

Alicia Ferguson

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: 1002 Vancouver Street consultation, 12 October 2017

From: Chris Goto-Jones
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2017 2:15 PM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: 1002 Vancouver Street consultation, 12 October 2017

Dear Madam/Sir,

As a resident and home-owner on Meares Street (947), I write to express my serious concern about the city's proposals to rezone 1002 Vancouver Street to permit 78 supportive housing units and 15 affordable rental units. In common with everyone else with whom I spoken about this, I am of the opinion that this proposal is short-sighted and irresponsible. It shows disregard for the health and safety of existing residents in the neighbourhood as well the well-being of the proposed residents of 1002 Vancouver Street. Instead, it privileges bureaucratic convenience and exploits a cynical form of opportunism.

The proposal seems to be premised simply upon the availability of a building within walking distance of the former 'tent city' location, presumably because the city is of the opinion that tent city was appropriately located and caused no social problems. However, the inappropriateness of the location of tent city (so close to some of the most vulnerable populations in the city — young school children and elderly residents) is clearly evident. 1002 is even less appropriately positioned, within a few meters of Christchurch Cathedral School and nestled into the heart of a residential neighbourhood. While the back of its property directly borders with mine on two sides, my house is only one of several residential units that share a boundary with Mount Edwards, some of which have young children or other vulnerable populations.

The present situation in this neighbourhood is already deeply compromised by the presence of the facility in Mount Edwards. Despite the smaller scale of the present use of 1002 Vancouver, Meares Street and Rockland Avenue are already corridors between Mount Edwards Court and Pioneer Square. Over the last few months, my wife and I have witnessed active drug use on Meares Street, including the use of needles in the street. We have witnessed drug deals taking place on the corner of Meares and Vancouver. And there have been several incidents of violence on this street, including a fistfight between three homeless men on our driveway (which turned out to be a dispute about drugs). Increasing the capacity of Mount Edwards Court can only increase the threat to the health and safety of people in this area. If residents of (or visitors to) Mount Edwards also gain access to the garden at the back of that property (which is presently off-limits), this will potentially enable such behaviour to occur even closer to our homes, but then unchecked even by the public gaze, seriously undermining the feeling of safety in the neighbourhood.

Reassurances from the city about the proposed profile of the residents of Mount Edwards are unconvincing, since it is unclear that BC Housing is actually entitled to dictate the rights of any future residents. Hence, it does not seem possible for the the city to provide assurances or guarantees to residents of the neighbourhood (not to mention to the children of Christchurch School and their parents, or the elderly community) that they will vet potential residents of 1002 Vancouver for drug-use, mental health, or even age. In this content, the pretence that such guarantees can be made seems not only disingenuous but also cynical, since its motivation can only be to override concerns about ethics and safety with an imperative for profit and money. If the safety of children a few meters from the proposed facility cannot be guaranteed or even assured, then the proposal is simply not fit for purpose. If the city is really willing to compromise the physical, emotional, and psychological

health of children (as well as to deny this in bad faith) in order to push through a building plan that has no local support and no apparent rationale (other than the fact of the existence of a building and, presumably, a form of financial convenience), then I question whether the decision-makers are fit to be public servants.

Regards,
Dr. Chris Goto-Jones

Alicia Ferguson

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No.1114) - No. 17-092 - input

From:
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2017 4:17 PM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No.1114) - No. 17-092 - input

Dear Madam/Sir,

I am unable to attend the Public Hearing regarding the rezoning of R-84 Zone (Mt Edwards) as I am travelling for work. I do hope that you will allow this message to be put on record although it is a few hours late.

My husband and I moved to ** last year July, and have been following the progress of the news regarding Mount Edwards Court with interest. Although I am a proponent of the 'Housing First' method to dealing with homelessness, I feel that the plan to house up to 78 people who need support plus 15 low-income tenants into Mount Edwards Court is unwise and ill considered, and does not follow the advice offered by the Canada government itself. If I were to attend the Public Hearing, I would ask the following questions:

- 1) What evidence do you have that we can refer to that the health and well-being of the neighbourhood will be maintained with such a large influx of tenants who require acute care suddenly inhabiting the building?
- 2) Will the would-be tenants voluntarily inhabit the building?
- 3) Will there be adequate mental health support staff in situ, 24-7?
- 3) Is this meeting simply a formality that can be recorded as having been taken place with no intention of seriously considering opposing views?

I would like to bring to your attention the following article that indicates that larger scale projects do more harm than good:

<http://blogs.berkeley.edu/2016/06/14/solving-homelessness-obvious-but-not-easy/>
(See section 'Build Smaller projects'.)

I would hope that you will consider housing a lower number of people in the complex, and follow the recommendations of Canada's own advice on how to make the Housing First project succeed:

<http://homelesshub.ca/solutions/housing-accommodation-and-supports/housing-first>

(See sections 'What kind of housing?', and 'Does Housing First work?'.)

Having repatriated to Canada after 23 years, I am shocked by the 'wild west' tendencies in local and provincial government dealings in this province. As a Canadian, I would be interested in bringing this nation up to the standards of other functioning, *actual* democratic nations that have proper policies in place that need to be followed as a matter of law.

Sincerely,

(Please could you consider my address, name and email address as confidential.)

Alicia Ferguson

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: Mount Edwards housing proposal

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

From: rick stevens
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2017 5:26 PM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: Mount Edwards housing proposal

Council Members: I live in a condo around the corner from Mount Edwards. I have been lucky enough to live here for more than 20 years. What a wonderful vibrant neighbourhood in Victoria, and increasingly so I hope!
But: the Tent City episode. I'm sure you know the stats with police reports of negative effects. We felt them here in our building. Mostly car break-ins. Worse a few blocks away.
I just hope the folks who might be living in the new proposed expanded assisted-housing development on Vancouver Street will not be the same people with the same unfortunate problems who caused so much grief to their neighbours. I think this is the wrong place for such a dense social experiment in our City so I am opposed to it, based on its scale alone. I wish I knew the right solution. I don't know it, but think this is not it.

Rick Stevens #109-1025 Meares Street.

Alicia Ferguson

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: Input on proposed changes to 1002 Vancouver Street

From: Laurie Brucker
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2017 9:46 PM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: Input on proposed changes to 1002 Vancouver Street

Hello,

I am writing to share my views on the proposed changes to the residence at 1002 Vancouver Street.

I am strongly opposed to expansion of its use to increase the number of "hard to house" residents living in the residence. My children attend Christ Church Cathedral school, immediately next door to this residence. It is not acceptable to consider the proposed/expanded purpose of 1002 Vancouver Street as is, which would place a large population of residents with high needs/minimal supports immediately adjacent to a school.

To be clear - I am not opposed to a housing strategy for vulnerable populations. My opposition is to the placement of this vulnerable population next to an elementary school - creating a situation where a security guard is required to be present to ensure safety.

I implore you to reject this proposal on the grounds that it is not suitable for this location.

Sincerely,
Laurie Brucker

October 12, 2017

RE: Mt Edwards - Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (N. 114) - No. 17-092

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter as a life long resident of Victoria that has watched the city change and grow for better and worse since I was a child, and I have spent the majority of my adult years living in the downtown area. I'm also someone who has contributed immensely to the cultural landscape of Victoria, and who cares deeply about this community. I'm also someone who has experienced addictions and homelessness first hand. As a child my father struggled with multiple addictions and periodic homelessness. I lost a girlfriend when I was younger to a crystal meth addiction, and she also experienced homelessness. During my lifetime I have also dealt with the death of a number of friends due to addictions. This has left me with a compassionate, but realistic perspective on these issues. I'm also a very concerned direct neighbor of the Mount Edwards Court building at 1002 Vancouver Street, and I trust you will listen and consider what I have to say.

It is obvious and unfortunate that Victoria is currently faced with a significant degree of homelessness amongst its population. I commend the city council and mayor of Victoria for their attempts so far to face these challenges and show leadership on this issue. Therefore I would hope that for the sake of leadership the current mayor and council will take a very critical look at the current proposal for Mount Edwards and decide if they believe old problems can be solved by old and highly questionable approaches such as this, or if old problems require a better approach than what the province and Cool-Aid are currently offering in this instance. What Cool-Aid and The Province are offering isn't much more than "X" number of bleak units of SRO housing that will park and hide homelessness. This won't allow people to flourish, transform and move towards their own autonomy. SRO housing simply does not work in the long term. I don't want to spend this letter arguing the statistics and examples of this. Instead I want you to consider that we as community can't allow the issue of homelessness to be reduced to a numbers game based around political appearances and how to fit the highest density of people in the smallest spaces possible at the least expense to the province while providing the most profits possible to contracted services providers. We need to encourage approaches that are more effective than this, and far more livable than this. Approaches that allow people to move away from institutions and towards better futures. We also need to encourage strategies to keep people from becoming homeless in the first place. Therefore I support maximizing the number of livable affordable rental units for those 50+ years of age that could be constructed inside of Mt Edwards, while eliminating or minimizing the number of smaller unliveable supportive units that might be constructed there. The need for affordable rental housing in Victoria for the elderly is a glaring issue for this segment of our population and is the type of housing that can prevent people from becoming homeless to begin. Affordable housing would also be a better fit for this neighbourhood. A neighbourhood composed of two playgrounds, the YMCA, a church, a school, a large population of seniors, residential condos and neighbours. An historical neighbourhood that should be celebrated and protected.

I also am very concerned that the recent ruling from the Residential Tenancy Board regarding tenant rights at Central Care Home, means that BC Housing and Cool-Aid

may not even be able to stick to their stated claims regarding the make up of people housed at Mt Edwards and the policies they claim they are intending to put into place. Regardless of this ruling I'm doubtful that Cool-Aid's screening procedures for prospective tenants are adequate and take into consideration how it's tenants could impact the surrounding neighbourhood. I also question how conditions placed on tenants such as no hard drug use can be enforced without infringing on their rights to privacy?

Ultimately the idea of warehousing people in SRO housing is a recipe for depression, low self esteem . Why do you think the former population of Mt Edwards was moved out of that building? Obviously because better, much more healthier options were created for them. If people can't be happy, then they can't be expected to be healthy. While potential future residents of supported housing units at Mount Edwards might be "lucky enough" to get new bathroom sinks and a bit of lead-free paint or something, they're still essentially going to get put into the same tiny little rooms that sucked the life out of previous residents. The Victoria Cool Aid Society does not appear to me to truly care about the residents of it's facilities, nor the neighbourhoods surrounding their facilities. This is a lousy opportunistic approach, as it is obviously about business, numbers, and nothing else. Other organizations in Victoria like Pacifica Housing have created supported housing that is forward thinking, creative and livable. This is the type of vision that needs to be encouraged and supported, rather than treating vulnerable people as nothing more than clustered sources of revenue from provincial contracts. The proposal for Mt Edwards is archaic and Victoria needs to be aggressively looking to the future if it is to thrive. The idea of people essentially "living in closets and eating downstairs at the soup kitchen" is just lame and cynical. We are not living in Victorian England, and we do not need modern versions of poor houses. People deserve more personal space, autonomy and safety than this scenario would afford, and I certainly think it would be very reasonable to expect BC Housing and Victoria Cool-Aid to come back to the table with a plan that involves less human density and more livability for residents. If that truly isn't financially feasible with this building because of the challenges that physically come along with it, then BC Housing should simply considering selling this property and go find a building or property that actually is suitable for a better plan then what they are currently proposing. When it comes to reducing homelessness I would have much more faith in slower to be realized solutions that stick vs fast approaches that fails. So again I implore you to show leadership and demand from BC Housing and Cool-Aid that we need better solutions than this brought forward to our community, because this is not just about the motives of BC Housing and The Victoria Cool-Aid Society... It's about us... all of us.

Thank You,

Dimitri Demers
201-1013 Vancouver St
Victoria, BC
V8V 3V9

Alicia Ferguson

From: Public Hearings
Subject: RE: Zoning of Mount Edwards Court

From: Denise
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2017 12:22 PM
To: Public Hearings <PublicHearings@victoria.ca>
Subject: Zoning of Mount Edwards Court

Please see the message below from two Cathedral School parents. I agree that the homeless should definitely not be housed here. Maybe a seniors residence?

The city is destroying our neighbourhood. It would be awful if the Christ Church Cathedral school, like others before it, had to close due to homelessness, mental health and drug issues.

Sincerely,
Denise Dalphy
4-1065 Collinson Street
Victoria BC V8V 3B9

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Samantha Stone**
Date: Fri, Oct 6, 2017 at 7:47 PM
Subject: Public Hearing for the zoning of Mount Edwards Court - [Thursday October 12th, 6:30 pm](#)
To:

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 12th 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, 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.

Lacey Maxwell

From: carolesmall [REDACTED]
Sent: October 11, 2017 5:12 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed Rezoning of Mt. Edwards Court on Vancouver St

Dear Mayor and Council.

It is with great disappointment that I write this letter regarding your proposed rezoning for Mt. Edwards Court on Vancouver Street. My disappointment arises from the lack of vision and understanding on your part of the complexities of the needs of the population that you propose to “warehouse” in Mt. Edwards Court. And also, of the lack of empathy for the neighbourhoods that have been so devastated by the City’s and the Province’s past and proposed actions.

We all acknowledge that the drug, mental health and homeless challenges in Victoria and many other centres are enormous. But warehousing those problems has never been the solution (look no further than the Johnson Street facility), and more enlightened cities have long ago abandoned that approach. Any social planning, mental health, housing or addictions specialist in any country will confirm that the related social costs of such a short sighted approach has been and continues to be devastating in the long term for both the occupants and the neighbourhoods and cities where they are located.

There are some positive and successful models of facilities that offer support for people who need referrals to services (mental, drug and physical) services, training opportunities and other services. They also provide an opportunity for those people to integrate into and be supported by the community where they are located. But that can only occur if the numbers are not so overwhelming for the people who actually live in those communities. A great example of such a model is Anawim House in the North Park Neighbourhood.

I live on the 1000 block of Pandora just east of Our Place. Our Place started out as a manageable and helpful facility for the homeless, but they (and we) are now struggling to deal with the overwhelming numbers of drug addicted, mental health and other problems that are going nowhere. Most of the people who frequent Our Place are looking for support and help, and they’re spilling out onto the streets and boulevards. Regretfully, Our Place is no longer able to cope with the increasing number and array of difficult people who have nowhere else to go. And the neighbours (I would be one of them) and the police are also struggling to deal with the increasing fallout from the problematic behaviours of those people. We are not supportive of the warehousing model. It destroys the people who need the help and the neighbourhoods where they are warehoused. I know you’ve had feedback from the police. Please listen to them, and to us, the neighbours in these neighbourhoods.

Any research into the issues of homelessness, drug addiction, mental, and other health problems is very clear. Overcrowding is not only unhelpful, but devastating, not only to those who need the help but to the neighbourhoods where they’re located. The crime stats and social problems multiply.

Let Anawim House be a model for the City of Victoria, and the Province, in its efforts to deal with these problems. Provide, partner with, and fund smaller, more manageable facilities with dedicated supports, and referrals to supports, that give the people who need the help access to the services they need. And most importantly, provide these people with an opportunity to heal in and become part of a healthy community, not a war zone.

Didn’t you look to Europe for your cycling lanes model? Try and resist the quick fix in favor of more enlightened and successful models that actually work for everyone. The investment in time and money will pay big dividends for those who need help the most.

If you're looking to create another Vancouver East Side, by all means, continue on the path you're currently embarking on. We would all have expected and hoped for more informed and compassionate action from our civic leaders.

Carole Small

Lacey Maxwell

From: Donna Longley [REDACTED]
Sent: October 12, 2017 12:51 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); malto@vicotira.ca; Opmadoff@victoria.ca; Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Mount Edwards Court Rezoning Proposal

Dear Mayor and Council,

Given the recent court decision regarding the recent Residential Tenancy Branch decision allowing residents of the former Central Care Home at 844 Johnson Street, the right to have friends and family stay overnight, any guarantees of age restrictions, no drug use, and vetting for mental disorders, could likely become illegal. The age restriction would need to be changed to 55 plus because the Residential Tenancy Act does not recognize 50 plus as a legal designate age group for housing.

The VAT score tool promised by Cool-Aid would also be a problem as it is currently before the courts as a human rights violation, against the Residential Tenancy Act.

The same with restricting drug use on site as that would be a human rights violation as well.

The promises made by Cool Aid to the school are being challenged by the courts and any guarantees of safety for the children will vanish once Cool Aid and BC Housing receive their rezoning approval.

Please do not approve the rezoning until these challenges have been determined as it will make all the difference for the future of the school. The school needs to have a legal covenant on file with the City to ensure it's future. Families are leaving the school much like they did at the former St. Andrews elementary school on Pandora, because they fear for the safety of their children.

Children and families and the many seniors who live in the Fairfield neighbourhood cannot risk suffering the same fate as the neighbourhood near the former Central Care Home has experienced. Cool Aid and the Portland Housing Association are not equipped to safely manage large numbers of hard to house people. These organizations need to employ more people and have better security systems in place before they can assure the safety for all residents living in those neighbourhoods.

Sincerely,

Donna Longley
1343 Slater Street
Victoria BC V8X 2P8
[REDACTED]

October 12, 2017

RE: Mt Edwards - Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (N. 114) - No. 17-092

To Mayor & Council,

I am writing this letter as a life long resident of Victoria that has watched the city change and grow for better and worse since I was a child, and I have spent the majority of my adult years living in the downtown area. I'm also someone who has contributed immensely to the cultural landscape of Victoria, and who cares deeply about this community. I'm also someone who has experienced addictions and homelessness first hand. As a child my father struggled with multiple addictions and periodic homelessness. I lost a girlfriend when I was younger to a crystal meth addiction, and she also experienced homelessness. During my lifetime I have also dealt with the death of a number of friends due to addictions. This has left me with a compassionate, but realistic perspective on these issues. I'm also a very concerned direct neighbor of the Mount Edwards Court building at 1002 Vancouver Street, and I trust you will listen and consider what I have to say.

It is obvious and unfortunate that Victoria is currently faced with a significant degree of homelessness amongst it's population. I commend the city council and mayor of Victoria for their attempts so far to face these challenges and show leadership on this issue. Therefore I would hope that for the sake of leadership the current mayor and council will take a very critical look at the current proposal for Mount Edwards and decide if they believe old problems can be solved by old and highly questionable approaches such as this, or if old problems require a better approach than what the province and Cool-Aid are currently offering in this instance. What Cool-Aid and The Province are offering isn't much more than "X" number of bleak units of SRO housing that will park and hide homelessness. This won't allow people to flourish, transform and move towards their own autonomy. SRO housing simply does not work in the long term. I don't want to spend this letter arguing the statistics and examples of this. Instead I want you to consider that we as community can't allow the issue of homelessness to be reduced to a numbers game based around political appearances and how to fit the highest density of people in the smallest spaces possible at the least expense to the province while providing the most profits possible to contracted services providers. We need to encourage approaches that are more effective than this, and far more livable than this. Approaches that allow people to move away from institutions and towards better futures. We also need to encourage strategies to keep people from becoming homeless in the first place. Therefore I support maximizing the number of livable affordable rental units for those 50+ years of age that could be constructed inside of Mt Edwards, while eliminating or minimizing the number of smaller un-livable supportive units that might be constructed there. The need for affordable rental housing in Victoria for the elderly is a glaring issue for this segment of our population and is the type of housing that can prevent people from becoming homeless to begin. Affordable housing would also be a better fit for this neighborhood. A neighborhood composed of two playgrounds, the YMCA, a church, a school, a large population of seniors, residential condos and neighbors. An historical neighborhood that should be celebrated and protected.

I also am very concerned that the recent ruling from the Residential Tenancy Board regarding tenant rights at Central Care Home, means that BC Housing and Cool-Aid

may not even be able to stick to their stated claims regarding the make up of people housed at Mt Edwards and the policies they claim they are intending to put into place. Regardless of this ruling I'm doubtful that Cool-Aid's screening procedures for prospective tenants are adequate and take into consideration how it's tenants could impact the surrounding neighbourhood. I also question how conditions placed on tenants such as no hard drug use can be enforced without infringing on their rights to privacy?

Ultimately the idea of warehousing people in SRO housing is a recipe for depression, low self esteem . Why do you think the former population of Mt Edwards was moved out of that building? Obviously because better, much more healthier options were created for them. If people can't be happy, then they can't be expected to be healthy. While potential future residents of supported housing units at Mount Edwards might be "lucky enough" to get new bathroom sinks and a bit of lead-free paint or something, they're still essentially going to get put into the same tiny little rooms that sucked the life out of previous residents. The Victoria Cool Aid Society does not appear to me to truly care about the residents of it's facilities, nor the neighbourhoods surrounding their facilities. This is a lousy opportunistic approach, as it is obviously about business, numbers, and nothing else. Other organizations in Victoria like Pacifica Housing have created supported housing that is forward thinking, creative and livable. This is the type of vision that needs to be encouraged and supported, rather than treating vulnerable people as nothing more than clustered sources of revenue from provincial contracts. The proposal for Mt Edwards is archaic and Victoria needs to be aggressively looking to the future if it is to thrive. The idea of people essentially "living in closets and eating downstairs at the soup kitchen" is just lame and cynical. We are not living in Victorian England, and we do not need modern versions of poor houses. People deserve more personal space, autonomy and safety than this scenario would afford, and I certainly think it would be very reasonable to expect BC Housing and Victoria Cool-Aid to come back to the table with a plan that involves less human density and more livability for residents. If that truly isn't financially feasible with this building because of the challenges that physically come along with it, then BC Housing should simply considering selling this property and go find a building or property that actually is suitable for a better plan then what they are currently proposing. When it comes to reducing homelessness I would have much more faith in slower to be realized solutions that stick vs fast approaches that fails. So again I implore you to show leadership and demand from BC Housing and Cool-Aid that we need better solutions than this brought forward to our community, because this is not just about the motives of BC Housing and The Victoria Cool-Aid Society... It's about us... all of us.

Thank You,

Dimitri Demers
201-1013 Vancouver St
Victoria, BC
V8V 3V9

Lacey Maxwell

From: Betsy Nuse [REDACTED]
Sent: October 12, 2017 9:40 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Rezoning of 1002 Vancouver Street

Dear mayor and council

It is not possible for me to attend this evening's council meeting, but I would like to register with you one more voice in support of the proposed rezoning of Mount Edwards Court. I live in this neighbourhood and would welcome more supportive housing as well as affordable rental units where I live.

Most sincerely

Betsy Nuse
#303 - 1025 Fairfield Road
Victoria

Lacey Maxwell

From: Steve Kleinschmidt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: October 12, 2017 9:20 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Rezoning of Mount Edwards Court - wrong approach, wrong location

Affordable housing is a major problem in the City of Victoria. This is a fact and must be acknowledged. However, the provision of transitional and affordable housing must be done within the context of a supportable strategy that appropriately locates options as opposed to the haphazard approach currently adopted. Mount Edwards Court has served its purpose on an emergency basis but should not be transitioned as a long term solution. This is the wrong approach at the wrong location. As a resident in the vicinity with children who formerly attended Cathedral School, I am opposed to the re-zoning and the approach is hypocritical. You enacted a by-law that prohibits a cannabis dispensary from being within 200 metres of a school. This re-zoning puts a far more concerning situation less than 25 metres from a school with evidence of injected drug use and distressing behaviour from residents of and visitors to Mount Edwards Court on the grounds of the school and in surrounding areas. To assume that these problems can be appropriately mitigated, with even more residents at Mount Edwards Court, is naive and irresponsible.

Mayor and Council need to develop a strategic zoning approach to the homelessness and affordable housing issue. Your reactive approach will ultimately create more problems than you are attempting to solve.

Steve Kleinschmidt
522 Quadra St

Lacey Maxwell

From: ANDREW BECKERMAN <[REDACTED]>
Sent: October 11, 2017 12:37 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Kathy Stinson
Subject: please say "yes" to mt edward rezoning

dear mayor and council, i am sorry that i will be out of town thursday evening and unable to attend the rezoning hearing for mt edward. i urge you to approve the application despite what appears to me to be neighbourhood hysteria about the residence and it's residents.

i have read months' worth of minutes from community meetings and complaints from neighbours of the building and parents and staff at the cathedral school. there are always comments about "loitering". until recently i would purposely bicycle by the area to see "loiterers" . despite claims to the contrary , i have never seen a one. the only "loiterers" appear to be security staff.

parents who are complaining, unlike the residents of mt edward, generally do not actually live in the neighbourhood .they have come from away to enroll their children in a private school and do not live in the community. a year ago the complaints had more reality vis a vis folks that were living in the tent encampment rather than people who were fortunate to receive a roof over their heads when the province stepped in and purchased mt edward. given the ongoing need for supportive housing it would be inappropriate for you not to approve this application which will allow mt edward to be used to it's full potential. it is an opportunity to provide stability to some of our most vulnerable and disadvantaged neighbours.

thanks for your consideration

andrew beckerman