JAMES BAY NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION
MINUTES – General Meeting February 14th, 2018

1. Welcome 7:00 pm; 122 in attendance
Marg Gardiner: meeting chair; Laura Neil: recorded minutes

2. Approval of Agenda as amended: m/s/c

3. Correspondence and Announcements:
Correspondence accepted as circulated m/s/c
~ CRD Wastewater Niagara – Feb 21 (5-8) Feb 24 (10-1) Edelweiss
~ Winter Wanderland
~ Coast Guard Initiative: Victoria's Working Harbour Forum
~ Sharing OPR Streets survey
~ James Bay to Fairfield Link – Tuesday Feb 21st 6:30pm
~ Seedy Saturday – Feb 17th Conference Centre
~ first call for JBNA 2018 AGM: Voting members only – receive agenda from Bob.
6:45 pm Wednesday, March 14

4. Minutes of January 10, 2017 general meeting: m/s/c as distributed

5. CALUC – 415-435 Michigan Street Development Proposal
Deane Strongitharm, CitySpaces Consulting Ltd.
Peter Huggins, Burrows Huggins Architects
Ashley Burke & Trevor Potts, Starlight Investments (observing)
Mairi Bosomworth, Transportation Planner, Watt Consulting Group

JBNA Development Review Committee Report: presented by Tim VanAlstine.
Tim VanAlstine reported on the Development review Committee meetings.
May 31, 2017: The proponents hosted a meeting for JBNA DRC followed by a meeting with nearby residents. Tim VanAlstine, Marg Gardiner, Linda Carlson,
Wayne Shillington, and Trevor Moat met with Ashley Burke (Starlight Investments) Peter and Michael Huggins and Michael Huggins (Burrowes Huggins
Architects), Deane Strongitharm and Brenda McBain (City Spaces Consulting) and Patrick (UVic student).
Suggestions from DR Committee:
• Parking unrealistic. Recognized historical zoning and parking limitations creating a need to mitigate existing parking rather than add more
load
• Suggest waiting until Capital Park completed when more employees and more residents move into James Bay
• Give serious consideration to allotment garden opportunities since current tenants use public space.
• Supports family housing in community
At the May meeting, we were told rezoning not needed, only a development permit required.

On November 23 2017, we were contacted by the proponent's agent, who informed
us that a rezoning was now needed due to height (proposed being lower than

permitted).

December 13, 2017: Tim VanAlstine, Marg Gardiner, Trevor Moat and Janice Mayfield met with Ashley Burke (Starlight Investments) Peter Huggins (Burrowes Huggins Architects), Daniel Casey (Watt Consulting Group), and Deane Strongitharm (City Spaces Consulting).

The proposal for 24-stacked townhouse development, to be rental. Twelve 2-bedroom units over 12-studio units. Upper units planned to have roof-top gardening (for 12 of the 24 units).

Key Issue: PARKING
• Parking issues remain – over 130 parking stalls below Schedule "C"
• Proponent's traffic consultant stated that parking should not be a problem as this portion of Michigan seems to be under utilized much of the time. The parking analysis by Watt provided suggests a surplus of 5 units. That analysis is based on the existing population in Charter House and Regent
Towers, and may not fully access current use of public street space by the tenants.
• This position counters the City's proposed off-street policy, Schedule "C", which was created by the same consultant.

Key Issue: AESTHETICS & AMENITY
• The proposed structure will take the streetscape of Michigan closer to the roadway. There could be a domino impact in the years ahead.
• Setback out of sync with street.
• Suggested utility area location be rethought as the sunny location might make garden plots
• Elimination of large greenspace bordering Michigan
• Starlight has NOT been monitoring resident parking in parking lot or on the street.

COMMUNITY MEETING PRESENTATION:
Deane Strongitharm, CitySpaces Consulting Ltd, introduced Starlight representatives, architect and transportation consultants.

24 unit stacked townhouse building – 12 2-br units and 12 studio suites – combination of singles and families – rental stock – will be market rates
R3 zoning required 21m height build – proposal does not reach this height and
rezoning was required. Density is not changing.
CoV OCP designates site as Urban residential; located directly adjacent to Large urban village, Proponent suggests that requirements of OCP met:
~ Ground-oriented low to mid-rise residential buildings.
~ Transportation and mobility 7.12.1, 7.12.2
~ Placemaking Urban design & Heritage 8.43 8.44 8.45
~ Housing – housing diversity – 13.9 & 13.10 met (spirit + goals)

Peter Huggins – architect – working on project with Starlight 2 yrs+.
~ 2016 to 2017, 2% in rental stock only 0.01% relief in needed to address vacancies for city.
~ Current vacancy rate in CoV 0.07%
~ 6 townhouse units will face Michigan and 6 units will face south to pool

side of property
~ 2 trees planned to be removed – replacement trees, 2 to 1 of existing trees
on boulevard
~ urban agricultural will not current work on site – still investigating possibilities
~ addressing transportation/car use – identified Modo parking areas with a 5
minute walking radius of building and also identified bus stops with radius
as a way to address lack of parking. ~ buildings will last in excess of 50 yrs, hence changing transportations and mobility needs
~ working with the Schedule "C" of CoV.

Mairi Bosomworth – parking study for site
~ existing parking 104 cars, on street 25 cars, total 129 cars = ratio of 0.73 parking rate demand per rental unit 176 units occupied 19 units vacant =
14 car spaced units unused using calculation of 0.73 spacing per rental unit
~ Calculate residents utilize 40% of parking spaces between Oswego and Menzies = 25 cars
Concludes new build requires 22 parking spaces, hence will increase demand to
140 vehicles from 129, implying a shortage of 2 parking spots (with planned
use of on-street parking).

Q/A first opportunity given to those who live within 100m of 415-435 Michigan
Street

C: lives in 3 unit townhouse down the street, with 2 parking spaces/unit, underground, doesn't believe proposal has adequate parking – will be a lot of
push-back since inadequate parking

C: Trees 4 existing tress marked for removal (not 2 as stated) – doesn't believe parking will be adequate – move development to other side of the pool
and create 2 tiered parking garage
A: Proponent could not verify any tree/landscaping information

C: 435 Michigan resident – states shadowing is inaccurate – doesn't agree with figures on parking study. Questions seismic concerns as existing building
A: Shadow on schematic is not accurate – shadow studies will be part of rezoning application

Q: 415 Michigan resident – concerned about loss of green space in JB – feels
the existing green space has been a part of the community for the last 45 yrs+ there is too much density in the area. Feels new structure will be a blight – and cost will require more than what is proposed for number of

residents per unit.

Q: what will be market value of the units
A: will be determined at the time of completed based on market value

C: don't need luxury housing

C: resident manager across the street from site – already a nightmare with current construction and parking is a nightmare – so much traffic and parking
that even garbage collection has been challenging – suggest need to redo parking study – has residents in her building that park 3 blocks away from building as no on-street parking for those residents/visitors
A: Study was conducted on a Thursday at approx. 1:30pm

Q: 415 Michigan resident – R3 to site specific – 40% open green space requirement – is there a 40% open green space in the proposal.
A: Slightly under the 40% currently covers two lots. 34.2% open space being
proposed. There will be 3 variances requested in the rezoning, green space,
coverage and parking

Q: Alma Place resident – there is no street parking on Alma and her guests are not permitted to park on Michigan – on Michigan there is huge challenges
for CoV vehicles, Telus vehicles, etc. Capacity of street is exceeded – manoeuvring on street is impossible – what if there is an emergency – what happens when ER vehicles need access?

Q: when is project proposed to start?
A: 8 to 10 months away to start and 1½ to 2 yrs to complete
Q: Is blasting required for project
A: No blasting indicated

Q: has been a resident for 10 yrs at site – do not want loss of common space
– moving project back and creating alternate green space is necessary. Parking is horrible when trying to exit site. Is the current bike shed being
removed?

C: two bike sheds on parking on site are you removing existing?
A: No biking storage where garbage area is proposed – will create parking for
32 bikes

C: has endured noise activity for 2 yrs. Parking, green are key issues

Q: Charter House resident – the trees are protected are they going to be cut
down
A: some trees have been identified to be removed some are not – can't provide

concrete answer will have to defer to arborist who couldn't attend tonight

C: Site coverage proposed to increase from the permitted 20% to 29%, a 50% increase !

Q: to Marg – has JBNA experienced such backlash from a project in the area?
A: yes

C: affordable housing don't need luxury housing

C: feels it is a warm fuzzy presentation – is opposed to the zoning and density.
A: Proponent – the project meets with the community plan and is only before
the community due to the height requirement to be rezoned.

6. CALUC – 430 Parry Street Development Proposal (71 in attendance)
- Luke Mari, Purdey Group
- Jesse Ratcliffe, D'Arcy Jones Architecture Inc.
- Ryan Goodman, Aryze
- Bianca Bodley, Biophalia Design

JBNA Development Review Committee Report: presented by Tim VanAlstine.
May 19, 2017: pre-pre-meeting with Marg Gardiner, Janice Mayfield, Tim Sommers
16-21 units suggested, no vehicle parking and abundant cycle parking. The discussion focused on the use of streets for parking and inability of landlords to restrict tenants from owning cars or having parking needs for visitors. Further, JBNA has received resident complaints about parking overload on Parry. It was emphasized that James Bay is not downtown.

January 9, 2018: Tim VanAlstine, Marg Gardiner, Tim Sommers & Linda Carlson
met with Luke Mari and Ryan Goodman to discuss the proposal for a redevelopment of the property.
The proponents presented schematics showing a unique structure with a frontage blending with the Redstone complex, and very small setbacks on the
other sides.
The structure was to be U-shaped residences on top of the parking and lobby
entrance and parking area, with a courtyard between two rows of stacked residential units.
12 units were proposed: six units of 450-550 sq ft, with six 2 storey units
of 1200-1400 sqft on top of each of the studio units with 10 parking spots.
They also mentioned that they were considering using part of the ground floor
space for a small 200 sqft unit while reducing the parking to 9 stalls.
Consideration was also being given to placing a fifth storey on top of the rear units.

The proponents were advised that in addition to the one-page handout for Community Meeting participants, they were required to have shadow studies prepared for the meeting. Deviations from the existing and proposed Schedule
"C" off-street parking policy must also be clearly disclosed. They were also
advised to consult with nearby neighbours, both those on Parry and Menzies before the February 14 Community Meeting.

The proponents have revised their plans would like to build 13 units and 9 parking stalls.
Currently the property is zoned R-2. Spot-zoning is being sought.

Key Issue: PARKING
• Parking was suggested seen as a major concern of the proposal
• James Bay is not downtown
• Parry used by employees and others as there is a parking shortage at the Community Project on Michigan and downtown.
• Proponents advised to meet Schedule 'C" parking policy

Key Issue: AESTHETICS
• The current zoning is R-2 while the proposal calls for the demolition of a single family home, although flatted, and the elimination of an R-2 lot.
• There could be shadowing problems to the north, onto the Redstone (shadow study requested)
• There could be significant objections due to loss of view from Parry neighbours to the south and Menzies neighbours to the southwest and west.
• Screening – the entrance to the building to the south would have an unpleasant view of the open parking area. Screening recommended.

COMMUNITY MEETING PRESENTATION:
Luke Mari presented a review of changing uses of the area over the past century and anticipated transportation changes.
Jesse Ratcliffe presented the proposal build-out of a new 4 (front) – 5 (rear) storey structure.
Bianca Bodley, landscape consultant, described the approach to landscaping to
screen the parking area and to provide green (trees) above the first floor in
the area between the units.

Q/A preference given to those who live within 100m of 430 Parry Street
Q: 420 Parry resident – good design but too large – it will create too large
of a brick wall need to decrease starkness of wall, perhaps create small windows?
A: Thinking courtyard and greenery will add to structure – can look at possibilities based on feedback from residents

Q: Resident of Redstone for 5 yrs – building too big – concerns about shadowing – doesn't feel greenery makes up for size. Structure will take away his sunlight. He will be living in a shadow How long will build take?
A: 14 to 16 months

Q: Parry resident – appreciate landscaping and architecture – but too large –
will dwarf the heritage home across the street. Why isn't this 100 yr old house considered heritage?
A: Street has history if changing usages
Q: What estimated selling price of units?
A: haven't set prices at this point

Q: Menzies resident – lives in a 4-storey building built to old parking standard and residents are still short of parking – suggests proponent read
CoV schedule "C" for parking – minimum of 1 to 1 parking needed – too big, too much density for small lot – scale back to 8-10 units
A: states ICBC and other data suggests other rental properties – especially
millennials – car ownership is 13% less the prior generations

Q: Michigan resident – lives in complex behind the church [between church and Redstone]. Development will shadow his property kill the tree he planted
and leave him in shadow.
A: If lower building height won't make much difference to shadowing

Q: 420 Parry St – appreciate design, landscaping, however building is way too
big for site. Zero set back will affect visibility when trying to access street of existing residences. Reduce by a storey to 3-storeys with same architectural look.
A: ???
Q: Any commercial in building?
A: No

Both CALUC presentations exceeded their time frames and several residents left before having the opportunity to voice their questions/opinions.

7. Adjournment: 9:35 pm.