

Janice Appleby

From: Lynn Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 3:18 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Cc: Janice Appleby
Subject: Oliphant development proposal

Dear City of Victoria,

As a resident of Fairfield/Cook St Village, I am deeply troubled by the Oliphant development proposal for our neighbourhood.

It is essential that there finally be a proper community review of this proposal in the form of a CALUC meeting, before this is able to proceed.

My personal concerns echo those of many but I will be specific and speak to these particular issues.

There is no place for any commercial development south of Oliphant, as has been established. The thought of a McDonald's or another corporate chain in our village would be the death knell for the place we have come to love as our unique little oasis of understated charm.

Green space is an essential concern for any new development that bridges the village with Beacon Hill Park. This transition must include visual perspective south towards the ocean and maintain the treeline and walkable space inherent in the present village design.

The design and materials must be chosen to blend easily with the present structures and not be a continuation of the recent appearance of cold and modern stone/wood/metal/glass that seems to be more prevalent in new designs in Victoria.

And finally, we must be cautious not to eliminate present affordable housing units with more upscale real estate. Even though this proposal purports to offer 9 rental units as opposed to all condos, this does not imply that they will be "affordable", or in a price range that ensures the mixed income inclusive neighbourhood that has to now existed.

This is certainly an area of "special significance", primarily to those of us who call Cook St Village home and to those who come for the coffee and stay for the ambiance. Please join with us in partnership to collaborate on the kind of future we envisage here.

Sincerely,
Lynn Taylor

Janice Appleby

From: Karen Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 3:16 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca; Janice Appleby
Subject: Cook and Oliphant Planning

A week today, on the 29th of October the Cook and Oliphant development proposal will go before the City's Planning and Land Use Committee and they may vote on sending the proposal to Public Hearing, which is the last step in the approval process. We still need a Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) meeting for a proper community review of this proposal that could forever change the Cook Street Village.

If there is ever a time to write mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca cc jappleby@victoria.ca **NOW IS THE TIME.**

Sometimes it is more effective to write the mayor or councillors individually, in which case it's their first initial and their last name @victoria.ca (i.e. c.coleman@victoria.ca) and cc jappleby@victoria.ca **she will make sure it gets attached to the Planning and Land Use Committee agenda.** SUBJECT: Cook and Oliphant. In this email we are trying to demonstrate the need for a meeting in our community where we can learn more about the proposal and provide the appropriate feedback to the developer and council.

Your email can take one or several approaches as to why you feel a new CALUC meeting is needed, here are some suggestions:

1. The more questions we present, the more likely council will tell the applicant to go back and speak to the community. So pick one or several topics and ask several questions. A list of items you might want answers for: PARKING - SETBACKS - NO COMMERCIAL ZONING SOUTH OF OLIPHANT - LOADING ZONES - GEOTECHNICAL SURVEY - BOULEVARD TREES - GREEN SPACE LEEDS CERTIFICATION OTHER GREEN FEATURES - TYPE OF BUSINESSES (McDonald's?) - BLASTING - BARBEQUES ON BALCONIES - AFFORDABLE HOUSING - REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING HOUSING - ROOFTOP LOUNGE - DESIGN - MATERIALS TO BE USED -
2. 99.8% of the 15,825 people living in Fairfield and Gonzales have not had the proposed six-storey development for Cook and Oliphant presented to them. The vast majority of these people are not aware that the plans exist on the city's website and if they were, it is highly unlikely they would be able to understand all the details and impacts it may have. So how can they possibly make any kind of informed decision or offer alternatives to the proponent or to council? The best that can happen under these circumstances is to "react" to both the project and the process.
3. We want to work with the proponent, staff and council to find a respectful resolution, but we need to be respectfully included in the discussion. The Cook Street Village is designated a Development Permit Area, a designation put forth by the province and implemented by the city to identify areas of "special significance." Is this designation for developers, council, staff? Should we the residents not be given the same consideration?
4. The proposed development is also in a transition zone going from a village to the neighbouring park. Where in the current design is this being respected or the transition being acknowledged? If anything the total opposite is taking place. No setbacks, increased height and double the density.
5. Here is a list of other reasons to request another Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) meeting. The first meeting held in December, 2014 was not held in accordance to the rules of City of Victoria Development Application, CALUC Policy and other Community Association Documents.

- The person who chaired the meeting resigned from the FGCA Board and the Planning & Zoning Committee in October. There was nobody from the Community Association present, as is required.

- CALUC Policy, Section 4; requires there to be at least three members of the committee to help educate the public in making informed decisions. The CALUC was operating with only one member, who was not present at the meeting.
- City of Victoria Development Application lists the documents the proponent is required to bring to the meeting. There was no documentation brought to the meeting nor was there any left behind.
- There are 15,825 people in Fairfield and Gonzales, 35 people were present. That equals one fifth of one percent of the residents. The rest of us must be given the opportunity to be heard and informed at a new meeting in the community.

Janice Appleby

From: Nicole Chaland [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2015 9:05 AM
To: Chris Coleman (Councillor)
Cc: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca; Janice Appleby
Subject: request for a CALUC (re: 220 Cook Street)

October 23, 2015

Nicole Chaland

1148 Chapman Street

Victoria, BC

V8V 2T6

Councillor Chris Coleman

Fairfield Neighbourhood Liaison

c/o 1 Centennial Square

Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Email: ccoleman@victoria.ca

Re: Request for a CALUC meeting regarding 220 Cook Street

Dear Councilor Chris Coleman:

I would like to request your support for a CALUC meeting for the proposed Cook and Oliphant Street rezoning project as requested by the Fairfield Gonzales Community Association (FGCA) on August 7, 2015. Click [here](#) to view the request.

I live at 1148 Chapman Street, which is ½ block away from the site of the proposal and – according to Google Maps – 190 metres away from 220 Cook Street. I have only learned about this proposal very recently. I have also recently learned that there was an initial CALUC meeting on December 15, 2014 that I was not notified of.

I am in the process of familiarizing myself with all the rules and terminology, and it seems that there may be a reasonable argument or procedural requirement for residents within 200 metres to be notified of CALUC meetings for significant proposals such as this.

Regardless, I live seven houses away from this proposed development. It represents a significant change in use, building form and natural ecology and I would like an opportunity to ask questions in a public meeting before forming an opinion.

Some of my questions are:

- - What have the historical rents been in the rental houses and apartments that will be removed? How many units have historically been rented here?
- - What will the rents be in the new units? How many units will be rented and at what rates? Are rental rates protected into the future?
- - What protections and limitations exist for the types of businesses? I.e. Can Macdonalds or Dairy Queen move in here?
- - How will this change the fabric, texture and character of the neighbourhood?
- - How will this building affect people's health – both those who live in it and those who walk around it?
- - Are there any risks to our neighbourhood economy, such as property taxes and rents increasing beyond what local incomes can afford?
- - Are there any risks to our relationships such as loss of neighbourliness, familiarity and the 'slowness' with which we stroll through the village currently encouraged by our built environment?
- - Are there any risks to our natural ecology such as loss of trees, sky, birds, critters, dirt, loss of open space and increased run-off?
- - What are the carbon emissions associated with this building?

Therefore, I urge City Council to dedicate resources to promote and facilitate a CALUC meeting on the 220 Cook St. development proposal.

Thank you for all you do to make Victoria a truly wonderful place to live!

Sincerely,

Nicole Chaland

Cc: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca; jappleby@victoria.ca

Janice Appleby

From: arlene carson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2015 3:39 PM
To: Janice Appleby
Cc: ajcarson@shaw.ca
Subject: Request for addition to Oct 29 Planning and Land Use Cttee agenda
Attachments: Oct 22-15-Carson letter to Council.docx

Hello Ms. Appleby,

I have sent the letter below to Mayor Helps and all City of Victoria Councillors (also attached)

I'd appreciate it if you can add it to the October 29, 2015 agenda for the meeting of the Planning and Land Use Committee.

Thank you !

Kind regards,
Arlene (Carson)

To: Mayor Lisa Helps

October 22, 2015

Re: Development Proposal (1041 Oliphant, & 220, 216/214, 212 Cook St.)

Honourable Mayor:

I urge Council to honour the August 7 request of the Fairfield Gonzales Community Association (FGCA) for a proper CALUC meeting with regard to the above proposal.

I attended the initial CALUC meeting on Dec 15, 2014. In a previous letter I wrote to council members (April 17), I outlined why that meeting did not meet City-designated protocol for CALUC meetings considering Development Proposals, in that:

- No plans were provided by the developer. The City's Development Application lists the documents a proponent is required to bring to a CALUC meeting. No documentation was brought to, nor left behind after the Dec 15 presentation. I know because I asked to see the plans and was told that they were not available.
- The meeting was not chaired or properly facilitated by a member of the Board of the FGCA. CALUC Policy (Section 4) requires there to be at least three members of the community association's planning committee to help educate the public in making informed decisions. In Dec. 2014, the FGCA CALUC was operating with only one member, who was not present at the meeting.
- Notices for the meeting were sent only to residents within 100 meters of the site (not 200 meters as required for Development Permit Areas, as is 220 Cook St). As a result, only 35 of over 15,000

Fairfield-Gonzales residents attended the Dec 15 presentation. In the ten months since that time there has been no neutral forum for community input and discussion.

Fairfield residents want to work respectfully with the proponent and City staff and council to provide feedback and constructive input on a proposal that will have a profound and wide-ranging impact on Cook St Village. To do this, residents deserve a valid community meeting to discuss the pros and cons of this proposal and have their questions answered. The meeting should be advertised by (i.e., notices sent by the City), chaired by, and properly facilitated by a neutral third party (this should be the CALUC), with minutes recorded and delivered to the City for consideration in decision-making.

Therefore, I urge City Council to dedicate resources to promote and facilitate a second community meeting in the near future on the 220 Cook St. development proposal.

Sincerely and with thanks for all you do to make Victoria great!

Arlene Carson, PhD, RAUD

Janice Appleby

From: Ted Relp [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 12:27 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Cc: [REDACTED]; Charlotte Wain
Subject: Comments on Development Proposal Cook and Oliphant

Comments concerning Development Proposal for 1041 Oliphant, 212-220 Cook Street

I am a recently arrived resident of Fairfield with a professional background in placemaking and urban landscape and design and I am very interested in the way in which Cook Street Village might be intensified. I hope these comments are in time to inform the Planning and Land Use Committee that will discuss this proposal at its meeting on 29 October.

I note first that this development proposal is the first for Cook Street Village under the guidelines of 2012 *OCP* that designate it as a Large Urban Village, and it will be a precedent for future intensification projects. Documents of record that might provide bases for assessing this proposal are, however, limited. *Design Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential and Commercial Buildings* provide general suggestions consistent with those in the *OCD*. *Cook Street Village Guidelines* for buildings (updated to 2003) offers some brief suggestions, as does the mostly CR-3M zoning in the commercial area of the Village. (This mixed-used development proposal is actually in what *Cook Street Village Guidelines* describe as the southern half of the Village, currently zoned R3-A2).

There is as yet no Local Area Plan (the process was recently initiated by the City) that would update the Cook Street Village Guidelines, and provide the sort of local detail about sense of place and placemaking that the *OCD* encourages.

In the absence of Local Area plan, and given the fact this proposal will serve as a precedent for future intensification projects, I do think is important that it be subjected to what otherwise might be an unusual degree of scrutiny in terms of how it will change the sense of place of Cook Street Village.

I have made some systematic observation about building heights, setbacks, and facades in Cook Street Village and on the basis of those my opinion is that the proposed development does not, to quote the first sentence of the *Design Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential and Commercial Buildings*, constitute a "design that responds to place character and local patterns of development." In other words, the proposal warrants some substantial revisions.

Context of Existing Height of Buildings in Cook Street Village.

The Development Area, as defined in the *OCP* Map 43, has 23 buildings fronting Cook Street. Of these, there are:

- 1 four storey buildings (adjacent to the development site)
- 6 three storey buildings
- 11 two storey buildings
- 6 one storey buildings.

There are a number of four storey apartments in the area around Cook Street Village and further north on Cook Street, but, with just one exception, Christ Church Cathedral is the closest building of five or more stories to this proposed development.

Height and Massing of Proposal

At a height of five storeys plus mechanical equipment, and with its long side to Cook Street, the proposed building will have by far the greatest massing in Cook Street Village. (Note: renderings of the proposed building show views looking south and along Oliphant, but the greatest impact will be looking north up Cook Street or directly across the street, for which no renderings are provided).

The *OCP* height guidelines for large urban villages indicate buildings “up to approximately 6 storeys,” a standard that already applies in Selkirk and VicWest, and is probably appropriate for the major arterial roads that run through Humber Green, Stadacona and Jubilee. It is less appropriate for Cook Street, Quadra and James Bay, where buildings of this scale will constitute a dramatic change to the urban form of commercial centres that have well-established histories and community identities associated with buildings mostly of three storeys or less. Intensification with buildings of up to four storeys would be more appropriate for the context of these three large urban villages.

The *Design Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential and Commercial Buildings* recommends variations in building height and massing, and while the proposed design has suggestions of this, in a building with this sort of bulk, even one at four storeys, the variations need to be much more pronounced in the otherwise relatively low-rise and varied context of Cook Street Village.

Setbacks at Street Level and Retail Frontages

The 23 buildings in Cook Street Village have 41 commercial frontages facing Cook (and a few more on adjacent streets) with a variety of setbacks. There are nine restaurants and cafes with setbacks sufficient for outdoor seating areas, and at least another seven businesses regularly use space in front of the stores for sidewalk displays.

The proposed development has very limited opportunities for such spill-out activities (it shows two benches and a water fountain).

The angled retail frontages in the proposed development have no equivalents in Cook Street Village and they extend to the sidewalk/property line. I suggest that these angles be eliminated and the setback proposed for Retail E and F, or something more generous and consistent with that for PrimaStrada and Serious Coffee in the Sutlej to Oliphant Block, be used for all the building. The greater setback will allow all stores to have some outside display space, which is clearly important in the pedestrian context of Cook Street Village.

Storefronts should be articulated and varied, for instance using different setbacks as suggested in Figures 9, 13 and 14 of the *OCP*.

I note that Retail E has almost no window display frontage, which seems very odd. (Incidentally the plan for the retail floor and the east elevation do not correspond. The plan shows a double door for Retail E and the elevation a single door)

The Cook Street Guidelines for the commercial zone recommend allowing additional space at pedestrian intersection points. The corner entrance to Retail F would be more effective if there is a larger open space at the corner of Oliphant and Cook.

The Cook Street Guidelines also call for linkages from rear yard parking to Cook Street by mid-block walkways. This would be appropriate in this case and would support the sort of articulation that the retail frontage warrants.

Setbacks at upper levels

The elevations for the proposed development show an almost solid wall rising four storeys from the sidewalk, with a minor setback for the fifth storey. Chapter 8 of the *OCP* indicates the importance of setbacks in large buildings for maintaining human scale for pedestrians. Figure 9 (in Chapter 6) and Figures 13 and 14 (Chapter 8) suggest that a setback at the fourth storey is generally appropriate. In Cook Street Village the newer two and three storey buildings (eg between Oscar and McKenzie, and Sutlej to Oliphant) have upper stories setback above the ground level. The current CR-3M zoning requires such setbacks

In this case, a stepback at the second or third storey at least equivalent to what is shown on the elevation for the Oliphant façade would be appropriate for the entire building.

New Pedestrian Crossing

The construction of this building will presumably necessitate a fourth pinch point and pedestrian crossing across Cook Street, partly for safety and partly to improve pedestrian access to the new stores.

I hope these comments are of some use to the Planning and Land Use Committee.

Sincerely

Edward Relph

70 Linden Ave

Victoria

Janice Appleby

From: Jamie Kyles [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 12:24 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca; Janice Appleby
Subject: Cook & Oliphant development proposal

Last week the mayor led a meeting with Fairfield residents at the Activity Center in Cook St village. One of the major issues of concern for the audience was the proposed "Cook & Oliphant" development, particularly when considered in the context of the current rather vague community planning guidelines and definitions of large and medium village centers therein. The mayor indicated that the weaknesses in the existing guidelines have been recognized by the city and, over the coming year, these guidelines would be reviewed and modified as appropriate - in particular to allow those communities wishing to have a greater impact on future development to do just that.

The primary concern with the captioned proposal is that, with the requested 6 storey height and modest setback from the street, it represents a significant step towards the "downtowning" of Cook St village (compared to the current profile which is dominated by 2 and 3 storey structures) and has come up for consideration before the above-mentioned guideline review has been completed. We are being pushed towards a situation where the residents of Fairfield will be worrying about closing the stable door long after the horse has gone!!

Thus it is of particular concern that the Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) meeting of Dec 2014 to review this proposal was conducted improperly. Specifically, and quite surprisingly to me, there was no documentation about the development provided to residents, so how on earth could the community be constructively engaged in discussion about the proposal??? Other issues which residents feel they deserve the opportunity to discuss directly with the developer at a CALUC meeting include: parking for residents, # of units dedicated to low income housing, setbacks from the street, green spaces and proper management of the transition between the commercial heart of the village and Beacon Hill Park to the south.

In my view it is inevitable (and desirable) that Cook St village be developed, but this should not be done in a way that leads to the "stealth downtowning" of this very pleasant area.

It is for these reasons that I believe **council should direct the developer to convene a second CALUC meeting with the community BEFORE this proposal is brought before council.** The residents of Fairfield have, effectively, been unable to offer any input to the proposal and the recommended meeting, properly convened, would provide such an opportunity.

Respectfully

James D Kyles P Eng, Sustainable Livelihoods Consultant

Janice Appleby

From: Merwan H. Engineer [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2015 9:05 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Cc: Janice Appleby
Subject: Cook and Oliphant -- Proposed new apartment

Dear Council,

A Public Hearing is needed explain the proposed new apartment complex for Cook and Oliphant. I am particularly concerned that there is a sufficient setback for the new building. The new building on Park Ave butts up against the street and is almost intimidating. It ruins the aesthetic of walking on that street.

There are a number of other issues which come to mind: height of the building, trees on the boulevard, commercial activity. I have lived on Cook for 20 years and regularly enjoy my walk to the village. The new building would seem to change the nature of the neighbourhood in a way that would stick out like a sore thumb.

Please vote for a Public Hearing.

Regards,

Merwan H. Engineer
16-159 Cook St
V8V 3W9

Janice Appleby

From: Terence Young [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 12:23 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Cook and Oliphant

Hello,

I live in the vicinity of the Cook Street Village and have done so for over 30 years. We have had our share of contentious developments in our time -- the pub, for example -- but we have always been consulted about implementing them. I have never heard of the Cook/Oliphant development, nor do I know what form it will take and what impact it will have on this special part of the city. I strongly recommend you reach out to the Fairfield Community Association to include them in this process.

Than you,

Terence Young
130 Moss Street

Janice Appleby

From: Christopher Petter [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 11:46 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: COOK and OLIPHANT development

Dear Mayor and Council,

Before the proposed development at Cook and Oliphant goes to a public hearing there should be a Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) meeting for a proper community review of this proposal that could forever change the Cook Street Village.

We have lived close to the Cook Street village for 36 years and are alarmed at the way this proposal has proceeded without the proper consultation with the Fairfield Community Association and residents. A six story building, without proper setbacks and with underground parking, in area which is at high risk of major earthquake damage in the event of a subduction earthquake, will not only destroy the ambience of the village but could also risk the lives of people in and around the building. We urge you strongly to delay this proposal going to a public hearing until after there has been a chance for proper community consultation.

We also advise you to, please, develop a proper community plan for Fairfield which limits development for what should be viewed as primarily a residential neighbourhood and not a commercial development area like downtown. This kind of ad hoc decision making on individual commercial/residential buildings should be a thing of past. Without a community plan for development we believe that rational and evidence-based community planning will be impossible.

Thanks you,

Chris Petter & Linda Roberts

Residents of 1220 McKenzie St., V8V 2W5

Janice Appleby

From: JENNIFER RIECKEN [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 6:46 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Cook and oliphant development

I am writing to express concern about the proposed development at Cook and Oliphant. I have grown up and still live in the Cook street village area. I have seen many changes to this area-all that have been able (for the most part) to maintain the integrity of a lovely neighbourhood village. I am concerned that this development will significantly change the Cook street village and that the neighbourhood has not been consulted. Also, there is not sufficient information known about the following:

- 1) impact of increased need for parking for new residents and their visitors
- 2) increasing commercial zoning area
- 3) impact on existing green spaces
- 4) knowledge about what kind of commercial businesses
- 5) decrease in affordable rental housing in the area

The cook street village is a vibrant area that is a place for locals as well as visitors from other neighbourhoods as well as tourists. It is vital to make changes that will maintain the special place it has become.

Thank you,

Jennifer

from my iPhone

Janice Appleby

From: webforms@victoria.ca
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 9:21 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Cook and Oliphant development in Cook St. Village

From: Judy Lightwater
Email : [REDACTED]
Reference : [REDACTED]
Daytime Phone : [REDACTED]
Dear Mayor and Council,

We want to work with the proponent, staff and council to find a respectful resolution, but we need to be respectfully included in the discussion. The Cook Street Village is designated a Development Permit Area, a designation put forth by the province and implemented by the city to identify areas of "special significance." Is this designation for developers, council, staff? Should we the residents not be given the same consideration?

4. The proposed development is also in a transition zone going from a village to the neighbouring park. Where in the current design is this being respected or the transition being acknowledged? If anything the total opposite is taking place. No setbacks, increased height and double the density.

We definitely need another Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC) meeting.

The first meeting held in December, 2014 was not held in accordance to the rules of City of Victoria Development Application, CALUC Policy and other Community Association Documents. The person who chaired the meeting resigned from the FGCA Board and the Planning & Zoning Committee in October. There was nobody from the Community Association present, as is required. CALUC Policy, Section 4; requires there to be at least three members of the committee to help educate the public in making informed decisions. The CALUC was operating with only one member, who was not present at the meeting. City of Victoria Development Application lists the documents the proponent is required to bring to the meeting. There was no documentation brought to the meeting nor was there any left behind.

Thank you,
Judy Lightwater

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The City of Victoria immediately by email at publicservice@victoria.ca. Thank you.

IP Address: 184.66.141.107

Janice Appleby

From: Karen Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 3:47 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca; Janice Appleby
Cc: Jeff Hunter-Smith
Subject: Cook and Oliphant Development proposal

Dear Mayor Helps and City Councillors,

I am writing to add my voice to the discussion of the development proposal for Cook and Oliphant Streets. As a home owner on Oliphant St. next to the Robbins parking lot, I am concerned about the speed with which this proposal process is rolling out.

To be frank, I have 3 main concerns:

I believe the 6 story height referred to in the new Community Plan is far too high. If you look at the surrounding buildings of 2 or perhaps 3 stories, it is out of character. This aspect of the plan should be something we all participate in deciding. I am not against development at all. I understand it is the right of landowners to develop their properties. I encourage the City to listen to the overwhelming numbers of residents in the Cook St. area who want to see a lower height restriction to maintain a "village" feel. There are many areas closer to downtown, or even closer to a larger thoroughfare such as Fort St or Fairfield Road that would be better locations for a building that tall.

Parking is a big concern for us on Oliphant. I've lived there for 16 years and at first there were no issues around parking. We gathered signatures to create a "residential only" parking zone several years later and as more commercial establishments open, the need for regulation has increased so quickly. I can't imagine with 80 new residences and all of the new commercial space planned how we will manage parking on Oliphant. As it is now, we call parking services to come out several times / day to deal with the people parked in front of our homes to "run in" for coffee etc. The flow is constant. Usually by the time the commissionaire arrives the car we called about has left but another has taken its place. For the past few years we have rented a parking spot from the city in the closed laneway beside our house for \$68 / month so that the elderly resident at our home can have easier access to her car. The one parking spot / condo ratio just doesn't work - as the disastrous development on Cook and Sutej has shown. What would work better is a smaller building that would not require so many people living and shopping there to park on the street.

Finally, I'm concerned about the amount of retail space available. There is still space in the Sutej / Cook development that have NEVER been leased. This is because it is far too expensive.

Perhaps everyone involved should be expected to recognize and respect the needs of each group. The City, by creating a plan that allows 6 story building in this location, is pandering to the developers and ignoring the residents. It has come up very quickly and the developers must be feeling wonderful that they're only suggesting what is allowed. I request that you slow down and extend the process of this plan to be sure it is the right thing. It's pretty hard to turn back and I believe it will be seen as a mistake.

Respectfully yours,
Karen Smith
1032 Oliphant

Janice Appleby

From: GORDON TELFORD [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 11:43 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Cook and Oliphant proposed development - letter of support

We recently purchased #4-1035 Oliphant Street.

As an immediate neighbor to the proposed 5 storey mixed use building, we write in support of this project at the corner of Cook St and Oliphant St.

We are encouraged to see projects like this in the vibrant Cook Street Village setting. What most impressed us about this particular neighbourhood is that most amenities one needs for day to day living are within walking distance. There is Beacon Hill Park, grocery stores, retail stores, restaurants, all within a short stroll away and the area has a true neighbourhood feel.

The proposed development provides for more amenities to residents already living in the area and it provides for more apartment/condo residences which are needed. The development faces Cook Street and as such does not disturb the more quiet residential streets of the area.

We believe that the additional retail and residential space this project provides for will contribute positively to the Cook Street Village area. We are definitely in support of this development proposal and hope that council will support the application for re-zoning.

Gordon & Anita Telford

Janice Appleby

From: Linda Cooney [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2015 10:04 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Cc: Janice Appleby
Subject: Cook and Oliphant Streets Development Proposal

Linda Cooney
1212 Oxford Street, Victoria, BC, V8V 2V5
[REDACTED]

October 24, 2015

Mayor and Council cc: J Appleby

I understand on the 29th of October the Cook and Oliphant development proposal will go before the City's Planning and Land Use Committee (CALUC) and they may vote on sending the proposal to Public Hearing, which is the last step in the approval process. As a neighbor and member of the Fairfield Gonzales Community Association (FGCA), I believe we still need a proper FGCA Land Use Committee (CALUC) meeting for a community review of the proposal that could forever change the Cook Street.

The first meeting for the development proposal was held in December 2014 and was not held in accordance to the rules of City of Victoria Development Application, CALUC Policy and other Community Association Documents. The person who chaired the meeting resigned from the FGCA Board and the Planning & Zoning Committee in October 2014. There was nobody from the FGCA present, as is required. Also, of the 15,825 residents in Fairfield and Gonzales, only 35 (99.8%) were present, which is one fifth of one percent.

- CALUC Policy, Section 4 requires there to be at least three members of the FGCA Planning & Zoning Committee to help educate the public in making informed decisions. The CALUC was operating with only one member, who was not present at the meeting. Clearly the residential turnout suggests many residents were not educated and informed, about the development proposal.
- The City of Victoria Development Application lists the documents the proponent is required to bring to the meeting. There was no documentation brought to the meeting nor was there any left behind.

More of the 99.8% of the residents must be informed of the development proposal and given the opportunity to be heard at a new meeting. The vast majority of us who were not present were completely unaware of the development proposal until last April and many are still unaware of the impact the development proposal will have on the Village.

I am most concerned about the parking and setback variances. The City seems to provide parking variances for developers' contributions toward affordable housing, i.e. money. While we would like to believe more people are not using private vehicles, many new residents are and already traffic on Cook Street is showing signs of future pattern resembling Denman Street in Vancouver. As well, setback variances seem to be provided to developers to enhance their profit. If Oak Bay stands by their Community Plan around variances, why doesn't Victoria? As well, more commercial space in the Cook Street Village is not at all needed, since similar space is still unsubscribed many years after the last large development on Cook Street.

What I would like to see is the developer, City Staff and Council and as residents find a respectful resolution. Residents need to be included in the discussion. The Cook Street Village is designated a Development Permit Area, a designation put forth by the province and implemented by the City to identify areas of "special significance." Let us all---developers and residents as well as visitors, benefit from this designation.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janice Appleby

From: Crin Roth [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 1:47 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca; Janice Appleby; Chris Coleman (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor); Pam Madoff (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: Cook and Oliphant

I respectfully urge you to NOT approve the Rezoning Application for 1041 Oliphant Ave. and 212-220 Cook St. from the R3-A2 Zone (Low Profile Multiple Dwelling District) to a site specific zone in order to increase the density and allow commercial uses at this location.

"Under the current R3-A2 zone (Low Profile Multiple Dwelling District) the property could be developed at a density of 1.2:1 FSR and three storeys." (Existing Site Development and Development Potential , p.3 of 8, Planning and Land Use Committee Report for the meeting of October 29, 2015)

The proposal IS consistent with the OCP which designates the property as Large Urban Village but the application is NOT consistent with the Suburban Neighbourhoods Plan as it relates to density. (Executive Summary p.2 of 8 Planning and Land Use Committee Report for the meeting of October 29, 2015)

With respect to the Suburban Neighbourhoods Plan, scale is intended to have the appropriate height to its surroundings. This includes three storeys for sites bordering low-profile buildings and four storeys for most other sites. ... The intent when the OCP was adopted in 2012 was that Local Area Plans would be brought into alignment with the OCP over time through amendments and more up to date Local Area Plans (OCP policy 19.2)

THE SUBURBAN NEIGHBOURHOODS PLAN REMAINS IN EFFECT IN THE INTERIM.

(Suburban Neighbourhood Plan, p.6 of 8, Planning and Land Use Committee Report for the meeting of October 29, 2015)

The proposed development of five storeys is in a transition zone going from the village to the neighbouring park. If the ground level commercial use is not approved, the four proposed storeys above this level could drop down and the village would then have a four storey development that much more reflects the character of Cook Street Village and would have the same density as the proposed development of 5 storeys with commercial.

The loss of six units of commercial as is planned is not a huge sacrifice when the Village currently has adequate businesses. If not approved it will certainly lessen the car and foot traffic, the parking difficulty and the delivery trucks that will add to the congestion on this corner.

I would ask that Council consider the Alternate Motion: that Council decline Rezoning Application at 1041 Oliphant Ave. and 212-220 Cook St.
(p. 7 of 8, Planning and Land Use Committee Report for the meeting of October 29, 2015.

Sincerely,
Crin Roth
1018 Oliphant Ave.

Janice Appleby

From: Anne Russo [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 4:21 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Development Proposal at Cook Street and Oliphant Avenue

re: Development Proposal at Cook Street and Oliphant Avenue
2015

October 26,

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

Please support Fairfield residents' request to hold a new community meeting under the auspices of the Fairfield Gonzales Community Association CALUC committee, to review and reassess the merits of the development proposal at Cook Street and Oliphant Avenue.

This is an opportunity to resolve differences of opinion and to bridge the acknowledged gap between the OCP and existing planning guidelines by doing things differently. Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Anne Russo

1017 Oliphant Avenue
Victoria BC V8V 2T9
[REDACTED]

Janice Appleby

From: Norm Tatlow [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 1:04 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Fairfield - Cook St Development - Need a proper public review !!

To Victoria Mayor and Council.

Please take good note that there has not been any kind of proper public consultation and hearing process regarding the specific development proposal for Cook and Oliphant that is being reviewed and decided now. Process has been avoided and skirted so far in the view of the public! Also there is need for a robust long term plan and review process.

Please do the right thing.

Our trust is in our elected officials.

Norm Tatlow

Fairfield

Janice Appleby

From: webforms@victoria.ca
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2015 7:22 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Mayor and Council email

From: Jane Mertz
Email : [REDACTED]
Reference : [REDACTED]
Daytime Phone : [REDACTED]
Dear Mayor and Council

The proposal development at Cook and Oliphant needs more community input. I am not against new housing but I am against the creeping height escalation in the village. Also, why is commercial space being allowed south of Oliphant towards the park. Is there not a requirement to preserve transition space towards the park? I understand that no set backs are being considered - Abstract has done this in Oak Bay and it is not acceptable for the Cook Street Village. Where will the green space be in front of the building? Will there be blasting at this site to allow for the underground parking - blasting and old houses don't really go together, there will be cracks in people's foundations after that on the type of ground it's being built on. As for more commercial space, I personally don't see what can be added to the village for services. It would be interesting to see what the business owners think of more retail space in the area. I know the planners are keen on more commercial space for tax purposes but at what cost? I would like to see another community meeting to see more of how these issues can be addressed prior to approval.

Kind regards,
Jane

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The City of Victoria immediately by email at publicservice@victoria.ca. Thank you.

IP Address: 96.54.182.73