



James Bay Neighbourhood Association

jbna@jbna.org
Victoria, B.C., Canada

www.jbna.org

November 16th, 2021

Mayor and Council,
City of Victoria

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

Re: CALUC – 205 Quebec, 597 Montreal, and 210, 214, & 224 Kingston

The 205 Quebec proposal was considered at the November 10th, 2021, JBNA ZOOM Discussion Forum. 100 people participated.

Several meetings and events preceded this CALUC discussion. The principals representing the proponent, Mike Geric Construction Ltd, were Niall Paltiel and Greg Gillespie. Erica Sangster was the principal representative for the architect, DAU. Other consultants involved at various times were from Murdoch de Greef and Watt Transportation.

Consultation meetings and events:

June 25 early discussion: Niall Paltiel, Erica Sangster, and Greg Gillespie with Marg Gardiner and Trevor Moat of JBNA. Discussion of overall build-out intention and consultation process.

Mid July proponent letter: letters to near-by residences.

August 17 and 19: Proponent Open House events held at the site. Well promoted and attended.

September 30 JBNA Development Review Committee meeting: The JBNA pre-meeting to determine preparedness for the CALUC meeting was held by ZOOM. The JBNA DRC members were Trevor Moat, Wayne Shillington, and Marg Gardiner. Representing the proponent were Niall and Greg (Mike Geric Construction), Erica and Franc D'Ambrosia (DAU), Nadine King (Watt Transportation, Scott Murdoch (Murdoch de Greef).

November 10 JBNA CALUC Discussion: Notices were sent out by the City, JBNA and Mike Geric Construction Ltd regarding the CALUC discussion. See Addendum for discussion on ZOOM link. Presenting at the meeting were Niall Paltiel (Mike Geric Construction), Franc D'Ambrosio and Erica Sangster (DAU), Scott Murdoch (Murdoch de Greef), and Tim Shah (Watt Transportation).

The proponent's presentation was comprehensive, with 'understandable' shadowing studies. Following the presentation, meeting participants were given the opportunity to ask questions or provide comments. Residents spoke about the proposal and several wrote questions in the ZOOM "chat". Forwarded to Mayor and Council as separate documents are: Addendum (ZOOM issues), Meeting Chat, and Excerpt of Minutes. As part of this letter, please find Appendix 'A', resident correspondence forwarded to JBNA.

...2

Although the presentation itself was appreciated as being informative, the proposed redevelopment was not well supported. While a few residents supported the proposal there was overwhelming objection. Questions and discussion centred on the appropriateness or desirability of a 17-storey tower in the residential area of James Bay, and the changes it would bring without increase in public realm or amenity for James Bay. Particular issues raised:

- Proposed FSR 3:1 when the FSR for Urban Residential is “generally up to 1.2:1” with the OCP suggesting possibility of increase to FSR 2:1
- Proposed 17-storey when OCP states 3-storey buildings with multi-unit up to 6-storeys while current zoning of R-K is medium density attached dwelling.
- Parking impacts (where will current vehicles using lot be parked?)
- Traffic impacts related to
 - underground parking access on Kingston
 - Pendray and Kingston may become ‘faster routes’ when streets have heavy traffic during events and cruise ship visits
- James Bay is not downtown

We have also been provided with documents from Edy Bradley who has informed JBNA that she will be forwarding versions of the documents to the City and proponents. These are not JBNA documents.

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: Niall Paltiel and Greg Gillespie, Mike Geric Construction
Erica Sangster, DAU
Rob Bateman, CoV Planner

Attach: Addendum (ZOOM issues)
Meeting Chat
Excerpt of Minutes

Appendix 'A'
Correspondence forwarded to JBNA concerning the proposal:

Within CoV Notification Area:

From: David and Rosemary Bayliffe

Date: November 5, 2021 at 3:19:32 PM PDT

Subject: Proposed Development 205 Quebec Street, Victoria, BC

Dear Mr. Paltiel,

After listening to the online presentation by the Developer and the Architect It is our understanding that you are looking for input on the proposed development of 205 Quebec Street in James Bay. We are residents of 636 Montreal Street and our location in the building dictates that it won't have any long term impact on any proposal that is accepted.

We personally see that the area of the subject property which is surrounded by single family homes and townhomes as the ideal location for townhouses with access and egress on Kingston. We feel townhouses are a lot more conducive to the present neighbourhood.

The proposed density given the current services: i.e. access to Fisherman's Wharf, Dallas Road and Ogden Point we feel is not conducive to the high density of 112 homes being proposed by the Developer. Plus, the extra traffic that would be created by the Commercial component of the project: i.e. childcare Centre and Coffee Shop on an already busy road with two hotels and a timeshare building.

We trust our input will be given serious consideration.

Regards

David and Rosemary Bayliffe

From: Carolyn Lyn

Subject: Re: Proposed Development. Quebec, Montreal and Kingston streets.

Date: November 7, 2021 at 1:10:14 PM PST

Hi.

I am writing as I am unable to attend the on line meeting proposed for November 10th.

Whilst I understand the need for further residential development, I am not in agreement with a 17 storey building.

I think this will detract from the overall feeling of the neighbourhood and possibly an eye sore for the local residents.

Is it not possible for a proposal of a lower high rise, such as 10 storeys?

Thank you.

C.J. Anketell
Michigan St.

From: XXXXXXXX. van Campen

Subject: proposed development notice - 205 Quebec, 507 Montreal, 210,214,218,224 Kingston.

Date: November 3, 2021 at 1:56:34 PM PDT

I have just received mail notice of the proposed development in our neighbourhood. I am resident at 640 Montreal Street (directly opposite the proposal).

The basic requests in the data table:

- An adjustment from the current zoning height permissions of 7.5m to a new max height of 56m and to accommodate a 17 storey tower.
- Additional density is to increase from current max of 0.6 FSRD to 3.
- Set backs are reduced from 7.5m typical to 0-5.5m
- The entire plan needs to change the zoning of the site and
- The OCP needs to be amended for this proposal.

My questions:

1. Why do we have an OCP in the first place if we are going to essentially ignore its designations and direction? The whole point of an Official Community Plan to guide development in the area and the region. Yet, here we are just choosing to amend it. Why? And with such massive variances from current zoning?
2. The variances being asked for are incredibly different than the current allowances, and substantially different than the buildings currently in this neighbourhood. 17 storeys at 56m is incredibly high and substantially larger than surrounding buildings. Our building has 5 floors above ground, and neighbours are in the 5-8 floor range. This size of tower is well outside of this norm and I am not sure why it is even being considered
3. It has been noted by others that the corner of Montreal and Quebec is fairly blind for motorists, bikers and pedestrians. At the same time, the proposal asks to reduce setbacks to 2.0 and 3.0 m in this area. This seems to be asking for accidents.
4. I read the following sections of the OCP as the pertain to this area of Victoria. I don't really see how this proposal is aligned to 21.16.5. and 21.16.7 :

21.16.5 Continue to support sensitive infill.

21.16.6 Implement and connect the Harbour Pathway and restore ecologically sensitive shoreline areas.

21.16.7 Realize development opportunities near the Parliament Buildings in a way compatible with neighbourhood character.

In short, I do not understand the reason to accept this application and its amendments to the OCP and zoning as requested. It is not aligned to the OCP, it is not aligned to the existing buildings in the area.

I understand the value it can provide to the developers and the fact it can create a number of very high end condos into our city. Overall, I do not see the value of this proposal and encourage the developer to substantially lower the size of the buildings proposed, and provide a solution that is more in keeping with the area and the OCP. Until this is done, I would encourage staff and council to reject this proposal.

I am sure there are many other elements of the project (good and bad) that could be reviewed further. However, until the overall project is properly sized, I am not sure why we should waste our time on these points.

Best regards
Jacques van Campen

From: Bryan Currie

Subject: Re: 205 Quebec Street, 507 Montreal Street, 210,214,218 and 224 Kingston Street

Date: November 10, 2021 at 4:24:30 PM PST

Good afternoon, yes please, unfortunately I will not be able to attend this evening due to work commitments. This is a watershed moment for James Bay and if the rules are allowed to be changed here then this will open the floodgates for other inappropriate building.

Thank you

On Wed, 10 Nov 2021, 12:34 Marg Gardiner, wrote:

Hi Bryan, I am preparing for tonight's meeting.

Would you like your submission to be included in the JBNA submission?

Marg Gardiner,

On Oct 27, 2021, at 5:54 PM, Bryan Currie wrote:

Good afternoon,

It was with dismay that I learned of this new building proposal in James Bay. I have outlined some points that I hope you will see are considered and provide a more appropriate approach to this site.

Proposed building borders a Heritage Conservation area

The properties are located immediately adjacent to the Inner Harbour Heritage conservation area DPA 9. Consideration should be given to the proximity to the inner harbour, its special character and significant historic buildings.

A new build on land immediately next to this site would be required to be physically and visually compatible with, and subordinate to, the historic place and the landmark buildings. There should not be a significant demarcation line between this delicate historic area and land adjacent to it, as is proposed.

James Bay and Tourism

James Bay is the gateway for the majority of tourists visiting Victoria, James Bay itself is also a draw for tourists. They are not interested in seeing 70's inspired monoliths, any future building in James Bay should not detract or diminish the special character of the area by jarring with its surrounding buildings as this proposal does.

Building design

The Tower: is uninspiring and more akin to Coal Harbour in Vancouver than the Historically sensitive inner harbour of Victoria. The tower building should be no more than 6 or 7 storeys high. It must be built of quality materials (not just glass and concrete) have a pitched roof, it must accommodate some of the features of the other historic buildings around or follow the modern interpretations of these designs such as the Hotel Grand Pacific, the Shoal Point building or even the Coast Victoria Hotel.

The Townhouses: allowing the proposed brutalist 70's building type townhomes across the road from the existing quaint heritage and 'would be' heritage buildings would be an affront to any idea of heritage or conservation.

The townhouses along Kingston should be sympathetic to their counterparts around them. That is they should have a Victorian feel with pitched roofs, be clad in similar looking materials and have small gardens in front. They should feel part of the community not compete against it in an insulting way.

Building proposed in contravention of the Official Community Plan

The Official Community Plan shows this property's Urban Place Designation as Urban Residential. This designation allows for Attached and detached buildings up to three storeys. Low-rise and mid-rise multi-unit buildings up to approximately six storeys.

17 storeys would make this building one of the top 20 tallest buildings in Victoria. It would be twice as tall as the Coast hotel!

Not only is this proposal in contravention of the Official Community plan but this building ignores the Heritage and special character of James Bay, it is wholly inappropriate for this location, it is too tall, it is not in keeping with its surroundings and the 70's offering jars horribly against the heritage, the would be heritage and the new build heritage style properties surrounding it.

This is one of the few remaining open plots of land left in the heritage rich harbour of our capital city. It deserves a carefully thought through, appropriately sized building that compliments the buildings around it.

Housing Crisis

Victoria has had many housing crises in its history, we are beholden not to repeat the mistakes of past housing crises and allow this issue to dictate buildings that do irrevocable harm to their surroundings for many years to come.

Additional Traffic

Inevitably the population of this oversized project would significantly increase the traffic on Kingston and Superior, unfairly affecting these low density streets and their inhabitants.

The Daycare

Although a laudable idea, there is nothing in the plans to suggest anything other than providing room for such a venture - who is to say what the room may end up being used for. If a daycare did get set up here in reality this would again increase traffic with drop offs and pick ups. There are plenty of buildings in James Bay where a more appropriate daycare could be situated.

Thank you

Brian Currie
Superior Street, James Bay

Outside CoV Notification Area:

From:

From: Joanne Thibault

Subject: Input re: 205 Quebec St - CALUC Nov 10 2021

Date: November 9, 2021 at 8:42:21 AM PST

I am sorry that I'm not able to participate in the Nov 10 2021 CALUC for the proposed development at 205 Quebec St. If I may, my input is that I support the development. I feel that the developer has been very open about their plans and has welcomed lots of input into their project. In terms of the design, I appreciate developer's approach which is similar to Capital Park where height matching has been built in. Where the street facing is low-rise residential, the 205 Quebec St design is for townhouses. Where the street facing is residential tower, the 205 Quebec St design matches that. This provides much needed housing, while, like Capital Park, design matching is maintained. I especially like the child care facility and café space which really help build community fabric for all ages.

Thanks! Joanne

Joanne Thibault
Rithet St