

MAYOR'S OFFICE

AUG 27 2015

VICTORIA, B.C.

City Hall
#1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC

Sept. 11, 2014

Mary E. Doody Jones
435 Kipling St.
Victoria, BC, V8S 3J9

A hearing on such a significant, large site and such a crowded development should not be held the last week of August (vacation time). Please turn this plan down or at least extend the hearing into September, so more can attend.

Re St. Andrews Site Development

Mayor and Council

This letter is about the proposed development for the St. Andrew's school site set up for a hearing tonight. This case involves a new policy of increasing density and height in the Blanshard St. area. It is important in applying general policy to specific areas to respect three aspects: possible heritage, density's affects on areas around and some relief of green areas and space.

In the case of what is at issue tonight, here are these points:

- 1) The school building is a landmark with an authentic style from the past and a history connected with the whole city and the Roman Catholic Church. The school seems heritage worthy, but would be lost. There are some buildings which have merit for themselves. The older main building could be adapted for new uses and have added new structures. Please consider this possibility. Once we lose a building, it is gone.
- 2) Councillor Young stated "The controversial part is that as the downtown expands, you will have areas where you have low density development right near newer higher density development" (Vic News Sept. 10). So this proposal will set the keynote as to how other proposals happen. The problems caused by heavy commercial use on a quiet residential street matter more than the policy of having commercial. That part can be fulfilled with something smaller.
- 3) In the midst of such new density and height-with more developments to follow in the area-is there enough real green space for respite and height closer to the streetscape? Developers' requests are often for the maximum for their financial reasons.

I have not written for a while, but am concerned about how these three aspects were apparently not fully met. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Doody Jones

Mary E. Doody Jones

The present plans contain the same problems as described above on Sept. 11, 2014. The fact that rental is included as well as "affordable" does not alone justify the problems. Reduce other parts on the plan.
August 27, 2015
Mary E. Doody Jones

Janet Hawkins

From: Jason Stearns [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, Aug 27, 2015 6:34 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Pandora Development rezoning

I work in downtown Victoria and typically avoid the pandora/vancouver area as it is run-down and offers very little other than the McDonalds. I am very supportive of any new development in the area, it is a much needed improvement and a significantly better use of land than an abandoned school.

Sincerely,

Jason Stearns

Janet Hawkins

From: Ben Isitt (Councillor)
Sent: Friday, Aug 28, 2015 10:37 AM
To: Andrew Godon; Public Hearings
Subject: Re: Mason St

Hi Andrew,

City Council has adjourned the public hearing for this land use application until Thursday Sept. 17 at 7:30 pm at Victoria City Hall. I am unable to comment until after the public hearing closes.

I am forwarding your message to City staff so that it can be included in the agenda for that meeting. You are also welcome to share your views directly with City Council members at the meeting as well.

All the best,

Ben

> On Aug 28, 2015, at 9:01 AM, Andrew Godon [REDACTED] wrote:

>

> Hi Ben,

>

> Hope you don't mind me contacting you personally on city matters. I'm very interested in the outcome, if any, of the development proposal at St Andrews school site. I'm just recovering from surgery so was unable to attend the meeting last night. I'm deeply concerned about these sorts of developments that seem to have no regard for the greater good of the community and the context in which they are created.

>

> Thanks

>

> Andrew

Janet Hawkins

From: Leo Chaland [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, Aug 30, 2015 3:08 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Development re 1008-1008 & 1012 Pandora

My name is Leo Chaland and my wife, Ann, and I live at 25 Cook Street, Victoria, BC V8V 3W6.

We wish to express our support for the development proposal at the site of the former St. Andrew's Elementary School at the corner of Pandora and Vancouver Streets. We believe that this development proposal is an excellent example of the type of development envisioned in the Official Community Plan.

The building proposal is a reasonable accommodation for existing residents of the neighbourhood and provides much needed rental accommodation in an aesthetically pleasing way. Further, the reservation of five percent of the living units for affordable housing, guaranteed for the life of the building, meets important social goals in making Victoria a livable city for all its citizens.

The building design respects the Mason Street residents and the provision of a public plaza is a positive contribution to the neighbourhood.

We urge city council members to endorse this development application as a positive contribution to our city.

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.

Leo and Ann Chaland

Janet Hawkins

From: Ben Isitt (Councillor)
Sent: Monday, Aug 31, 2015 6:45 AM
To: 'Janet L'; Public Hearings
Subject: RE: North Park

Hi Janet,

City Council has adjourned the public hearing for the St. Andrews school land use application until Thursday Sept. 17 at 7:30 pm at Victoria City Hall. I am unable to comment on land-use issues relating to this proposal until after the public hearing closes.

I am forwarding your message to City staff so that it can be included in the agenda for that meeting. You are also welcome to share your views directly with City Council members at the meeting as well.

All the best,

Ben

Ben Isitt
Victoria City Councillor and CRD Director
Email. bisitt@victoria.ca / Tel. 250.882.9302
Web. www.BenIsitt.ca

From: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Sent: Friday, August 28, 2015 11:29 AM
To: 'Janet L'
Subject: RE: North Park

Dear Ms. Lundman,

Thank you for your email regarding North Park and the development process, it has been shared with Mayor and Council.

I have shared your email with our Community Planning department, who have advised that these issues you have raised are well-suited to be addressed through in-depth community discussions during local area planning. Council has asked staff to look at ways to accelerate local area planning, so that plans can be completed within the next few years. A timeline for local area planning will be recommended to Council by the end of the year.

The purpose of local area planning will be to provide detailed guidance on how an area will grow and change over time. Local area planning will see the City working with the community to review and refine the OCP policies and urban place designations related to a specific neighbourhood. The OCP and other plans may be amended as a result of local area planning. Once a new local area plan has been approved by City Council, Council can decide to amend parts of the OCP and other plans to ensure that all of the plans are consistent. Specific policies regarding amendments and local area planning can be found in sections 20.11- 20.15 of the Official Community Plan.

Sincerely,

Monica Dhawan
Correspondence Coordinator
Citizen Engagement and Strategic Planning
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

T 250.361.0516



From: Janet L [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2015 10:22 AM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: North Park

To Mayor and Council of Victoria,

North Park community suffers from the same disregard as Cook Street Village residents when change comes to their neighbourhood. Why is it that developers have first turn at City Hall's ear? Affected neighbourhoods need to be included and consulted from the beginning of any process that alters where they live. It seems past time for City Hall to alter their procedures so this can happen.

Yours,

Janet Lundman
#3 Sutej St.
V8V 2V8

Janet Hawkins

From: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Sent: Sunday, Aug 30, 2015 8:28 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: St Andrews Development

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Date: August 30, 2015 at 8:12:05 AM PDT
To: <councillors@victoria.ca>
Subject: **St Andrews Development**
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

Hello,

I was not able to attend the recent public hearing about the proposed development at the site of the old St Andrews school. I wanted to voice my objection.

There are a number of negative aspects to the proposal, but the most significant concern is the height, and the impact that will cause Mason Street City Farm. If the development brings in a large grocery store, that will likely cause Wellburns to shut down. This is a negative in that a non-local business will gain the profits that used to benefit a Victoria-based business. But, local businesses shut down sometimes, and there are other local businesses like Wellburns in town. But there is no other place like Mason Street Farms. It's an expressed goal of Victoria (and many, many of its residents) to pursue food sustainability. We need to help Mason Street Farms thrive, and encourage other farmers to make use of available space within Victoria's core.

The St Andrews site could have an amazing development, that would be a draw to the surrounding communities, that could benefit the local businesses. Having the proposed two-way bike lane right there on Pandora could open up many amazing possibilities.

I hope it's not too late to stop this project as proposed, to encourage the developers to come up with something that work for everyone. I hope it's not too late to save Mason Street City Farm.

Daryl Elving-Klassen
1336 Grant St
Victoria

PS - I have no business or family ties to Mason Street City Farms.
Sent from my BlackBerry® powered by Virgin Mobile.

Janet Hawkins

From: Jared Warren [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, Aug 31, 2015 10:36 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Rezoning Application No. 00381

I am writing in support of proposed rezoning and development.

Any decrease in density or increase in amenities will be passed on to buyers in the form of higher rates for market units. This is a hidden tax on the middle class, particularly young people.

It is frustrating that higher levels of government are not providing adequate social assistance for people to afford market-rate housing and groceries, and incentives to secure food production, but the City cannot fix these problems on the backs of middle class buyers and renters alone. The best thing the City can do to address affordability is to increase the housing supply as much as possible. Tax dollars collected from these many new and all other property owners (including those who have owned their property for a long time) can be directed to these important social issues.

I urge Council to approve this development.

Jared Warren
751 Fairfield Rd
Victoria, BC

August 31,2015

Mayor and Council
City of Victoria

Dear Mayor and Council

Re Rezoning 1002-1008 , 1012 Pandora St.

I owned and operated a business a few blocks from the subject property for over 25 years

I have attended the developers open houses and the August 27,2015 public hearing related to the above property .In my opinion , the complaints voiced by the North Park Association (NPA) are not supported by the facts . For example , the issue of the building shading the Mason Street farm was reviewed by an independent consultant and carefully documented to be of no consequence . The NPA has not presented any facts to refute the consultants study . The NPA appears to be against the proposed food floor tenant in the building but nothing is stopping them from continuing shopping at the existing markets thus having no impact on their lives .The NPA has also raised the issue of traffic but the developer has taken steps to minimize the effect on Mason Street and the calculated 300 cars per day is very minimal .I urge you take macro view of this proposal as it provides many well documented benefits to the overall community .The question at hand is will you allow the voice of a well organized minority to override the rights of the community . There are 4 houses on Mason Street which are holding up the much needed development of 200 rental homes .Is this fair to the City Of Victoria ? Do you think it is the best interest of the city for the property to remain in its current condition ? This is an excellent proposal by an responsible developer who has worked for over 3 years to respond to the unfounded and unrealistic demands of the NPA . Please consider the entire community and realistically review all sides of the issue .

Mr. G.L.T Lee
2575 Vista Bay Rd
Victoria B.C

Janet Hawkins

From: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Sent: Monday, Aug 31, 2015 8:12 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: Delegation for the Pandora project development

--

Lisa Helps
Mayor, City of Victoria,
www.lisahelpsvictoria.ca
250-661-2708
@lisahelps

"Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody only because, and only when, they are created by everybody."

- Jane Jacobs

Begin forwarded message:

From: Carla [REDACTED]
Subject: Delegation for the Pandora project development
Date: 27 August, 2015 10:07:32 PM PDT
To: "mayor@victoria.ca" <mayor@victoria.ca>

Dear Mayor Helps and counsellors,

My name is Carla Wormald and I reside and own the property at 1925 kings road. I was in attendance at the Pandora Project development meeting this evening but was unable to stay so please find below my planned remarks.

As a young professional in start of my professional career I want to see my tax dollars at work towards a vibrant community where I can raise my family.

I commute daily past this proposed site with my son and husband.

I'd like to be able to ride my bike on our commute but the truth is I don't feel safe traveling through the Pandora blocks. I believe additional population density would help To continue to a larger community and as a result a feeling of safety in the neighbourhood. With more citizens in this development the entire city would reap the benefits of additional safety and additional contributors to the tax pool.

Months ago we were commuting past the site and my son, excited as can be, asked "what's that" pointing at the abandoned school.

"Well that is a old school." I replied

Quick whit that he has he asked, "where are the kids?"

I stopped and paused. How can I explain to a toddler that a school once filled with laughter and learning now sits empty.

"There are no kids there because the building is too old and it's time to build a new one."

It was then that I realized that is what needs to be done. A new building contributing to the revitalization of the neighbourhood and more over to the Economic development of the entire city.

As an passionate advocate and dedicated volunteer for vulnerable citizens, I was pleased to learn about the 5% units or 169 units for dedicated affordable housing.

I want to be able to tell my son in the years to come that no longer is it an empty school, now 209 + people have homes.

This is the Victoria that I invest in. This is the Victoria I want to raise my son in.

I urge you to vote yes to help support the economic development of Victoria to help pave a better path for tomorrow.

Sincerely
Carla Wormald

Sent from my iPad

Janet Hawkins

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, Sep 1, 2015 2:39 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Comments concerning Public Hearing for Mason St. Development

To: Mayor and Council
Re: St. Andrews Development Proposal

I am a Victoria resident: 1324 Denman St.

An important aspect of this, and probably any, application is what effect it might have on neighboring business. Of particular focus is the Urban Farm, directly across from the proposal on Mason St. The applicant, Blue Sky, being a business itself, should be fully aware that the structure of the present application will decrease the Farm's ability to conduct business. Blocking a portion of the direct sunlight will decrease the Farm's ability to grow its product. For a farm, this sunlight reduction would be like rolling back the amount of available hydro for an electricity based business because the new neighbor is pre-empting the source. This is hardly business friendly.

I support greater density in North Park, and every other neighborhood in Victoria. I support expanding business in Victoria. But not at the expense of existing business.

Business friendly and neighborhood friendly possible changes:

- Concentrate living units closer to, or immediately on Pandora Ave. If the structure was 7 or 8 stories bordering Pandora, and sloped back towards Mason St., designed to allow maximum sunlight delivery to the Farm, without losing any of the suites proposed.
- Reconsider access from Pandora for vehicles. A separated bike lane doesn't have to be on the residential side of the street, it could be on the boulevard side.
- Open the interior space, allow foot traffic as well as vehicular traffic.

Use this opportunity to allow a development that will still work in 100 years: integrating a creative, ingenious development with a very special Urban Food Security Source.

Thanks,

Bill Goers

Janet Hawkins

From: Joanna Fox [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, Sep 1, 2015 4:05 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Fox, Joanna
Subject: 1002-1008, 1012 Pandora Avenue

Sept 1, 2015
Re: 1002-1008, 1012 Pandora Avenue
From: Joanna Fox, 1058 Davie Street, Victoria

I have been following with interest the debate and discussion regarding the St. Andrew's School/BOSA development project and after watching the public hearing on August 27 online, I would like to share my thoughts on this project. As I am unable to attend on Sept 17, I figured this would be the best way to communicate with Council. I agree that density is necessary in order to create safe, vibrant neighbourhoods, and I do believe that the developer has made some compromises. I was also inspired by many who spoke about the current vibrant and engaged community that is North Park, however I am concerned that this development needs work to reflect that current vibrant and engaged community.

I have lived in Victoria since 1992 and was lucky enough to get into the real estate market at that time. Currently I live in a 1908 home that was run down and had a lineup of people to buy it. We had it designated heritage and have worked with the City to restore it over the past 19 years. I live there with my husband, 20 year old son and 17 year old daughter, and a young couple who rent our basement suite that we built last year. When our kids have moved on, I look forward to downsizing, and would love to be part of a co-housing project, like what I have seen in other cities and countries, i.e. Mole Hill in Vancouver, or the Fernwood Urban Village project here in Victoria.

When I talked to my family about this project, my son's reaction was, "what, another condo development downtown? Can't there be something a bit more interesting?". Like him, I agree that something more interesting would be a welcome addition to our expanding downtown. While I would like to believe that this development is going to attract young people and families who want to live downtown, I secretly fear that it will become another condo development with seasonal or absent residents, and that does not lead to a healthy, vibrant community.

It seems to me that co-housing developments are typically started by engaged residents vs developers, so it's likely a non-starter conversation with BOSA. But how does the City of Victoria encourage co-housing? Developers have to follow the city's cue in the form of regulations. I understand the Fernwood Urban Village project is now "in development", but as one of its founders has said, "It takes a herculean effort to find community these days, to create it by your own will". If I read between the lines, that says to me that they had to jump through municipal hoops.

I like to think that the City of Victoria is a 'healthy community', characterized by a high degree of citizen participation and the engagement of multiple sectors to sustain environments that promote well-being, including built, natural and social environments. Partnerships like these are essential and actively involve local governments, non-profit organizations, the recreation, business, education and transportation sectors, as well as citizens in collaborative initiatives that improve the health of the population.

What I think this city needs is a development with a combination of owned/rented townhouses, rental apartments (low housing and market housing rates), condos and common areas, i.e. shared use eating/workshop facilities, bookable guest space, etc. Instead of having a private walled courtyard in the middle where there might be little sunshine in the shoulder seasons when the sun is lower, there would be a community garden on the east side, and Mason Street Urban Farm could run workshops to help people learn to grow their own food. It would also feature less parking spaces for

residents and encourage car sharing, like what is happening in Vancouver. Do we need more market rent condos with commercial on the main level? Do we need more grocery stores and coffee shops? There are two medium size grocery stores in the neighbourhood, Chinatown and the Hudson Market are nearby for produce, and coffee shops on every block. And if you think of it, if people only have to go downstairs to get their groceries, are they getting to know their community, or just getting to know their building? And what of the City's Official Community Plan that has as one of its themes "diversity of housing across the city and within neighbourhoods" - only a small number of rental units and market prices is not diversity. The OCP states "encourage partnerships that address the need for affordable nonmarket and market housing suitable for households with children".

I do hope that the Sept 17 public hearing continues to bring forward other ideas on how this development could be a successful little gem of the North Park and downtown communities. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my views,

Joanna Fox

Janet Hawkins

From: Joyce Harris <jharris@ssabc.ca>
Sent: Thursday, Aug 27, 2015 12:02 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca
Subject: Rezoning and Development Application at 1008 Pandora Avenue

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

I am writing to support the Rezoning and Redevelopment Application for 1008 Pandora Ave. (former St. Andrew's Elementary School). The proposed project will create more "mixed" housing in Victoria which as you know is so desperately needed. Also, if approved, it will encourage other Developers to follow this approach and make more affordable housing available to the citizens of Victoria.

I see the approval of this Application as a step in a direction that we can be proud of i.e. to support the more vulnerable persons in our city in a responsible and compassionate manner for all those concerned. It will also enhance the North Park neighborhood and add status to the business community and housing market.

I truly hope this Application will be approved. Thank you so much.

Joyce

Joyce Harris, ssa
Sisters of St. Ann Social Justice Chairperson
1550 Begbie Street
Victoria, BC V8R 1K8
Phone (250) 592-3088
Fax (250) 592-0234
jharris@ssabc.ca



Janet Hawkins

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, Aug 30, 2015 8:12 AM
To: Councillors
Subject: St Andrews Development

Hello,

I was not able to attend the recent public hearing about the proposed development at the site of the old St Andrews school. I wanted to voice my objection.

There are a number of negative aspects to the proposal, but the most significant concern is the height, and the impact that will cause Mason Street City Farm. If the development brings in a large grocery store, that will likely cause Wellburns to shut down. This is a negative in that a non-local business will gain the profits that used to benefit a Victoria-based business. But, local businesses shut down sometimes, and there are other local businesses like Wellburns in town. But there is no other place like Mason Street Farms. It's an expressed goal of Victoria (and many, many of its residents) to pursue food sustainability. We need to help Mason Street Farms thrive, and encourage other farmers to make use of available space within Victoria's core.

The St Andrews site could have an amazing development, that would be a draw to the surrounding communities, that could benefit the local businesses. Having the proposed two-way bike lane right there on Pandora could open up many amazing possibilities.

I hope it's not too late to stop this project as proposed, to encourage the developers to come up with something that work for everyone. I hope it's not too late to save Mason Street City Farm.

Daryl Elving-Klassen
1336 Grant St
Victoria

PS - I have no business or family ties to Mason Street City Farms.
Sent from my BlackBerry® powered by Virgin Mobile.

Janet Hawkins

From: Ana Simeon [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, Aug 27, 2015 11:28 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Chris Coleman (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor); Pam Madoff (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor)
Subject: Bosa development in North Park Neighbourhood

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

Unfortunately we will not be able personally to attend the public hearing tonight about the proposed Bosa development on the St Andrews site in the North Park neighbourhood. However, as nearby residents who are directly affected by the proposal, we wish to make sure our perspective is heard before any decision is made.

The proposed Bosa development is much too massive, and especially too high for this neighbourhood. It would shade the Mason Street City Farm and prevent it from producing local food year-round: there would only be enough sun to grow vegetables in the height of summer, a time when food is abundant in every garden. It is precisely the ability to grow vegetables through the winter that offers market gardeners a comparative advantage in our region. The proposed Bosa project would reduce the supply of local food that North Park and Fernwood residents (and others: Mason Street City Farm is a supplier of Share Organics which delivers throughout the CRD) now enjoy within a few miles of their residence. Instead, it would erect a massive box store – three times bigger than Market on Yates! – replacing fresh, local vegetables with trucked-in produce at ever-higher prices. (If you haven't seen the recent Vancity study predicted steep increases of prices of imported produce due to the south-western US megadrought, we heartily recommend it.) The increasing impact of climate change on our food supply behooves us to localize production as much as possible and eschew greenhouse gas-spewing megaprojects such as this one.

The impact on the Mason City Farm would directly affect us as the farm's regular customers.

Given its negative impact on an existing, thriving urban farm, the Bosa project is clearly contrary to the OCP goals of encouraging local food production (section 17 of the OCP, "Food systems").

Another OCP goal that is flouted by this project is increasing the share of non-motorized transportation. The megastore behemoth would require a constant procession of delivery trucks plying Mason Street and Vancouver Street and nosily idling in the parking lot. When you add the residential traffic to and from the proposed 210 units, Mason Street and Vancouver Street will become a noisy, dusty traffic corridor. This will impact the safety and comfort of the users of the Vancouver Street greenway and cycling corridor, while the children and parents using the playground will be exposed to toxic emissions as well as noise.

The impact of trucks and increased general traffic on Mason Street and Vancouver Street would also directly affect us as Ana cycles to work via that route.

We support the North Park Neighbourhood Association's statement on other neighbourhood impacts.

The Bosa project has been repeatedly touted as a contribution to the OCP goal of increasing residential density. This is a worthy goal, and we have supported it in our own back yard, in Fernwood, with the recent application to subdivide the property on the corner of Camosun and Balmoral and build an extra residence, barely a block away from us. We attended the meeting at the Fernwood Residents Association and wrote in support of it although we do not relish the thought of noisy construction practically next door. It was, however, the right thing to do in that case. This one isn't. It would impoverish the neighbourhood by taking away a local food supply and adding traffic hazards, while toxic fumes and stress from traffic noise would impact the residents' health. The project's only "benefit" would be for the developer's bank balance.

Other developers have flirted with the possibilities of this block in the past, and I'm sure more will come in the future. We support the development of the St Andrews site, but it has to be done right, in a way that meets neighbourhood concerns, multiple OCP goals (not just density) and offers a generous proportion of truly affordable housing (the current project's commitment to 11 units of "affordable housing" at 85 per cent of market rates just doesn't cut it!)

Please reject the rezoning application by Bosa development.

Sincerely,

Ana Simeon and Tom Martin

1703 Fernwood Road, suite B

Victoria, B.C.

V8T2Y3



Victoria, 27th of August 2015

Ana Simeon

Janet Hawkins

From: Bryan Bogdanski [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, Sep 5, 2015 11:55 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Rezoning application #00381

I am in favour of the rezoning application #00381: 1002-1008, 1012 Pandora Avenue, also known as the closed St. Andrew's Elementary School.

The proposed use of the closed school offers a great opportunity for the neighbourhood. The new stock of rental and affordable housing will allow many more low to middle income families to live close to places of employment and ready access to educational, health, social, recreational, and cultural services. This new group of people will add to the existing community's size and in turn improve the business conditions for immediate and near businesses. This new demand for goods and services will spurn new investments in existing and future businesses, especially grocery businesses. The new commercial space on the first floor of the development will provide a new space for entrepreneurs to provide new and creative goods and services that will enhance the lives of new and existing residents of the area.

It is hard to imagine a better use of the land to stimulate a vibrant and inclusive neighbourhood for today and generations to come.

Sincerely,
Bryan Bogdanski
70-850 Parklands Dr.
Esquimalt V9A 7L9

Janet Hawkins

From: Allan Gallupe [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, Sep 5, 2015 1:22 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: St. Andrew's site: presentation to council

Since I was unable to finish my presentation to Council re St. Andrew's in the five minutes allotted at the Aug 27 hearing, I am sending it to you in writing:

Our family owns a house, with a family member living there, at 1016 Mason St. I am also a Board member of the North Park Neighbourhood Association, but am speaking on my own behalf.

There is no question that this development will affect our house. Where once we looked across at children playing in a school playground we will be now be faced with a large building that will have 300 cars per hour in peak hours coming and going into a parking garage directly across the street from our front door.

However, we have tried to maintain a larger perspective of what is good for the community in the development of this site. The question for me is: Is this an appropriate development for the community?

To answer that question I ask four questions:

1. Whether the development plan received real input from the community in its creation?
2. Has the community supported the plan?
3. Is it forward thinking and does it address the many pressing environmental and social issues that this city and all cities are facing?
4. Does the plan do its best to soften the detrimental effects on the neighbourhood?

1. The first question: real input is where the developer comes to the community and asks what they want to see on this site before any plans are drawn. Then really listens to what the people are saying. I am reminded of a quote from Jane Jacobs: "Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody."

The developer came to the community, however, with a set of plans already drawn up. The developer said that the plan had elements that were fundamental to the developer's bottom line and the developer was not willing to move on them.

One of those elements was that it had to be one large building covering the whole site. This is despite the fact that there are actually two lots there. The community said they wanted the comprehensive nature of the development to be broken up into at least two buildings so that there could be more flexibility around green space and a mid-block walkway to break up the massing. This is a massive building, after all, with a footprint that covers half a city block.

More than one building would also allow for better options for traffic coming in and out of the site. Currently, all the traffic is coming in and out of Mason St, effectively using that small, laneway-sized street as a driveway for the development.

But the developer said no, it has to be one large building because it has to have as part of its retail complement one very large store, the size of which has varied over time from 35,000 to 38,000 sq ft., depending on when the developer is talking. The developer was unwilling to move to any plan that didn't involve one large building covering the whole site with a very large store.

So that ended the discussion on most of the other real alternatives and left the community simply talking only about how to tweak the developer's plan.

The developer was willing to proceed to Public Hearing in September 2014 until the last minute when the developer asked Council for a postponement to discuss, in their words, "issues of significance to the key stakeholders."- Unfortunately, that discussion of significant issues never really happened. When the developer finally got in touch with the neighbourhood eight months later, there were no significant changes to their plan. It wasn't a rethink, it wasn't a revisioning, it was just a time out – possibly so the municipal election could come and go.

So I would have to answer no to the first question and say that they didn't gather real input from the community.

2. On the question of whether the community has supported the development, the over-1,000 signatures on a petition opposing the development speaks for itself. When over 1,000 people who live, work or play in the neighbourhood say they oppose a development, that should mean something.

But there is also the consistent opposition by the North Park Neighbourhood Association, in six different letters to Council describing their serious concerns with massing, lack of community and green space, mid-block walkway, the access and egress point and excess traffic. The NPNA described the contraventions to the Official Community Plan, to the Greenways Plan, the Master Pedestrian Plan and the Cycling Master Plan.

The NPNA reached out to the community and included the developer. At the last of these well-attended meetings to establish a neighbourhood position, the verdict was clear: unanimous opposition to this development plan.

And it is not only the North Park Neighbourhood Association that has voiced its opposition to this development. Both the Fernwood Community Association and the Rockland Community Association have both sent letters to Council voicing their opposition to the plan.

So I would have to also answer no to the second question and say that the development plan definitely does not have the support of the community.

3. 3. Is the plan forward-thinking, and does it address the significant environmental and social issues facing Victoria and other cities? This is an important question. It is not only what's wrong with a development but what a development fails to do right that is at stake. Council has a unique opportunity with a rezoning application to ask for plan that really considers climate change and pressing homelessness issues.

More and more people are going to be living in cities, so our elected politicians, when they have the opportunity, should ensure that developers are doing everything possible to make our cities sustainable and liveable if they want the political support for rezoning. One only has to look at other developments in Victoria for good examples, including ones that the North Park Neighbourhood Association has enthusiastically supported, like the passive solar apartment building on Queen St.

Buildings can account for up to 70% of the energy a city consumes. The Queen St. building and the LEED Platinum buildings at 1515 Douglas and the Capital Park buildings by Jawl and Concert behind the legislature will not only conserve energy, they have a plan for conserving water and recycling, for geothermal, green roofs, significantly regional-sourced and recycled materials, and on and on.

How about the building in Vancouver in Southeast False Creek that is net-zero.? This building will produce as much energy as it consumes. This is in addition to the green roofs, food-producing gardens and a host of other environmental features. This is being environmentally responsible! In fact, Vancouver has made a commitment to 100% renewable energy in electricity.

On the subject of the Capital Park development, the Times Colonist reported that the Mayor and some Councillors praised the green space, plaza and walkways that were offered by the developer – essentially public domain within private land. How considerate and community-building that is: giving amenities back to the community.

The St. Andrew's plan offers a zig-zagged fenced-in walkway around the east end of the site that will likely have to be locked.

One Councillor praised moving access to parking on to the busier street, Superior, to preserve the pedestrian aspects of quieter Michigan. If that's good for James Bay, why not for North Park? For St. Andrew's, all traffic is slated to come on and off narrow, one-way Mason St., changing the quiet character of that byway with excessive traffic.

The St. Andrew's building will have no particular green designation, only the developer's vague statement that it will go for the equivalent of the lowest LEED designation – silver. Not very forward-thinking. What a missed opportunity for the City on this significant site.

The building will shade a thriving urban farm. Do we want local food opportunities and food security, as stated in the OCP, or is that just lip service to forward thinking that was never really intended to happen?

Regarding social responsibility, this developer's plan now offers 11 affordable units out of its 210 units. That is their contribution to the social issues facing the city. Contrast that to the Capital Park plan, which, out of 175 residential units, offers 51 affordable-housing units. Let's remember that the St. Andrew's developer touts it's project as being worth \$70 million. They offer 11 affordable units or 5% of the total, compared with almost 30% for Capital Park.

So on the third question, I say it is not forward thinking. In fact it is backward thinking.

4. The fourth question is: what does the plan do to soften the detrimental effects on the neighbourhood? The increased traffic brought about by the development will be intolerable - not because of the 195 residential units, but because of the very large store. One only has to look at the Fairways at Quadra-Hillside to see how many cars go in and out from Quadra St. at peak hours (with access also off Fifth). Yet Quadra St. is not a bike path and greenway as Vancouver St is, and that Fairway is only 27,000 sq. ft. This store is 35,000 to 38,000 sq. ft.

The peak-hour 300 vehicles we talked about will affect Mason St and Vancouver St. A recent study says Vancouver St. had 427 cyclists using the street at peak hours. I know from cycling this street daily that it will severely jam up where those 300 peak-hour vehicles meet the 427 cyclists, right at the McDonald's drive-thru. That is an accident waiting to happen.

Our community plans are supposed to prevent this. We have a Cycling Master Plan. The NPNA sent two letters to City Engineering pointing out how the Vancouver St. bike path would be undermined, and the response was that it would be worse if the cars all came out at Pandora because it is a major arterial road. The NPNA pointed out that Vancouver St. is a people-priority greenway, and the answer was that Pandora was a greenway too. (Inexplicably, the plan refers to Pandora between Quadra and Cook as a people-only greenway.) But Pandora is a major arterial road; Vancouver is not.

The plan's answer to extra traffic on Mason St., a well-used pedestrian, cycling, electric scooter and skateboard path, is to produce "chicanes" or cut-outs that would supposedly slow traffic and make it safer. In fact it will take away valuable parking from the church, businesses and residences on Mason St.

In summary, City Council offers the only way the community has a voice in deciding what a neighbourhood will look like. You have the opportunity to vote that this proposal be rescinded and revisioned. The neighbourhood is telling you overwhelmingly - over 1,000 signatures on a petition - that they want a better plan. This plan needs an R&R: rescind and revision.

Thank you,

Al Gallupe

Janet Hawkins

From: Linda Chan [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, Sep 9, 2015 12:26 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Letter in support of Mason Street City Farm and in opposition to Bossa Development

September 8, 2015

Dear Mayor Lisa Helps and Victoria City Councillors

I am writing in support of Mason Street City Farm and local food security. On Vancouver Island, we currently imports up to 85% of our food from off the island. In light of climate change, we need to do what we can to increase local food production so that we can become more food secure. Mason Street City Farm offers a sustainable model of commercial local food production in the City, is dedicated to educating people about growing food in the Pacific Northwest and seeks to be a year-round source of food for our Victoria community.

I am opposed to the Bossa Development for the following reasons:

* Sun is a vital ingredient in growing food. While shade won't impact the Mason Street City Farm site during the height of summer, they will be dealing with increased shade in the spring and fall, and their farm will be completely shaded out by the development in the winter months. The combination of the existing shade and new shade from the development in the spring and fall would affect their food production. The impact of the full shade in the winter months will also drastically affect their planting schedule and growing capacity in the months following as it will take their soil longer to recover from cold temperatures. This development will thus mean that they will be **permanently unable to meet their goals of being a year-round source of food for our community.**

* Victoria does not need a 32,000-square-foot grocery store which is part of Bossa Development's Ground Floor Plan. Our Victoria community is already served well by grocery stores such as Market on Yates (a few blocks away), Lifestyle Market(s), Ingredients Cafe and Community Market, Mother Natures Market and Deli, Niagara Grocery to name a few.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Chan

Coordinator, Spring Ridge Commons
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Web: <http://springridgecommons.ca>

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/springridge.common?ref=hl>

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/SpringRCommons>

and a member of the Victoria Urban Food Table

Janet Hawkins

From: M STRAUSS [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, Sep 9, 2015 9:33 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: A Harris Green resident's view on the Bosa proposal to redevelop St. Andrews site

Dear Mayor and council:

I live at 1015 Pandora, directly across the St. Andrews site, in the Harris Green neighborhood.

Before moving into our condo last year, we lived in Fernwood where we raised our children and where, in the late 80's, I was on the board of the Fernwood Community Association. We then moved to Saanich before moving back to Victoria.

While I appreciate the concerns raised by the North Parks residents, I support the development because:

- The project will inject life and vitality to the 1000 block of Pandora, making it more livable for us on the south side of Pandora and for the Harris Green neighborhood. It will also benefit the city as a whole.
- I am not aware of alternate proposals. Future proposals will be challenged by similar concerns (ie., shading, public amenities, traffic). In the absence of options, rejection of this plan will likely result in the site remaining undeveloped for some time, a loss to our block on Pandora and to Harris Green.
- The scale of the Bosa proposal seems 'human' relative to the 14-plus-stories condo projects already approved around us (e.g. corner of Cook and Pandora, 900 block of Yates, etc.).
- While the concerns of North Park residents merit consideration, the decision should be based on what is best for all surrounding neighbourhoods and for the city as a whole. I noticed that I did not hear many (or any) comments from Harris Green residents. What would we say if our voices were organized?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Mario Strauss

September 10, 2015

Mayor and Council
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria BC V8W 1P6

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors:

Re: Rezoning application #00381 for 1002, 1008 and 1012 Pandora Ave – St. Andrew's Site

I'm writing to you today in regards to the rezoning application at the former St. Andrew's Catholic School site. I live and work adjacent to the site at 1015 Balmoral Rd, and as such have a vested interest in the development of that site. I attended the Public Hearing on August 27th, and based on my observations that evening I would like to present several points for your consideration. My observations are informed by an academic background in International Development at McGill University, and several years professional experience in Community Development in Toronto, Mexico and Ghana.

To begin, it seems quite clear to me that there is a good amount of agreement between the two sides; that is, those who are in favour of the proposal, and those who are opposed. Both sides agree that development of the site should occur; both sides agree that increased density is needed, in the city generally and at this site specifically; and both sides agree that whatever development goes in will have a large impact on the neighbourhood. It also seemed to me that both sides believe the outcome of this particular proposal is indicative of Victoria's values as a city, and the direction that chooses to move into the future.

The disagreement seems to stem from whether or not *this particular proposal* is the best option for the site at this time. I think that the current context in the immediate neighbourhood, in the City as a whole, and even globally strongly suggest that the proposed development is not the right fit for this site. My reasons are as follows:

- Rezoning this site in order to allow BlueSky Properties to proceed with their proposal would represent a *major* missed opportunity for North Park and Victoria. We have a larger than usual site, adjacent to the City's oldest urban farm, with an important hub for the street-involved community just down the street. The site is owned by the Catholic Church, an institution that historically has had a strong social mission, and is located in the City's lowest income neighbourhood, minutes from the downtown core. The idea that we should put in a straightforward apartment complex whose most innovative feature is a dog washing room and extra parking for bikes is deeply disappointing. The opportunity to find precedent-setting and effective solutions to issues such as lack of housing and food security, while supporting OCP goals around placemaking, walkability and climate change is enormous. The North Park

neighbourhood is not Topaz Park. We clearly have a passionately engaged community that is willing to take risks. There is a legacy waiting to be formed here, if Council has the vision to see it.

- In Victoria we do have an urgent need to create more housing for people, and will be most successful with a variety of approaches. The other rezoning application on August 27th was an example of a complementary strategy, with an application for a garden suite. Councillor Coleman noted that through applications such as this, 7500 additional housing units could be constructed. Streamlining processes and creating incentives for this kind of solution is *just one approach*. The proposed development is not the only way that housing will be created on that site or that density will be increased, and the characteristics of the site as mentioned above suggest other options. Even if it were, according to Cited Victoria, there are currently 590 rental units already under construction in Victoria, and 1,050 in Metropolitan Victoria with 328 and 1,250 planned, respectively. The OCP calls for the construction of 13,500 apartment units over the next 30 years. At this rate we are on track to meet this target. Of specific interest to this site, on p. 94 the OCP goes on to state that "Land capacity analysis prepared for this plan indicates that there is just enough capacity available under existing zoning to meet this demand." It is clear, then, that in the immediate term other building projects are both planned and under way, and there exist a multitude of tools and strategies with which to address the housing shortage. Not only that, but there is no pressing need from a land availability perspective to immediately rezone this site for residential use. Proponents of this proposal argue that we need to accept it, warts and all, because this is our only route to needed increases in density and housing availability. This is patently false.
- The current proposal for the St. Andrew's site does not actually provide substantial affordable housing. Their stated price for an 'affordable' bachelor apartment of \$737.50 is actually more expensive than the average for the City of Victoria, which according to the Vital Signs report of 2014 is \$697. The one-bedroom cost in the proposal is \$862.50, \$841 is the average in the city. But I don't want to split hairs, the bottom line is that 10 units of affordable housing does not make this proposal an affordable housing development. The attempt by BlueSky Properties to position it as such, and to suggest that the provision of these units at prices that are *actually just average* somehow offsets the negative impacts of the proposal, is at best misleading. At worst it is a cynical attempt to obfuscate the situation, thus pacifying those with legitimate concerns about the housing issues in the city who may otherwise oppose the proposal.
- While it is true that the current proposal before Council meets density targets and building height limits as set out in the OCP, it's important to note that in many ways the proposal actually undermines the OCP. It does not support Section 13.5 which directs the City to "encourage new housing initiatives that partner with other levels of government, agencies, private industry, community organizations and individuals to maximize shared expertise and resources and to help achieve new affordable housing initiatives." Section 17 makes strong provisions for supporting urban agriculture, and in shading the City's oldest urban farm the proposal undermines its long-term viability. The shading issue for Mason St. City Farm is real, as it casts significant shade during the winter when the marginal value of both each hour of sun and each dollar earned is much higher than at any other time of year. If the city wishes to truly support

urban agriculture, then the concerns that the farm raises need to be given weight. Agricultural land in the city is exceedingly scarce (more so than land zoned for residential use), and it takes years to build the soils to the point of productivity that Mason St. City Farm currently operates at. It is not easily moved or replaced. Additionally, the poor community engagement process that BlueSky Properties has pursued severely undermines several items in the Civic Engagement portion of Section 15. These are just a few examples.

There are, as you are all surely aware by now, many more issues that those who live and work in North Park have raised. I share the concerns around traffic, the impact of a large retail store, the massing and comprehensiveness of the proposal that the North Park Neighbourhood Association clearly and consistently has put forward. These issues remain unresolved.

This site holds a huge amount of promise for the future of the city, and while increased housing and density are certainly vitally important to our growth, truly sustainable growth takes into account a rich diversity of factors. It is possible to increase density, provide housing and support sustainable community development all at the same time. The proposal fails on many measures. Therefore, on balance, it is clear to me that this proposal is simply not the right one for this site, at this time. I urge the Mayor and City Council to take the visionary path that Victoria deserves, and vote against the rezoning application for this site.

Thank you kindly for your time,
Sincerely,

Julia Ford

North Park Resident
Nursery Manager, Mason St. City Farm

Janet Hawkins

From: Giles Addey [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, Sep 10, 2015 12:28 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Rezoning Application No. 00381 for 1002-1008 and 1012 Pandora Avenue - hearing on Sept 17th at 7.30pm

Importance: High

Dear Sir,

I live on Grant Street, close to Cook Street and I have 3 main objections to this proposal.

The first being that the proposed development would be too high and the Mason Street City Farm and Mason Street residents would be in shade numerous months of the year. I believe that massing should be broken up to allow for sun light with higher density on Pandora Avenue side & townhomes on Mason Street side.

The second being that we don't need a 35,000 square foot grocery store which will harm local family owned grocers.

The third being that it is ridiculous that the vehicle access is proposed to be off Mason Street which is a small street and it would be much better for the access to be off Pandora Avenue.

Yours sincerely,

Giles Addey
3-1137 Grant St
Victoria BC

Janet Hawkins

From: Tristan Trotter [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, Sep 10, 2015 2:03 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Rob Woodland
Subject: Public hearing process

Mayor and Council,

Regarding process for public hearings, it strikes us that people outside the Victoria boundary have the same opportunity to speak as citizens of the city.

A requirement should be an announcement at the hearing to sign the speaker's list with residential addresses and that citizens of Victoria be given the first opportunity to speak. Otherwise, those most affected by a development, and who are most familiar with the area, often must wait behind speakers from Oak Bay, Langford or, who knows, Prince George! We pay taxes here and have to live with the impact of development decisions.

There are guidelines for notifications (100 metres) about public hearings and publication of such, yet the ability of the process to be skewed by people far from the site is overlooked.

Tristan Trotter
Yoka van den Berg
3-1046 Mason Street