 AM PDT

To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca, marg.jbna@telus.net

Hi all,

Thanks for the opportunity to contribute to the decision regarding the proposed development at 450 Dallas Road. I own a strata unit at 525 Rithet St, Victoria, BC V8V 1E4, and was invited to comment as a resident within 200 metres of the proposed development that also involves an amendment to the Official Community Plan.

First off, I am very happy to see additional rental development proposed in the neighbourhood. More supply is a critical component of addressing the housing crisis.

However, more supply of market-rate housing is going to do very little to make housing more affordable. I saw no reference in the development proposal to adding below-market units to the development.

The proposal seeks to amend the Official Community Plan to allow a 43% increase in density beyond the maximum density currently allowed in the Plan. That's a significant revenue windfall to the building's owner.

The City should be ensuring that in exchange for this increased revenue opportunity, unlikely to be extended to others who might seek to develop their land in James Bay, the owner should be contributing more to the City than its bare minimum responsibility of paying property taxes. I strongly urge the City to premise an amendment to the density limits on the addition of below-market housing units.

We have to take every opportunity to move in the direction of ending the housing crisis, and this is an obvious opportunity.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

Shamus Reid

XXX-XXX Rithet St

XXX-XXX-XXX

Appendix 'B' . . . cont'd

From: j clarke
Subject: redevelopment proposal in James Bay
Date: July 3, 2021 at 11:24:18 AM PDT
To: marg.jbna@telus.net

Dear Ms. Gardiner,

Here we go again seniors being displaced so the rich can get richer. I live @450 Dallas Rd. where it is proposed that our bldg is to be pulled down to create bigger higher much more expensive apts. I have lived here for 23 yrs and seen a lot of changes; however now my choice is being subjected to moving as many seniors here will be and that cannot afford the high rents that Victoria now demands. I really hope the development proposal is defeated.

Thank you for your attention,

Sincerely Josephine Clarke .

From: FIN MACDONALD
Subject: Re: 450 Dallas Rd CALUC
Date: June 30, 2021 at 9:39:45 PM PDT
To: Timothy Van Alstine
Cc: Marg Gardiner

Hi Marg and Tim

Another Make Me Rich proposal from an out of town developer.

Q. In "Project Overview" states Reliance bought in 2019. Starlight was the owner (common knowledge as their renovations displaced MANY tenants, not just @ 450, but also @ 415 435 Michigan) BC Assessment shows "

Sales history (last 3 full calendar years)

No sales history for the last 3 full calendar years"

<https://www.bcassessment.ca//Property/Info/QTAWMDBITjhIQQ==>

Does Reliance actually own 450 Dallas?

Best

Fin MacDonald
XXXXX Rithet