

Janice Appleby

From: Wayne Hollohan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 10:57 AM
To: Janice Appleby
Subject: WHY a CALUC MEETING for Cook & Oliphant is necessary

WHY a CALUC MEETING for Cook & Oliphant is necessary

- Didn't even know Density Bonus was permitted outside of downtown. There has been ZERO discussion on this topic, anywhere, anytime, let alone about **amenities**.
- 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.
- 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 at the very least equal opportunity consideration and information?
- Attended the proponents Open House and there was "**no data table**" present, just images and technical drawings

SO WHAT ABOUT

PARKING >>> how many is required, how many is being provided, type and how many, commercial, residential, visitor, above and below ground spaces, street parking

SETBACKS >>>> required setbacks provided, where and how much

COMMERCIAL >>>> unites and size

LOADING ZONES >>>> where and times

GEOTECHNICAL SURVEY >>>> has it been done and what are the results given the location

BOULEVARD TREES >>>> where and how many will be removed and where and how many will be preserved

LIQUOR LICENCE >>>> will it be zoned for one

GREEN SPACE, LEEDS CERTIFICATION & OTHER GREEN FEATURES >>>> what can they tell you about this

TYPE OF BUSINESSES >>>> McDonald's?

LANEWAY >>>> who owns it and what happen to it

BLASTING >>>> will it be required

BARBEQUES, BIKES AND OTHER S STUFF ON BALCONIES >>>> will this be permitted.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITES >>>> how many and size, if we are losing four three bedroom and three two bedroom rentals. Will we get back the same size and number of bedroom units

REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING HOUSING >>>> will it be in this community, if not why not

DESIGN >>>> it just looks like a square block, is that what it is

ROOFTOP LOUNGE AND OR GARDEN >>> will the rooftop become usable space

MATERIALS >>>> to be used in the construction

These are just a few questions I have and I'm reasonably knowledgeable on the topic

IT IS VERY IMPORTANT SHOULD ANOTHER CALUC MEETING BE REQUESTED - THAT YOU RESPECTFULLY ATTEND SO YOU TOO CAN MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION

Wayne Hollohan
15 Cook St. Victoria

Janice Appleby

From: webforms@victoria.ca
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:14 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Mayor and Council email

From: Barbara Edwards
Email : [REDACTED]
Reference : [REDACTED]
Daytime Phone : [REDACTED]
Honorable Mayor and Councillors,

Thank you for taking on the daunting task of navigating the future of Victoria.

Please consider two requests; 1 submitting the following letter (this may have been sent already) and 2. kindly helping me come up to speed with concerns within my community.

+++++

1. Dear Councilor Coleman and Development Services staff, The purpose of this letter is to request your support in calling a second CALUC meeting for the proposed Cook and Oilphant re-zoning project.

This request comes from the Fairfield-Gonzales Community Association (FGCA) Board of Directors, the Association's Planning and Zoning Committee (CALUC), and Association senior staff. To date we have held off requesting a second CALUC meeting, primarily, until revised plans submitted by the developer were available. We are also aware that such revised plans were shown at a recent Open House (arranged by the developer), and to which various groups have estimated that between 200-300 people attended over the course of the event.

Over the last several months, the FGCA has consistently continued to hear feedback and interest from the community as to this project, and the numbers of people showing such interest has only seemed to increase. Indeed, the numbers who showed up for the developer's Open House are a far cry from the approx 35 people who attended our (first) December CALUC meeting. In addition, we have had 20-40 people show up for several of our recent Board meetings, solely in the hopes that discussion of this project would be on our agenda (which, unfortunately, was not possible in a format that would have provided a full exchange of information and viewpoints). And, the FGCA continues to receive many calls and emails from the community for the Association to host a second CALUC meeting as soon as possible. Furthermore, the first CALUC meeting for this project, held in December 2014, continues to receive critical community feedback as to: (1) being poorly timed within the busy holiday season, and so many potentially interested parties were unavailable or away; (2) being not publicized widely enough as, given the size and nature of the proposed project, a 100m notification distribution was insufficient to encompass enough of the potentially impacted parties; and (3) the presentation and documentation provided at the meeting were not complete as to the norms specified for such meetings. And, with hindsight, we agree with these concerns raised by the community.

And, given that the revised project plans are now in hand, and notwithstanding the showing of these plans at the recent Open House, we do not feel that the developer's Open House provided a sufficient venue for the community to openly voice their thoughts, nor to properly measure and collate public commentary, and to which the City could review and evaluate such commentary.

Therefore and for all the above stated reasons, the FCGA strongly requests the calling of a second CALUC meeting with a 200m notification radius.

August 7, 2015

We believe this request is timely and supports the ever-expanding community interest in this development. A second CALUC meeting would also: (1) provide an appropriate forum to have the development proposal presented in its entirety, and have information clarified if need be; (2) give the community the opportunity to voice their questions and or comments in a neutral setting; and

(3) subsequently provide this information to City Planning and Mayor and Council, to assist in their evaluation of this project. Approving this request would also support a core mandate of the FGCA (and through it, it's CALUC): to always be supportive in providing opportunities for the open exchange of information (and discussion) on topics of importance to our community.

Subject to your supporting this request, our intent is to hold this second meeting in September (when community and committee members have returned from holidays), as well as have no other projects on the agenda to ensure sufficient time for all voices to be heard.

Given the wide interest amongst our community for his project, we would also welcome the attendance of our Council liaison and, possibly, other City staff, subject to their availability.

We would add that, to date, we have very much appreciated the willingness of the developer to participate in communications about this project and, therefore, would hope the developer would see a second CALUC meeting as a (further) opportunity to provide information and generate community support.

We look forward to a favourable response to our request, upon which we will schedule a suitable date and location for the meeting.

Thank you for your understanding in this matter.

Doug Tolson, Vice-President, FGCA Board of Directors
Joan Kotarski, Executive Director, FGCA
George Zador, Chair, FGCA CALUC

+++++

2) The concerns from Planning, the Developer and the Fairfield community regarding 1041 Oliphant Avenue, at the Corner of Cook Street in Fairfield.

The City Planning Department graciously wrote down the 14 by-law variances to be excluded, revised or created regarding the 1041 Oliphant Avenue Proposal.

I'm currently trying to understand and address all aspects of the Proposal, from the merchants, property owners and from the city.

The concerns that I am hearing, most often, regarding this matter is the vague definition for "Large Urban Village".

Last Sunday I took a moment to photograph the Village of Harris Green, downtown between Yates and View. The sunlight and vibrancy of this Village and how it addresses the immediate needs of the area, reflects and compliments your vision for an Urban Village.

1. Does this Village, in its current footprint and story height, define Large Urban Village?

2. Could we use this Village as a reference?

Concerns from others over the parking congestion for the Cook Street Village.

3. What are the current plans to address the continued increase in parking for the Cook Street Village?

4. Will there be parking structures placed just outside the Village area to address the growing parking requirement?

5. Will the parking structures be similar to the Village of Harris Green or larger?

(Upon speaking with Transportation "Uber" does not appear to be an alternative.)

The concerns regarding Parks, Coastal, Environmental or Transitional Corridors from the city to these sensitive areas?

6. Will the Green Space Corridor be maintained from Oscar Street to Dallas on the West Side of Cook?

7. Has an independent Geo-Tec Study been done to find alternatives for large structures to stand on the blue clay and peat moss in this area?

8. Has an independent study been done to determine the maximum weight load upon the blue clay and peat moss in this area?

Please, if possible and if still relevant, explain the concerns noted below:

9. When there is a sizeable omission or any substantial changes to a proposal, why is it not prudent to have another meeting within a community? Would this not produce a working guidelines for the developer?

10. Please suggest any questions or answers I could consider, making your planning responsibilities easier.

11. I would sincerely like to bridge relationships between the government, Merchants, Businesses, and Residents. It would be wonderful to have more rather than less, to weigh in and suggest positive ideas for growth that are also possible as well as practical.

Thank You So Very Kindly for Your Considerations,

Respectfully and Warmest Regards, Barbara Ann B. Edwards

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: 96.54.187.74

Janice Appleby

From: Jacinthe Tremblay [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 8:57 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

Dear Mayor and Council,

My husband, Gordon Clements, and myself are in full agreement with Mrs. Crin Roth's letter and we respectfully urge you to not approve the Rezoning Application for 1041 Oliphant Ave and 212-228 Cook Street from R3-A2 Zone to a site of specific zone in order to increase the density and allow commercial use at this location.

Cook Street Village is often referred to one of the "Jewels" of Victoria communities. This "Jewel" will be lost if you keep increasing the density and allow more commercial use. Cook street is not a "commercial strip" but a friendly, family oriented neighbourhood. The shops we do have stop at Oliphant and 100% residential use continues all the way to the ocean.

Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely

Jacinthe Tremblay and Gordon Clements
1026 Oliphant Ave
Victoria

Subject: Cook and Elephant
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 2015 13:47:21 -0700
From: Crin Roth [REDACTED]
To:

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.

