

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Jonathan Bengtson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 07, 2017 7:24 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Cc:** Sandi Love; Sue Bengtson  
**Subject:** Comments regarding Oct 12, 2017 City Council Agenda Item, 3 Rezoning Application No. 00588

**Importance:** High

Comments regarding Oct 12, 2017 City Council Agenda Item 3, Rezoning Application No. 00588

To the Victoria City Council:

I am unable to attend the Public Hearing on Thursday, October 12<sup>th</sup> at City Hall, and **wish to express my strong opposition to the land use proposed for the [1002 Vancouver Street](#), otherwise known as Mt Edwards Court.**

As a parent of two children at Christ Church Cathedral School it is deeply concerning that this proposal — to house at-risk individuals cheek-by-jowl to the most vulnerable population in our society, children, and an elementary school — is even being considered by the City Council. On one level, I wonder if it even legal to do so — and I reference the The Safe Schools Act and the Safe Communities Act. On another level, I fail to see the logic in the proposal. Yes, we need more housing in Victoria but the availability of a building should not dictate its use, the community should also be a consideration.

Is it logical to to warehouse people in SRO facilities with out adequate supports? No.

Is it logical to have Cool Aid run this facility when there is no past evidence that they are able to do so with a faculty this large? No.

Is it logical that neighbourhoods have not been fully consulted and that this proposal has been quite obviously stick-handled by government and the municipality in concert with Cool Aid? No.

Is it logical that this would be an experiment that will not be backed up with a legal covenant on title? Absolutely no.

Is it acceptable that the elementary school will be the only school in Victoria that requires security guards? Surely not.

However this proposal may be dressed up by its supporters or Cool Aid, the fact remains that what is being considered is establishing a supportive and transitional housing facility for hardened street folk at a location that is arguably the worst possible location in the city. There are already 160 supportive housing beds in this neighbourhood within a radius of 500 meters — a neighbourhood that includes a church, a school, two playgrounds, the YMCA, a large population of seniors, residential condos, and homes. It is logical to increase the at-risk population by well over 50% with the addition of Mt. Edwards Court, and directly next to a large population of vulnerable children?

Politics is a played within a limited time-horizon. Should the Council make the decision to proceed in the view that this helps address a portion of Victoria's immediate housing issues, it will be the residents and the children of the neighbourhood that will be affected long-term. All the evidence indicates that the area will decline and that the school will be forced to close (reference: St. Andrews on Pandora closing shortly after Our

Place opened its newly renovated doors in 2013; also the Greater Victoria Christian School closing due to “Urban Issues” when the needle exchange opened across the street.)

The vast majority of the local residents and school parents in opposition to this proposal have never been against “the homeless”. As a parent my concern is that young children of the age of five to thirteen do not need to have the possibility of blatant exposure of mental illness and drug use paraded adjacent to their “safe ground.” As a parent , the use of fentanyl by at-risk populations and the never ending negative reports from an equally large facility in the 800 Johnson St, otherwise known as Central Care Home, only heightens my alarm that the Victoria City Council is considering taking us down a path towards the irreversible disruption of an established family neighbourhood.

**I urge the Council to reject this proposal in its entirety and work in good-faith with residents of the neighbourhood to seek an appropriate use of the property on 1002 Vancouver St.**

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan Bengtson

Christ Church Cathedral School parent

43 – 933 Admirals Road, Victoria

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Freedom 4 All [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, October 07, 2017 8:08 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Mt. Edwards Supportive Housing

Please rezone for this.  
Thanks!  
Larry Wartels  
Owner, 753 Yates St.  
Victoria BC

--  
UVIC Radio Hosts [Democracy Now!](http://www.DemocracyNow.org)  
The Independent Video News Hour  
101.9 FM Noon M-F or video at  
[www.DemocracyNow.org](http://www.DemocracyNow.org)



**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** H Burch <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 08, 2017 9:10 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Statement regarding Mt. Edward's Proposal

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am the parent of a Grade 6 student at Christ Church Cathedral School (and a recently graduated student now at Vic High) and a resident of the Fairfield area. I have signed up to speak at the hearing on Thursday (October 12), but I also wanted to send a letter to convey my profound concern about the proposed changes to the Mt Edwards facility.

Mt Edwards provides a needed service to the Victoria community, but CCCS has been our school for the past seven years - and has been fulfilling a vital part of the Victoria community for **over 25 years**. One of my children has significant special needs and the support he received at CCCS has been a significant factor in his growth. He graduated Grade 8 in June and just started Grade 9 at Vic High. I am writing because I want to make sure CCCS survives to benefit other children.

While the current parents at CCCS are committed to the school, our children will graduate and move on to high school. CCCS can only survive if parents of future students are willing to trust that their children will be safe despite the close proximity of Mt Edwards. The current proposal is for an age 50+ population with no "illicit drug use" and low needs for mental health. But even if Cool Aid and BC Housing are making these commitments in good faith and full intent to follow through, it is highly possible that the Residential Tenancy Act will prevent Cool Aid and BC Housing from being able to stick to these commitments. The Residential Tenancy Act does not permit BC Housing to dictate the rights of future residents. Guarantees of a certain age, current personal drug use, or vetting for mental disorders may not be possible. In short, there are no guarantees for us or the children.

The most important thing for the future of CCCS is to have all these agreements captured in a legal document that makes compliance enforceable by CCCS and requires the direct consent of CCCS for any alterations. There's an old saying that "an oral agreement isn't worth the paper on which it's written"! If Cool Aid and BC Housing are making oral assurances to obtain consent for their proposal, they must back it up with written commitments.

And those commitments must be enforceable by the Cathedral School Board! *A commitment enforceable by a third party - who is not directly affected by the failure to follow through on promises and who will have other constituents to consider - is not sufficient.* If the School is being harmed, it must have remedies it can pursue directly.

*Please do not make my email address public.*

Thank you for your time and attention,  
Heidi Burch  
Victoria Resident: 1129 May St  
Parent at CCCS

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Jim Fliczuk [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 09, 2017 8:47 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Public Hearing for the zoning of Mount Edwards Court - Thursday October 12th, 6:30 pm  
**Attachments:** scan.pdf

Dear Mayor and Council,

We cannot attend the Thursday October 12, 2017 Public Hearing for the zoning of Mount Edwards Court, so we're writing instead to have our views taken into account on the zoning application of Mount Edwards Court.

We're enclosing an appeal from Samantha Stone and Sandi Love, mothers of four children who are enrolled at CCCS. Please consider their pleadings very carefully. In our view these mothers make an exceedingly strong case that mandates that you refute the BC Housing rezoning application. The physical, emotional and mental safety of children demands the intentions of the Safe Schools and the Safe Communities Acts be honoured and the rezoning application be refused. The safety of the community must be considered. The danger to these children is just too great to do anything but refuse the rezoning application.

Yours,

Jim Fliczuk and Elaine Culver  
1149 Rockland Ave  
Victoria, BC V8V 4T5

Begin forwarded message:

**Subject: Public Hearing for the zoning of Mount Edwards Court - Thursday October 12th, 6:30 pm**  
**Date:** October 6, 2017 at 7:47:41 PM PDT

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. Our names are Samantha Stone and Sandi Love and we are mothers of 4 children currently enrolled at CCCS. We are two of many parents that have been engaging with our surrounding neighbours to understand the decisions behind placing supportive and transitional housing at Mount Edwards Court directly adjacent to our school.

A great deal has occurred over the last 19 months, leaving us where we are today. As you may or may not know, the school and the combined parent and neighbour group has been conscientiously challenging the original intentions of BC Housing and its partner, Cool-Aid to place a 100 person low barrier residence 18 metres adjacent to our school. Currently the proposal stands for a 50+ population with no "illicit drug use" and low needs for mental health.

To date, the Cathedral School Board has asked for a legal guarantee or covenant to be issued to protect the school and to give some assurance that both BC Housing and its current operator, Cool Aid, will be compliant and accountable for their actions going forward. Their reasoning being that administrations change, needs in society change but the physical, emotional and mental safety of children most certainly should be recognized. In fact there are rules already enforced federally and provincially that are being flaunted by the placing of the "hard to house" in the building adjacent to the school. The Safe Schools Act and the Safe Communities act have been overlooked gravely by this government. The availability of a building should not dictate its use, the community should also be a consideration.

We are asking you all to attend the Public Hearing on Thursday, October 12<sup>th</sup> at City Hall, and to sign up to speak specifically to the land use proposed for the 1002 Vancouver Street, otherwise known as Mt Edwards Court.

You can sign up to speak here: <http://www.victoria.ca/cityhall/council-address-form.aspx>  
We are not the first Victoria school or community to face this dilemma. St. Andrews on Pandora closed shortly after Our Place opened its newly renovated doors in 2013.

Also the Greater Victoria Christian School closed its doors due to "Urban Issues" when the needle exchange opened across the street.

This isn't new so why should you be concerned? Despite the pre-negotiations that existed between the school and BC Housing, the recent ruling from the Residential Tenancy Board regarding tenant rights at the Central Care home, means that Cool Aid and BC Housing are unlikely to stick to their stated and media broadcast commitments. The Residential Tenancy act does not permit BC Housing to dictate the rights of future residents. Guarantees of a certain age, current personal drug use, or vetting for mental disorders may not be possible. In short, there are no guarantees for us or the children.

Our perspective has always been the sustainability of our precious Elementary school, Christ Church Cathedral School, for now and for its continued success in the future. The integrity of this Fairfield neighbourhood, which has the largest per capita ratio of seniors in all of British Columbia is also at stake.

Our argument has never been against "the homeless" but rather the insistence that young children of the age of five to thirteen do not need to have the possibility of blatant exposure of mental

illness and drug use paraded so close to their "safe ground." The valid concerns of fentanyl and the never ending negative reports from an equally large facility in the 800 Johnson St otherwise known as Central Care Home only solidifies our concerns.

When pondering the task of what should be next to an elementary school, I can assure you that in any community planning, a supportive and transitional housing facility for hardened street folk does not come to mind. Within our residential neighbourhood we have a church, a school, two playgrounds, the YMCA, a large population of seniors, residential condos and neighbours. We already have 160 beds for supportive housing within a radius of 500 meters. Is it sensible and appropriate to put in another 90 beds and next to an elementary school?

If we are going to rezone the building at 1002 Vancouver Street, shouldn't more care be taken to consider what would benefit this community?

No - to placing two vulnerable populations in such close proximity to each other.

No - to warehousing people in SRO facilities with out adequate supports.

No - to "Housing First" when there is no real "Second" or "third."

No - to Cool Aid who has no experience running a facility this large.

No - to Neighbourhoods not being consulted.

No - to an experiment that will not be backed up with a legal covenant on title.

No - to being the only school in Victoria that requires security guards.

Silent voices lead to the misunderstanding of acceptance. Your presence at this meeting is imperative. Even if you do not want to speak – physically being there is important. For those who are unable to attend, your input can be sent via mail, an email to [publichearings@victoria.ca](mailto:publichearings@victoria.ca), or you can drop off your written feedback at Victoria City Hall to the City Hall Ambassador located to the left of the main entrance. Correspondence should be received by 11 a.m. the day before the Council meeting.

Thank you!

PS - Please forward this message to those that you believe can also help our situation.



**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Kate [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 09, 2017 4:44 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Proposed rezoning 1002 Vancouver Street - Mount Edwards Court

Victoria Councillors,

Please do not let your compassion deter you from your responsibilities as people elected to serve the interests of Victoria residents.

Your responsibility as councillors is to provide civic services and regulate land use, not to override local concerns to solve problems downloaded by senior levels of government. It is not the mandate of local governments to provide health care and social supports to people with psychiatric illnesses or addiction. Just because the provincial government has failed in its responsibilities does not mean you must fail in your responsibilities as civic leaders.

The issue is whether Mount Edwards Court should be rezoned for supportive housing.

No matter what you call it, supportive housing is temporary is transitional, “pending something new.”

Cell-sized rooms, showers down the hall and no cooking facilities are not permanent housing. Rooms that are less than one hundred square feet – a typical room size in an SRO in the Downtown East Side – are not permanent housing.

What is being proposed is a hotel, no matter how much lipstick is smeared on.

A hotel is not an appropriate land use in a residential area. In past you agreed, and have taken steps to curtail non-permanent housing -- short-term rentals -- in other areas not zoned for them. The residents surrounding Mount Edwards Court deserve the same protections.

This proposed rezoning is a drastic change in land use. When you re-zone land, it should not be to solve a short-term problem: it's pretty much forever. This decision is not to solve what we all hope is a short-term phenomenon; it is to decide if a hotel use should be permitted in a residential area.

It's irrelevant who the occupants are, and irrelevant whether the hotel is operated in 2017 by a non-profit organization or by Hyatt in 2025. It makes no difference if there are a couple of longer-term residences in the building. Lots of hotels also have suites, but they are still hotels and don't belong in a residential neighbourhood.

The ramifications of your decision are great. Allowing high-density transitional housing amid low-rise apartments could destabilize entire neighbourhoods as older, affordable apartments become targets for densification.

Please do not make the expedient decision to solve a problem that is the responsibility of senior levels of governments to fix. Please do not sacrifice decades of good planning and community development because the province expects you to solve the problems of its making.

Please vote against this proposal. As an apartment building, Mount Edwards Court set the standard for a liveable neighbourhood. Do not let it become the thin edge of the wedge to destroy it.

Kate Trotter  
1052 Rockland Avenue  
Victoria, BC

October 9, 2017  
City Council  
City of Victoria  
1 Centennial Square,  
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Re: Proposed Changes to 1002 Vancouver Street, Mount Edwards Court

Dear Council Members,

I am in favour of the Heritage Designation Application for Mount Edwards but I am absolutely against the Zoning Bylaw/Amendment (No.1114) – No. 17-092 for the following reasons.

Although Council has done a good job in providing housing for those in need in Victoria, this particular building is located next door to an elementary school. I am in favour of the part of your proposed bylaw to allow 15 affordable rental housing units, but the 78 supportive housing units need to be changed to allow supportive care for individuals who are not going to be mobile in the community, specifically right next to an elementary school. Children's safety and freedom of movement on their school ground, and also on the nearby (wonderful) playground next to the court house, should not be at issue.

We can provide care at Mount Edwards for the elderly and/or other individuals who are unable to leave Mount Edwards court without a responsible adult, but not for individuals who will be out in the neighbourhood. The impoverished elderly need beds.

This bylaw would profoundly change the nature of this neighbourhood. This is not NIMBYism. I believe we, as a caring society, should provide support for those in need. I also believe that funding for social work, drug rehabilitation, and mental health has been grossly underfunded in the last couple of decades. Our provincial government must make substantial changes in funding now. But to pass this bylaw to allow 78 supportive housing units in a building next door to an elementary school with students, ages 5 to 12, and half a block from a playground, is not the right thing to do.

The neighbourhood, as evidenced at earlier open houses, is not in favour of Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1114) – No. 17-092. Please listen to your constituents and reconsider this very big mistake.

Thank you for listening and thank you also for the good work you do for All the citizens of Victoria.

Sincerely,  
Mary James

cc. Finance Minister Carole James

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Debbie Berg [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 10, 2017 4:28 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Support for Mount Edwards Court rezoning application

Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

I would like to lend my support to the rezoning application regarding Mount Edwards Court. There is a great need in Greater Victoria for older individuals who are struggling with the effects of trauma, mental health struggles and addiction to have a place they can call home where they also receive supports, connection and meaningful opportunities. I welcome them to our community.



Debbie Berg  
*Director of Housing*  
*Our Place Society*



## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Ian Kunka <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** October 10, 2017 5:28 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council; Lisa Helps (Mayor)  
**Subject:** Mount Edwards Court Housing Facility

Dear Mayor Helps and City Councillors,

I am writing to you today regarding the proposal for the Mount Edwards Court Housing Facility located next to Christ Church Cathedral School. As an alumnus of the school, and since I have a younger sibling still there, CCCS means a lot to me and I want the best for the school. Recently, however, I do not believe the City of Victoria has appreciated the fact that this school means the world to many people, including myself both during my time at the school and to this day even though I have graduated. Placing a housing facility for poverty affected individuals, some suffering with mental illnesses and chronic physical health needs, next to an elementary school is not, as far as I can see, in the best interests of the school. That said, I do believe that my school and the Cool Aid housing facility can work together to make a safe environment for both the residents of Mount Edwards and the students of Cathedral School. The housing crisis must be addressed, but we cannot create yet another crisis just to solve this one.

If the City of Victoria approves the rezoning request by Cool Aid, certain policies and bylaws would need to be introduced and put into action before a safe environment for all the involved parties could be created. My main concern, one which Councillor Young pointed out as well, is that studies have indicated the optimal range for the number of residents would be between 40 and 50. Cool Aid's proposal for 78 supportive housing units and 15 independent-living residences would place the number of occupants at nearly double the maximum optimal number. This would also be Cool Aid's highest occupancy housing facility ever; both their housing facilities on Pandora Avenue combined surpass the hundred occupancy mark, but that is in two separately run buildings both staffed 24/7 and obviously neither building is located next to an elementary school. The current number of 38 residents at Mount Edwards does not interfere with the school most of the time. However, increasing this number by over double would most definitely have an effect on the number of disturbances that occurred. Would double the residents not result in double the calls to the police and double the number of disturbances involving the school? Therefore I must ask: why should housing the homeless be more of a priority than children's education and schools?

Ultimately, both sides will have to compromise to make this situation work. Cathedral School has already done their part, now I think it is Cool Aid and B.C. Housing's turn. I implore Council to do their part in making this situation the best it can be for both sides. Hopefully, Council can introduce some policies and bylaws that everyone can at least work with if not agree on.

Sincerely,  
Ian E. Kunka  
Grade 10 Student  
Mount Douglas Secondary

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Home [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 7:12 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** zoning regulation bylaw, amendment bylaw(no.1114)-no.17-092

re zoning regulation bylaw, amendment bylaw(no.1114)-no.17-092 and the development variance permit application.

We are strongly opposed to this.

John and Anne Boon

Please keep this email address confidential

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Natasha [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 10, 2017 10:02 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Mount Edward Court Zoning

To City Council Members and Mayor Helps;

This letter is to urge you to look to the Safe School Act and the Safe Communities Act, as they pertain to all the children at Christ Church Cathedral School, as well as neighbouring residents and businesses of Mount Edward Court.

Local and recent history has proven that placing a facility such as Our Place so close to a school does not work, as seen with the closing of St Andrews Elementary in 2013. There was also another school closure of the Greater Victoria Christian School when it had to close due to Urban Issues after a needle exchange opened across the street.

As a mother of two children at the Christ Church Cathedral School and also an owner / operator of a business in the 1000 block of Fort St, I feel that the rights of my family and the contributions from my family to the community is being gravely overlooked and disregarded in exchange for the benefit of those “hard to house” persons who could possibly be placed less than 20 meters from a vibrant elementary school.

The children need to be protected and sheltered from any “hard to house” persons. The seniors and all the residents who are tax payers need to be protected and sheltered from any “hard to house” persons. Lastly the business owners in the area who all pay taxes, need to be protected and sheltered from any “hard to house” persons.

Please do not use the Mount Edward Court Building simply because it is available. The well being of the whole community must be considered.

Natasha Rainsberry

October 10, 2017

To: Mayor Helps and Victoria City Councilors

**Re: Application to Rezone Mount Edwards Court**

The purpose of this letter is to protest the rezoning application of the Provincial Rental Housing Corporation (BC Housing), the owner of Mount Edwards Court, to develop a facility for 90+ chronically “hard to house” individuals who are 55+ years of age and who have mental and/or addiction issues that may result in unpredictable behaviours, when the facility is adjacent to Christ Church Cathedral elementary school and in the midst of a residential community. There has been overwhelming community opposition to the facility based on 19 months of documented bad experience with the Mount Edwards Court residents. There is no question that additional supportive facilities are required for these vulnerable people, but not at this location and not in these numbers. This is a high stakes social experiment that has already gone wrong.

Why do I say “no” to the rezoning application?

**LOCATION**

- There is a high probability that the rezoning of this facility will cause Christ Church Cathedral elementary school to close. We have two examples right in the neighbourhood where private schools closed due to declining enrollment caused by “urban issues”, a euphemism for the impact of adding facilities on Pandora. Greater Victoria Christian Academy (needle exchange) and St. Andrews School (Our Place). Parents, students and community members have spoken clearly to how much they value this last downtown school. Have you heard them? Visit the new jam-packed Courthouse Park we helped design to discover the impact of children downtown.

**No to placing two vulnerable populations in such close proximity to each other. Keep the children safe**

**No to being the only school in Victoria that requires security guards. Note: Cool Aid intends to remove the security guards when the new residents are in place**

- The Mount Edwards facility will increase the concentration of “hard to house” homeless in the ever expanding Pandora, Johnson, Vancouver Street cluster – shades of Downtown East side. No regional plan. No forward plan. Just another new facility, then services, then new facility close to services in an endless cycle. All against evidence-based best practices. BC Housing has had 19 months to develop a better housing alternative for the Mount Edwards residents. Public consultation has been a sham.



## **TOO MANY PEOPLE**

- There will be too many people residing at Mount Edwards Court if the rezoning proposal is approved. Studies show (read the FairWay Woods report) that 30-50 people are the ideal size, not 90+. The City planners selectively omitted this tidbit, which was in the study they quoted in support of the rezoning. They also omitted, “away from downtown predators and drugs, fully accessible and kitchen”.
- Did you know, supportive housing residences over 53 units report increases in violent and total crime in close proximity? It’s in the off-quoted Denver study, but if it doesn’t support, Cool Aid, the operator, won’t report.
- **No to warehousing people in SRO facilities without adequate supports**
- **No to populations exceeding the recommended number**

## **COOL AID AS OPERATOR – ONGOING RELATIONSHIP WITH COMMUNITY**

- Cool Aid, the operator, is not responsible for any behavioural issues outside of its facilities. Unfortunately, what goes on inside Mount Edwards has a spillover effect on the community. In the 19 months that Mount Edwards has been operating the experience had been bad, as documented by community impact statements and police calls. The steady appearance of emergency vehicles and the need to regularly clean up needles and other detritus in the area surrounding Mount Edwards when so many children are in the area is worrisome. Yes, the new residents are supposed to be intravenous drug free, but there are no guarantees about drug use off the premises, no idea whether evicting relapsed drug users will even be possible (ask TAPS), no guarantees about who will be attracted to the area near the school.

### **Rezoning is about land use. Mount Edwards is no longer a nursing home facility**

- Cool Aid does not have experience with running a facility of the proposed size. Cool Aid facilities for seniors include: Hillside Terrace (45 seniors), Olympic Vista (36 seniors), Fairway Woods (32 seniors) – all with smaller populations and away from downtown “predators”. Why is Mount Edwards being considered and to warehouse 90+ people who are age 55+?
- **No to Cool Aid who has no experience running a facility this large**
- Tent City residents were relocated to Mount Edwards without any community consultation. The relocation was supposed to be temporary but the contract for the facility operations was extended, again without community consultation.

## **No to Neighbourhoods not being consulted**

- Work continues at Mount Edwards in the absence of rezoning approval. Or has rezoning been approved and we have not been advised?

## **NO GUARANTEES**

- The approval of the rezoning is **forever**. What keeps the operator from becoming low barrier or even providing shelter space in response to crisis? Neighbours anticipate ever more crises. There are currently 38 residents at Mount Edwards. Their presence has not been trouble free as documented by community impact statements and calls to the police. Now triple the number of residents (844 Johnson Street #2 – here we come).

Cool-Aid and BC Housing are unlikely to stick to their stated commitments.

## **No to an experiment that will not be backed up with a legal covenant on title**

- Cool Aid “is willing to Heritage Designate the Mount Edwards building to ensure that the heritage property will be conserved for present and future generations.” Exactly who will benefit, generations of homeless?

**No to the application for Heritage Designation of the building. Approval will make it very difficult for the building to be repurposed in future. Mount Edwards could be sold and the property used to build affordable family homes in a child-friendly community.**

The rezoning of Mount Edwards Court as proposed is wrong; wrong location and wrong numbers of people. Please consider all constituents and long-term outcomes in your decision.

Shelley Campbell  
Victoria

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Debbie [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:59 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** 1002 Vancouver Street

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Victoria and was a parent of two children who attended Christ Church Cathedral School. It is inappropriate to house the present population located at the Cool Aid Facility on 1002 Vancouver Street next to an elementary school. If you do not protect this school you are setting a dangerous precedent for future children and students all across Canada. There is no facility such as this housed so close to an Elementary School anywhere else in British Columbia. The physical safety issues to the children alone (fentanyl, needles...) are of grave concern, not to mention their mental health and safety. We are either a society that cares for our children and our future or we don't. We can care for all of our vulnerable citizens in a safe and appropriate manner, this is not what we are doing at the present time. Please find a solution that makes it secure and safe for all. Please find secure, safe housing for the present population at 1002 Vancouver Street in an area that doesn't have a school right beside it. Sincerely, Debbie Stevens-Reznick Sent from my iPhone

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** George Churcher <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** October 11, 2017 7:45 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Proposal to Rezone Mount Edwards Court - 1002 Vancouver Street

**Council should send this proposal back for revision and downsizing of the occupancy limits to a maximum of 40 to 50 residents.**

The bylaw should restrict all future occupancy to:

- All clients will be over 50 or single parents and children
- No injection drug use
- No supervised injection facilities
- Maximum of 40 to 50 residents total

Portland Hotel Society at Johnson Street and Victoria Cool Aid Society at the Rock Bay Shelter have demonstrated themselves to be incapable of effectively managing large populations of behaviorally challenged residents. Street crime and mayhem flourish in the surrounding neighbourhoods. Massive police and first responder costs have been downloaded to City of Victoria taxpayers.

Humbolt Valley neighbours and the parents of attendees of Cathedral School have repeatedly communicated to Mayor and Council that they do not want 1002 Vancouver Street rezoned for this inappropriate land use.

Mayor and Council are reminded that they have obligations to consider the interests of neighbours and voters.

Neighbours' concerns must not be ignored by self-promoting representatives tied to special interests and advocates espousing "housing first" ideology and who appear have neither plans nor resources to treat illness and addictions of residents, and return the homeless to self-sufficient employable contributing (and tax paying) members of our community.

The practice of the former BC Liberal Government through the efforts of BC Housing has been to warehouse then ignore the homeless in decrepit SRO hotels, motels and failed seniors' homes. A poverty industry replete with "advocates" has developed to support this policy. This proposal smacks of that failed policy.

Councillor Alto is incorrect in her position that Mayor and Council have no responsibility for the behavior of occupants and users of rezoned properties. Is this Council prepared to rezone properties to allow Hells Angels' Clubhouses?

Also incorrect is Councillor Alto's perception that approval of this proposal is "a courtesy". The past Minister of Housing (and Deputy Premier) backed down on an unsuitable proposal in the face of community opposition. It is very unlikely that the present provincial government with a very slim majority will attempt to muscle an inappropriate project past the opposition of the community in the riding occupied by the present Minister of Finance (and Deputy Premier).

Most neighbours and many voters support construction of housing for homeless people but the non-profit group sponsoring this proposal have ignored well-grounded neighbourhood concerns.

**Please reject this proposal and require downsizing and considerable revisions before accepting a revised project for consideration.**

# Despite questions, Mount Edwards goes to hearing

**BILL CLEVERLEY**  
Times Colonist

July 28 2017

A proposal to rezone Mount Edwards Court for use as supportive and independent housing for people 50 and over will go to public hearing — subject to several council questions being answered.

Victoria city councillors, who have received hundreds of pages of correspondence on the facility over the past year, want more information on the proposed units, the residents and the number of times police, fire and ambulance have been called to the area.

The proposal was put forward by the Cool Aid Society, which would operate the facility, on behalf of B.C. Housing. It calls for 93 units for people 50 and older. No illicit drug use would be permitted, and no one with a history of violence would be allowed to live there.

Coun. Geoff Young said he has

## COUNCIL WANTS TO KNOW

- A rundown of the number of calls for service by police, fire and ambulance to Mount Edwards since it has been used as transitional housing, and to nearby areas such as Pioneer Square
- Operational experience about facilities such as Fairway Woods, Hillside Terrace, Olympic Vista, and Cottage Grove
- The demographic of current residents
- An explanation of the tool to be used to screen potential residents
- The extent of the ban on use of illicit substances and whether it will be limited to use on site
- Whether pets will be permitted
- Whether units will be accessible

some "significant concerns" about the proposal.

"The size of the operation, I think, is my major concern and the number of supportive units that's being proposed," Young said, adding that literature would

suggest 40 to 50 is the optimal number of units.

"I don't think in a housing crisis like we have, we can afford to have empty spaces and empty rooms that are not being utilized to give people housing," said Coun. Jeremy Loveday.

Mayor Lisa Helps said the proposal is exactly what is needed in the city.

"We need more supportive housing for people who are getting older and we need more affordable housing," she said.

The proposal calls for 78 units of supportive housing and 15 studio and one-bedroom independent-living units.

Poverty will have been an issue for most residents. Cool Aid said some residents will have chronic physical health needs, be managing a mental illness or a brain injury, be working to overcome social isolation, have mild to moderate cognitive or developmental

challenges, or be working on recovery from substance use.

The province bought the former seniors care facility, at 1002 Vancouver St., for \$3.6 million last year. It is being used as transitional housing for people who were staying at the former tent city outside the provincial courthouse, housing 38 people at a time.

It has prompted criticism from neighbours, including parents of students at Christ Church Cathedral School, who have cited safety and security concerns and problems of drug use and neighbourhood disruption.

In response to concerns, Cool Aid has said it is willing to enter into an agreement that no illicit drug use be permitted on the premises and that clients, all of whom would be over 50, would have to go through extensive screening.

Coun. Marianne Alto noted that the province has the authority to

override municipal zoning by overriding the application "a council's role, she said, is to use — not the behaviour of individuals who might live there."

Council should be "vigilant that in providing guidance that we're not stepping into the realm of dictating behaviour considerations, unduly."

Coun. Charlayne Thor said council tries to mitigate neighbourhood impacts in applications, such as limiting business's driveway so it doesn't bother the neighbours, or limiting hours for deliveries.

"This is not a rarity, in fact, we're just looking at this and the individuals that are to be in this building," she said.

"We look at operating procedures and how to make transportation work in the neighbourhood and for the neighbours in applications."

bcleverley@timescolonist.com

## B.C. backs away from controversial homeless shelter site in Maple Ridge

The Canadian Press  
March 29, 2016 10:41 AM

MAPLE RIDGE, B.C. - The B.C. government is abandoning plans for a homeless shelter at an old motel in Maple Ridge, east of Vancouver.

Housing Minister Rich Coleman says the province will instead provide about \$15 million for a permanent facility in the Fraser Valley community, once an appropriate location is identified.

The ministry says a public consultation process will take place before any site is confirmed.

Many residents were enraged when the government announced plans to use a motel as a long-term low-barrier homeless shelter that would allow people to bring in their pets and belongings.

Residents were concerned it would be located beside a restaurant popular among seniors.

For now, the ministry says it is working with officials in the city to extend the closing of a 40-bed temporary shelter to the end of June so homeless people will continue to have a warm, safe place to sleep.

© Copyright Times Colonist

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Graeme Dempster [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 1:40 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Zoning of Mount Edwards Court

Hello,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed re-zoning of Mount Edwards Court. I have 2 children that attend Christchurch Cathedral School.

Within this residential neighbourhood, there is a church, a school, two playgrounds, the YMCA, a large population of seniors, residential condos and neighbours. There are already 160 beds for supportive housing within a radius of 500 meters. Is it sensible and appropriate to put in another 90 beds and next to an elementary school? NO!

The size/density of the proposal (90+) is of grave concern, as there is clear evidence and guidelines to keeping vulnerable populations in more widely separated and smaller groups.

If the current proposal is approved, it MUST be paired with a legal guarantee or covenant to be issued to protect the school and neighbourhood, and to give some assurance that both BC Housing and its current operator, Cool Aid, will be compliant and accountable for their actions going forward.

I hope you will consider the choice carefully, bearing in mind the huge possible impact to our most vulnerable of populations - children.

Graeme Dempster

Victoria, BC.

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Julia Smith <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:51 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Cc:** Lisa Helps (Mayor); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Proposed Changes to 1002 Vancouver Street - Input for 630pm meeting October 12th

I am the owner of the heritage building across from 1002 Vancouver Street. I have worked with my business partner/property manager to ensure we maintain a clean, enjoyable home in which my tenants can live surrounded by a little piece of Victoria's history. I am in Vancouver and unable to attend the meeting tomorrow night so wanted to make my thoughts known.

My concerns regarding the proposed by-law changes are:

- A potential increase in public drinking/drug use/noise/garbage caused by the historical problem of supportive services not being provided appropriately:
  - What organization is providing the supportive services for the proposed additional supportive housing units?
  - I am worried about the vulnerability of the Christ Church Cathedral School students, Cathedral attendees as well as my own tenants and guests.
  - Is there a security plan for the neighbourhood to ensure our most vulnerable are not intimidated or verbally assaulted by supportive housing tenants with mental illness or addiction problems?
- Reduction in parking spaces:
  - With the increased number of units the number of parking spaces required to be provided by the development should increase not decrease.
  - My concern is that my tenants will have difficulty finding parking close to their home for ease of loading groceries, children, elderly guests, etc.
  - The same goes for the Cathedral School students and church attendees who have difficulty walking a great distance.

Thank you for your attention and I would appreciate your feedback on my comments above.

Sincerely,  
Julia

Julia Smith  
Owner  
1003 Vancouver Street



**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Paul Cottingham [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:35 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Mt Edwards Rezoning

As a parent of a student who attends Cathedral School, I would like to express my dismay at the manner in which council continues to ignore the concerns of Cathedral School, and of the neighbours in the surrounding area. Lest council get the wrong idea, as a recovering alcoholic, I am not unsympathetic to the plight of the people who will be living in the proposed facility. However, I don't believe that placing such a population next to a school is appropriate, no matter what the reassurances we are receiving to the contrary.

There have been many documented issues with the small population now residing in Mt. Edwards, leaving us concerned that these will escalate as the population increases. My question is this: who is responsible for the residents once they leave Mt. Edwards? If the answer is "not the operators," that is disconcerting, especially given (again) the Mt. Edwards' proximity to a school.

On another front, the recent arbitrators ruling regarding the Residential Tenancy Act only serves to create concerns. The promised restrictions are apparently subject to court challenge; leaving us still in a precarious situation.

I would like to remind Council that they serve the public a large, not small special interest groups. I hope you will bear that in mind as you deliberate.

--

*To understand recursion, one must first understand recursion*

**Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** Richard Marshall [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017 10:43 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No.1114) - No.17-092

I am in favour of supportive housing, however, I have problems with the process that has been followed for Mount Edwards. I attended a number of the community meetings. The impression I've been left with is that: this supportive housing facility has always been a done deal; and the "consultative process" has only been followed by the BC Government because it is a City requirement.

If Victoria rejects this bylaw amendment, is the owner (the BC Government) required to abide by this decision. And what control does Victoria have if/when the BC Government/Cool Aid change their criteria for people living in this supportive housing facility?

This supportive housing facility will be next to a school. Does the research support placing this type of supportive housing next to a school?

The number of supportive housing units proposed is much larger than the pilot project, which I believe worked reasonable well. However, I believe 78 supportive housing units is too many for one location. What is the optimal number of units for a supportive housing facility?

A recent decision by the Residential Tenancy Board has impacted how the Portland Housing Society manages the Central Care supportive housing facility on Johnson Street. How will this impact the commitments made by the BC Government/Cool Aid regarding the operations of Mount Edwards?

I've read that Victoria has lost approximately 1500 parking spots to new construction, and am aware that developers frequently ask for variances to reduce off-street parking. This seems to be another case: 12 parking spaces is a silly number. With @100 residents (plus full-time staff and visiting support staff), Mount Edwards will not have enough parking. I don't support the parking development variance.

Regards

Richard Marshall