

Meeting Minutes: James Bay Neighbourhood Association General Meeting

Date: March 13, 2024, 7:00 PM

Attendees:

- Board Members: Trevor Moat (Chair), Linda Carlson, Bob Vander Steen (Absent), Tim Van Alstine, Trevor Woodland, Keira Jackson, Wayne Shillington (Absent)
- Special Guests: Niall Paltiel (Mike Geric Construction), Jeremy Beintema (Continuum Architecture), Shannon Kowalko (Brown Brothers Property Management), Nadine King (Watt Consulting)
- JBNA residents

Agenda:

1. Opening Comments and Land Acknowledgement
2. OCP Update
3. Menzies Development Update (Presentation from Niall and comments/question period)
4. Community Comments

1. Opening Comments:

- **Land Acknowledgement:** Acknowledged meeting on the traditional territories of the Lekwungen-speaking peoples, including the Esquimalt and Songhees Nations.
- Regrets from Jeremy Caradonna (Council Liaison). He was unable to attend the meeting.
- The James Bay Recycling Depot can recycle your coloured and black styrofoam packaging, including meat trays, egg cartons, and take-out containers.
- City made compost, leaf mulch, and wood chips will be available at the City parking lot on Simcoe Street between Oswego and Montreal Streets, starting at 4 pm on Friday, March 15 and continuing until supplies run out.
- **Agenda Review:** Highlighted the main points for discussion, including the Menzies Development update and community engagement opportunities.

2. OCP Update:

- Trevor M. encouraged participation in the city's Official Community Plan (OCP) process, emphasizing the importance of community input in shaping the future of James Bay and

the broader city landscape. The City has started the consultation process to update the OCP. Go to engage.victoria.ca/ocp.

3. Menzies Development Update:

Presentation from Niall Paltiel:

- **Overview:** Introduced the development team and provided an overview of the proposed project at 131-139 Menzies Street, highlighting changes made in response to community feedback.
- **Proposal Details:** The proposal now includes a mixed-use, four-story building with 43 dwelling units, designed to fit the neighbourhood's character and minimize construction impact by eliminating underground parking.
- **Architectural Design:** Jeremy Beintema detailed the architectural design, focusing on family-oriented units, bike parking, commercial space, and increased green space. The design adjustments aim to reduce the building's height and density, improve setbacks, and enhance the pedestrian experience.
- **Transportation and Management:** Nadine King discussed transportation demand management strategies, including car share memberships, electric bike stalls, and improved transit shelter amenities.
- **Property Management:** Shannon Kowalko emphasized the role of Brown Brothers in ensuring quality tenancy and community integration, highlighting the project's focus on walkability, bike-ability, and car-free living.

Comments/Question Period:

- **Community Feedback:**

Residents raised concerns about the project's impact on parking, green space, and the building's scale. Questions were asked about the feasibility of a car-free lifestyle in the area, the impact on local infrastructure, and how the development would integrate with the neighbourhood's character.

- **Lifestyle:** One participant questioned how the development would support a European-style, walkable community without including more retail spaces, especially around the Five Corners, which is considered the center of the community. The concern highlighted the need for local services and amenities that support a car-free lifestyle.
- **Massing and Height Concerns:** Another participant reiterated concerns about the massing and height of the proposed development, especially in comparison to the larger lot sizes of other developments. There was skepticism about the fairness

of comparing the proposed four-story development on a narrow lot to other projects with more room for setbacks and less impact on residential homes.

- **Setbacks:** Questions were raised about how the proposed setbacks in the development compare to those outlined in Bill 44, specifically questioning whether the development's setbacks were in line with or exceeding the minimum requirements for residential areas as per the new bill.
 - **Unit Mix and Size Discrepancies:** There was confusion and concern over discrepancies between the number and types of units mentioned in the presentation and those detailed in the letter to the city. Clarification was sought on the actual mix of studio, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units, with a call for the development team to issue a revised letter to the city that accurately reflects the proposal.
 - **Aesthetics and neighbourhood Character:** Concerns were voiced about the aesthetic impact of the proposed development, described as a "big ugly box," on the Edwardian architectural character of the James Bay neighbourhood. The fear is that such developments could disrupt the visual flow and charm of the area, leading to a loss of the neighbourhood's valued ambiance.
 - **Community Feedback and Engagement:** There was a sense that community feedback on the size and scale of the development was not being adequately addressed or considered, with repeated calls for a development that better blends with and respects the existing character of the neighbourhood.
- **Developer Responses:** The development team addressed concerns by detailing the design considerations made to respect the neighbourhood's character, the extensive transportation demand management plan, and the commitment to quality tenancy and community integration through Brown Brothers' management.

4. Community Comments:

- Some community members raised questions about the broader implications of the OCP on the neighbourhood and expressed disappointment with the city's response to requests for a JBNA committee to have a more formal role in planning processes.
- There were inquiries about the city's approach to development, particularly regarding the "doughnut approach" which suggests lower density in the center of neighbourhoods.
- There was a sense of frustration over perceived limitations on community input and the need for more effective channels for resident participation in decision-making.
- The discussion touched on the limitations faced by the JBNA in forming a formal committee to have a more direct role in city planning processes. It was highlighted that

despite efforts to engage more formally with planning, the city/province will not support these measures.

- There was a call for more effective community advocacy, suggesting that direct action at City Hall might be more impactful than letters.
- The discussion referenced historical community efforts that successfully influenced development outcomes, suggesting a need for renewed community mobilization.
- This historical context was mentioned in relation to current challenges and the transformative impact of recent provincial legislation (Bill 44) mandating significant housing targets for municipalities, which could lead to widespread changes in community character.
- Tim Van Alstine acknowledged the community's feedback, emphasizing the board's commitment to facilitating constructive dialogue between the developers and residents. He highlighted the importance of finding a balance between development needs and preserving the neighbourhood's character, urging continued engagement and feedback from all parties.

Closing Remarks:

The meeting concluded with thanks to all participants and presenters.

Zoom Chat Log:

19:03:29 From JBNA to Niall Paltiel(Direct Message):

Hi Niall, I will give you co-host permissions so you can share your presentation.

19:16:53 From Niall Paltiel to JBNA(Direct Message):

Thank you 😊

19:20:17 From Trevor Moat to Everyone:

Participants are welcome to provide their comments in the chat line.

19:21:22 From Ocean Inglin to Everyone:

People will still have cars even if you idealistically say that parking options are not necessary

19:21:38 From Laurie Abel to Everyone:

I like this plan.

19:23:10 From mike jones to Everyone:

Is this proposal all rental?

19:23:14 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

if the developer is not going to provide parking, they must rent to ONLY people without cars. Otherwise you burden the entire community with congestion beyond control.

19:23:47 From Ocean Inglin to Everyone:

Reacted to "if the developer is ..." with 👍

19:23:58 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

People will still have cars. It will be a nightmare. The building itself is better. Very manipulative I feel to say you didn't want blasting so now you have to put up with possibly 43 new people parking in the neighbourhood.

19:24:20 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "if the developer is ..." with 👍

19:24:44 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Replying to "if the developer is ..."

It should be a rule to live there.

19:24:57 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

It's very naive to think tenants won't own cars — and something that no one can manage or guarantee.

19:25:03 From Niall Paltiel to Everyone:

Yes, this property will be 100 percent rental by covenant and we only will be renting to tenants without vehicles.

19:25:15 From Ocean Inglin to Everyone:

Now the city is removing parking from Rithet. So will people be parking in the Thifty's parking lot

19:25:43 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

it is very interesting that no one wants to address the car and parking issue. It is the elephant in the room and completely ignored by developers.

19:25:48 From Soressa Gardner to Everyone:

Yes, the no blasting is a welcome change, but a row of family oriented townhouses would be more reasonable and could have a few ground level parking spots.

19:26:03 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes, the no blasting..." with 👍

19:26:14 From Ocean Inglin to Everyone:

I like the inclusion of commercial on the ground floor

19:26:27 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes, the no blasting..." with 👍

19:26:31 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Will the tenant be restricted from ever having guests visit with cars? Currently most tenants on this block have cars. Where will tradespeople working on or delivering to this building Park. The zero car strategy is a fantasy. There is no nearby public parking so parking so the neighbouring streets will become parking lots. Fewer larger units or townhouses her would address the parking issue. Why so many bachelor units?

19:27:31 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Nial said that they have the right to build six storeys yet this is incorrect. One needs a larger deeper site for this.

19:27:35 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

There are slowly squeezing you out of your car. This is all on narrative for Sustainable development goals which wants to eliminate private ownership of cars and property rights but lets not go there!

19:27:47 From Ocean Inglin to Everyone:

This no parking plan only works if the city can mandate no vehicles for tenants

19:27:50 From Soressa Gardner to Everyone:

The massing is not "in kind" with the houses behind on Medana. The other development across the street is on a massive lot and set back from other residential homes.

19:28:01 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes, the no blasting..." with 👍

19:28:19 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "The massing is not ..." with 👍

19:28:26 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "There are slowly squ..." with 👍

19:28:41 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "People will still ha..." with 👍

19:28:51 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Will the tenant be r..." with 👍

19:28:53 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Will the tenant be r..." with 👍

19:29:01 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

This is a huge building to try to force on such a shallow lot.

19:29:02 From Joanne Thibault to Everyone:

Can Shannon speak to how many people who have cars rent in buildings with no parking? Also, are the car-free options proving to attract and secure car free tenants?

19:29:09 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

You can not mandate no vehicles. Rental laws are provincial. No vehicles at this site is insane.

19:29:09 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "it is very interesti..." with 👍

19:29:14 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

James Bay is in for a major overhaul in lifestyle for sure. Get ready folks. It's not going to ever be what it was. Put 43 units where there were 3, and not provide parking, and you have a problem that you are unwilling to address.

19:29:31 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes, this property w..." with 👍

19:29:35 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "James Bay is in for ..." with ❤️

19:29:41 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "It's very naive to t..." with 👍

19:29:52 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "People will still ha..." with 👍

19:29:54 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "This is a huge build..." with 👍

19:29:58 From edy bradley to Everyone:

The north end fourth floor should have the end unit deleted so that the massing steps down to the neighbouring retail unit at a more gentle angle. This also makes a more symmetrical front elevation.

19:30:11 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "if the developer is ..." with 👍

19:30:20 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:

What is the average size of the different units, please....for the bachelor suites, the 1-bedrooms, the 2-bedrooms, the 3 bedrooms.

19:30:25 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

They are showing the Thrifties parking lot which is reserved for clients of that mall. It is NOT public parking.

19:30:32 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "It's very naive to t..." with 👍

19:30:38 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:

Reacted to "They are showing the..." with 🙄

19:31:13 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:

Reacted to "It's very naive to t..." with 👍

19:31:16 From mike jones to Everyone:

Why is geric proceeding with the current proposal given government legislation in June?

19:31:40 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

This is a very shallow lot. Nial says that they have addressed neighbours issues regarding setbacks yet is only providing 1/2 the required rear setback - for a lower building. Drawing shows excavations for patios next to existing protected trees which will kill them

19:31:42 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

This ugly block still does not coalesce with the tone of the neighbourhood. It is an ugly wart on the pretty face of Edwardian James Bay.

19:33:32 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "This ugly block stil..." with 👍

19:33:50 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Set backs are vital to healthy neighborhoods. That is why the requirements are enshrined in the zoning, which was created by people who have made a study of healthy community planning.

19:34:54 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "Set backs are vital ..." with 👍

19:35:01 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Can we please see the people speaking instead of an image of a private parking lot?

19:35:16 From mike jones to Everyone:

Barbara you control that lol

19:35:22 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "This is a huge build..." with 👍

19:35:25 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "Nial said that they ..." with 👍

19:37:24 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "Set backs are vital ..." with 👍
19:37:30 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "This ugly block stil..." with 👍
19:37:38 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "This is a huge build..." with 👍
19:40:03 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

if you don't provide parking, tenants will take parking away from others who live here. We must change who gets to park on the street, which will take a Big change in bylaws around parking.

19:40:11 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:
Reacted to "if you don't provide..." with 👍

19:40:58 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Reacted to "Set backs are vital ..." with 👍

19:40:59 From Mary Koyl to Everyone:
No parking is totally inappropriate for this site, and apart from creating overwhelming congestion, will be unsafe. Again, this is proposal remains far too large for the site, the lack of setbacks is - yet again as the developer has been told about this - insulting to the community. Why do residents have to go through the stress of dealing with developer proposals which are overly massive and in this case, very unattractive? A detriment to the community rather than an asset. The poor neighbours on Medana, what a nightmare for them. We all need to stand up for them and stop this proposal from proceeding in its present form.

19:41:09 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Reacted to "if you don't provide..." with 👍

19:41:13 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:
Reacted to "No parking is totall..." with 👍

19:41:22 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Removed a 👍 reaction from "if you don't provide..."

19:41:36 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:
Reacted to "No parking is totall..." with 👍

19:41:38 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Reacted to "No parking is totall..." with 👍

19:41:47 From Deb Hull to Everyone:
Reacted to "No parking is totall..." with 👍

19:44:48 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

7:43 PM

Nial states limits of zoning but ignores one fact and requirement: REAR YARD
SETBACK 10m

19:44:54 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Perhaps I am wrong, but it seems like it would be illegal to discriminate against renting to anyone who owns a car.

19:45:05 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

This proposal does not meet Missing Middle guidelines. Nial supports future planning rules but these are not current

19:45:12 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "7:43 PM

Nial states ..." with 👍

19:45:20 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Perhaps I am wrong, ..." with 👍

19:45:39 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

The original survey from the original division of land is valid. I will prove this in court

19:47:10 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "The original survey ..." with 👍

19:47:54 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

even if 25% of your residents have bikes, it creates so much difficulty to find parking, for residents and visitors and service providers.

19:48:32 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

Has anyone looked at Cook Street? There is very little residential in the village and it is still hard to find parking.

19:48:54 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

The majority of the suites in this building are studios — it is not a family focused development - - to add insult there is no parking for any tenants or guests.

19:49:31 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

What about older people who have care people coming in. Nowhere to park. This is 15 minute city planning. The goal is NO CARS for anyone

19:50:13 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Retail needs deliveries, but there is not space for delivery trucks. Currently Thrifty's trucks need the 131 Menzies driveway cut in order to back onto their site.

19:50:26 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "Retail needs deliver..." with 👍

19:51:38 From Priscilla Tumbach to Everyone:

They just park in the bike lane around the corner as many other people do who live in the apartments by the bike lanes.

19:51:46 From Billy Page to Everyone:

This project replaces 3 houses with 43 units and violates existing bylaws and building guidelines. This will not be affordable housing.

19:51:54 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "This project replace..." with 👍

19:51:57 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "This project replace..." with 👍

19:51:59 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "This project replace..." with 👍

19:52:01 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

Reacted to "This project replace..." with 👍

19:52:11 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "What about older peo..." with 👍

19:53:11 From edy bradley to Everyone:

Reacted to "Retail needs deliver..." with 👍

19:53:29 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Niall please confirm to everyone how many suites are in your building?

19:53:43 From edy bradley to Everyone:

Reacted to "This project replace..." with 👍

19:55:52 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

When Ed Geric came to 139 Menzies to address squatters he had to park illegally on Medana. I have a photo of his truck illegally parked. When there is existing 3 units with four parking spaces with one house vacant, how will this not turn neighbouring streets into parking lots with over 43 units?!

19:56:16 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Everyone that lives on our street — Medana — enjoys the walkability of our neighbourhood, but we all own cars. == I cycle to work year round and we still have a car to run errands and help with elderly parents, etc.

19:56:44 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "Everyone that lives ..." with 👍

19:56:55 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:

Reacted to "Everyone that lives ..." with 👍

19:56:58 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "Everyone that lives ..." with 👍

19:57:10 From edy bradley to Everyone:

We need a hardware store but the commercial space you propose wouldn't work because of the delivery trucks the hardware store would need to receive.

19:57:20 From Billy Page to Everyone:

What is Brown Brothers criteria for rental and what is the estimated cost of these units?

19:57:58 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

I appreciate the changes but would like to make the following points:

19:58:14 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Most car share companies are running at a loss. Everyone depending on them will be affected when they fail financially. Street parking will become permit only then the prices go up...street parking is not assured.

19:58:36 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

The lack of parking is a saving to the developer, and will create issues for the neighbourhood. It's already difficult to park at Thrifty's.

19:58:44 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "The lack of parking ..." with 👍

19:58:47 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "The lack of parking ..." with 👍

19:58:56 From edy bradley to Everyone:

Reacted to "The lack of parking ..." with 👍

19:59:02 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

The setbacks and heights are not considerate/thoughtful of the neighbours on Medana.

19:59:25 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "The setbacks and hei..." with 👍

19:59:49 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

There are too many studio units, especially given the parking concerns. I am concerned about too many studio units going into Victoria. How can so many people be expected to live in a hotel room?

20:00:11 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "if you don't provide..." with 👍

20:00:19 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "There are too many s..." with 👍

20:00:43 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "There are too many s..." with 👍

20:00:45 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "There are too many s..." with 👍

20:00:52 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "The setbacks and hei..." with 👍

20:00:59 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "The lack of parking ..." with 👍

20:01:11 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "Most car share compa..." with 👍

20:03:27 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "What about older peo..." with 👍

20:04:10 From Gayle Nelson to Everyone:

This development would be much better if there were fewer studios and more 2 or 3 bedroom units for families. In addition architectural transitions are needed on the East side. One option would be to step back the second, third and fourth levels on the East side which would reduce the number of units but make the entire project much more acceptable.

20:04:25 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "This development wou..." with 👍

20:04:55 From Mary Koyl to Everyone:

Yes I totally agree, this soulless box of a building does nothing for the ambience of James Bay. Are pedicab drivers going to want to bring people through our community if it becomes a canyon filled with these unimaginative buildings? This building does nothing to complement the heritage nature of our architecture. I just want to reiterate, this is the wrong site for this building. It's far too big. Why not build attractive townhomes for families? Respect our neighbourhood please!

20:05:05 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Everyone that lives ..." with 👍

20:05:13 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes I totally agree,..." with 👍

20:05:31 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes I totally agree,..." with 👍

20:05:40 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes I totally agree,..." with 👍

20:06:04 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

Every developer and their cousin is now going to put up massive housing with no parking. The city needs to PAY ATTENTION to what they are allowing...setting precedents all

over the place, for housing without consideration to residents, neighborhood, and lifestyle. Developers have their heads in the sand when it comes to density, parking, and quality of life. And let's be honest, they don't care about the neighborhood. Only the people who live here actually care.

20:06:27 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

Well said, Kevin.

20:06:54 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "Every developer and ..." with 👍

20:06:59 From Gayle Nelson to Everyone:

Excellent points to honour the intentions of supporting people to have decent homes and maintain neighbourhood integrity, tourism and heritage values.

20:07:20 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "The lack of parking ..." with 👍

20:07:26 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "The setbacks and hei..." with 👍

20:07:38 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "There are too many s..." with 👍

20:08:00 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "Excellent points to ..." with 👍

20:08:03 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes I totally agree,..." with 👍

20:08:04 From Soressa Gardner to Everyone:

Regarding the 1995 map excluding our properties on Medana was the rescinded 1995 OCP, not the LAP

20:08:23 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Every developer and ..." with 👍

20:08:30 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

The neighbours on Medana are not trying to oppose development, we simply wish to see development that complements the existing neighbourhood.

20:08:42 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "The neighbours on Me..." with 👍

20:08:50 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

This is a poor precedent and not thought out. The letter to Council is full of errors and contradictions, even making reference to the parking garage which does not exist on drawings. Geric needs to do a proposal that is consistent and not full of errors

20:08:52 From Jennifer Button to Everyone:

Reacted to "Every developer and ..." with 👍

20:09:14 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "This is a poor prec..." with 👍

20:09:39 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "This is a poor prec..." with 👍

20:10:08 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

the whole idea of replacing 3 homes with 43 homes is out of whack on every level, in a neighborhood like this.

20:10:22 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:
Reacted to "the whole idea of re..." with 👍

20:10:33 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:
Replying to "the whole idea of re..."

Especially with no parking

20:10:52 From Garth and Doreen McBride to Everyone:
Reacted to "the whole idea of re..." with 👍

20:10:57 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:
the fact is it's not as lucrative!

20:11:49 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Reacted to "the whole idea of re..." with 👍

20:11:53 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Reacted to "Especially with no p..." with 👍

20:12:34 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:
no dont' take it offline. Let's look at the facts.

20:12:54 From Gayle Nelson to Everyone:
can mike turn on his camera?

20:14:51 From Linda Carlson to Everyone:
ToNiall,

20:15:05 From Linda Carlson to Everyone:
to Niall

20:15:29 From Linda Carlson to Everyone:
Replying to "to Niall"

have you given any thought to renting the house that was vandalized?

20:16:06 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:
Reacted to "The setbacks and hei..." with 👍

20:16:39 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Over a year ago Nial made a comment at a New Horizons meeting about high east facing windows providing privacy to Medana houses but had full patio doors and full windows on the drawings. Now so much later he still has the same comment on his letter to council. I find it sloppy and rude to keep repeating the same errors over and over. Are the errors intentional? Is this sloppiness respectful? Your letter contradicts itself saying you are respectful? You say you have addressed our concerns yet the same errors in the letter exist so much later.

20:17:24 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:
Reacted to "Yes I totally agree,..." with 👍

20:17:51 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

The "housing targets" are to build density its all part of Agenda 2030. They will build towers and then you get taxed for the air above your house. The Federal Government has housing targets for mass immigration.

20:18:29 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:
Replying to "to Niall"

They keep repeating the housing shortage issue but this house is left vacant. This is a contradiction

20:18:46 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Excellent points to ..." with 👍

20:19:08 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "The neighbours on Me..." with 👍

20:19:08 From Jeremy Beintema to Everyone:

Regarding the unit mix, we have 4x 3 bedroom, 5x 2 Bedroom, 15x 1 Bedroom and 19x Studio

20:19:27 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "This is a poor prec..." with 👍

20:19:46 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "the whole idea of re..." with 👍

20:19:49 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Especially with no p..." with 👍

20:20:41 From mike jones to Everyone:

Replying to "Regarding the unit m..."

Put another 2 storeys add more 3 bedrooms.

20:21:34 From Lynda Cronin to Everyone:

It should not be impossible to meld increased density with a development that is sympathetic and complementary to the existing neighbourhood. It would, however, require more imagination and acceptance of a smaller profit.

20:21:51 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "It should not be imp..." with 👍

20:22:13 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "Regarding the unit m..."

as stated by a developer whose proposals are universally rejected by James Bay neighbours

20:22:39 From Linda Carlson to Everyone:

Be nice Kirk

20:22:40 From mike jones to Everyone:

Given the two options in the current 30 year OCP for the future. Why can we approve a 4 storey 200 year structure?

20:23:05 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

Reacted to "as stated by a devel..." with 👍

20:23:21 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

Replying to "Be nice Kirk"

?

20:24:23 From mike jones to Everyone:

Replying to "Regarding the unit m..."

New ocp speaks for itself

20:25:15 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "as stated by a devel..." with 👍

20:25:24 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

139 has been allowed to fall into disrepair which led to the former tenant, James, leaving. I have photos showing how the tenant kept the place very nice.

20:26:14 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

The tenant at 135 had a former Geric employee contact her apologizing for how she was treating her under the employ of Geric Construction.

20:26:28 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

Replying to "Be nice Kirk"

Bottom line, I want to point out there is a LOT of opposition to this project, as well as other projects that seek to change the zoning and guidelines in a large way, despite the provincial push to densify.

20:27:04 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Bottom line, I want ..." with 👍

20:27:17 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "Bottom line, I want ..." with 👍

20:27:25 From Ocean Inglin to Everyone:

Reacted to "Bottom line, I want ..." with 👍

20:28:50 From mike jones to Everyone:

affordability and density go hand in hand. Both the staff and province have shown that in policy adjustments

20:28:53 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:

If I understand the evolution of this proposal over the 3 design iterations, it has dropped 2 storeys but there are still the same number of units, is that correct? So each unit must be quite a bit smaller in size, for the developer to fit in virtually the identical number of units in less storeys. So 'per door' they are getting good value, and - bonus - they don't have dig down much and don't have to provide parking. Brown Brothers is happy with any 'doors' that they get to manage.

20:30:23 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Reacted to "if you don't provide..." with 👍

20:30:26 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Reacted to "No parking is totall..." with 👍

20:30:36 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Reacted to "7:43 PM

Nial states ..." with 👍

20:30:44 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Reacted to "Perhaps I am wrong, ..." with 👍

20:30:45 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "It should not be imp..." with 👍

20:31:06 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Replying to "Perhaps I am wrong, ..."

You actually can not.

20:31:30 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "Perhaps I am wrong, ..." with 👍

20:31:39 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "You actually can not..." with 👍

20:32:26 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

thank you Kirk!

20:32:41 From mike jones to Everyone:

perhaps market rental sold under BC housing assisted purchase programs for first time buyers might suit this site.

20:34:15 From mike jones to Everyone:

Then buyers are consciously choosing to purchase car free units.

20:34:22 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

Well said, Kirk.

20:34:35 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

well said kirk!

20:35:09 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

There's a long standing CO=OP on Dallas isn't there?

20:35:17 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "well said kirk!" with 👍

20:35:18 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

There have been no guarantees to buyers (renters) consciously choosing car free units, or any regulations to such. This is just not true.

20:35:21 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "Well said, Kirk." with 👍

20:35:44 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

It's a crap shoot at best.

20:35:58 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

wishful thinking at best.

20:37:20 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

He is doing something he is proud of... to his boss. He is right on narrative.

20:38:15 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Niall — your letter speaks of neighbours to the west having privacy concerns — please be aware that there is a parking lot to the west of your properties — they're no neighbours to the west until you get beyond Thrifty's. The Neighbour's to the east are the people that are having their privacy violated.

20:38:20 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Reacted to "This development wou..." with 👍

20:38:29 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

There is no parking for service vehicles as demonstrated by Ed Geric illegally parking on Medana St. - all when there are two occupied units yet you propose 43.

20:38:30 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

You have to see the big picture they are fazing out cars wether we like it or not.

20:38:32 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes I totally agree,..." with 👍

20:38:42 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Reacted to "Every developer and ..." with 👍

20:39:01 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Niall — your letter ..." with 👍

20:39:13 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

I think this parking issue is a city issue. Clearly developers are not responsible to provide parking . So why should they? This is a city planning issue.

20:41:10 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "You have to see the ..."

Cars may be phased out but what about service vehicles? We had most of our spots taken up by Restoration company vehicle for the nursing home, for weeks. Parking is still needed even if people do not have cars.

20:41:42 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

who here does not have or need a car?

20:42:19 From Corinne Macdonald to Everyone:

Yes - I believe there is a 'sign' indicating that there is a Co-op on Dallas Road. When walking by the location, It appears to be a rather large development.

20:42:28 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "Yes - I believe ther..." with 👍

20:42:38 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

We all need to write to the city, our viewpoints, our concerns. This meeting is only worth our own need to clarify. PLEASE WRITE TO THE CITY AND SHOW UP WHENEVER POSSIBLE.

20:42:53 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "We all need to write..." with 👍

20:43:16 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "We all need to write..." with 👍

20:43:22 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "We all need to write..." with 👍

20:43:46 From Barbara Pedrick to Everyone:

Replying to "You have to see the ..."

The way to get folks out of cars is to create convenient and affordable public tansit. As a person with mobily issues I am appalled at the backwards way of doing this.

20:43:47 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Its out of character because they are changing our neighbourhood. Purposefully. Think West End of Van here we come...

20:44:08 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "We all need to write..." with 👍

20:44:29 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

I'm thinking Esquimalt actually.

20:44:41 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Its out of character..." with 👍

20:44:50 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

NO offense to that area....but it is not the same.

20:45:16 From Ben Ziegler to Everyone:

Hat tip to proponent for their initiative and compromise. Decent proposal. Mix of units is good. Car-free focus is good. Scale/form is good. All reasonable in my books.

20:45:30 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

This proposal shows retail yet much of Menzies retail is vacant. Is there really a demand for more retail. Think of the mostly vacant H&R Block in A class space.

20:45:32 From mike jones to Everyone:

Given the new OCP shows 3.0 FSR in this location, how are we accepting a 1994 OCP design compliant structure just months out of a change.

20:45:58 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Replying to "NO offense to that a..."

There is all these signs that say "land assembly" in Esq. They are massively being developed.

20:45:58 From Deb Hull to Everyone:

Hi Mike — just to clarify, there is no new OCP yet.

20:46:13 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Marianne brings up all the important points...aesthetics, practicality, trees, traffic, appropriate housing. Nothing about this proposal addresses any of these concerns.

20:46:22 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "Marianne brings up a..." with 👍

20:46:24 From mike jones to Everyone:

sorry just 2 option for blanket zoning the entire city.

20:46:41 From Lynda Cronin to Everyone:

Reacted to "Marianne brings up a..." with 👍

20:46:55 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "This proposal shows ..." with 👍

20:47:21 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Mike: Zoning has to be equal. If neighbours bordering the rear yard were to build with teh saem rear setback there would only be a dak lightwell between buildings . This may make sence in Morocco or sunny hot places, but not here.

20:48:04 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Mike: Zoning has to ..." with 👍

20:48:08 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "Mike: Zoning has to ..." with 👍

20:48:16 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

I have a family member with mobility issues. Cannot not have a car. Period.

20:48:32 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

The city should rather build out the area north of Chinatown before destroying James Bay. DO positive rezoning to make that area better before destroying a historic family neighbourhood

20:48:43 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "The city should rath..." with 👍

20:48:43 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

According to statistics in BC, 1 out of 5 people has a disability.

20:48:52 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "The city should rath..." with 👍

20:48:52 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "The city should rath..." with 👍

20:48:58 From Corinne Macdonald to Everyone:

Does the Property Management company have data on the amount of time that renters actually remain in a studio unit. The size is comparable to a hotel room. The family units are also small. I agree, it appears to be a type of transitional housing.

20:49:13 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "Does the Property Ma..." with 👍

20:49:20 From Lynda Cronin to Everyone:

Reacted to "The city should rath..." with 👍

20:49:21 From Anne Duchesneau to Everyone:

Reacted to "The city should rath..." with 👍

20:49:23 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "The city should rath..." with 👍

20:49:31 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

You know many of those residents are going to try to park in thrifty's parking lot!

20:49:39 From Anne Duchesneau to Everyone:

Reacted to "Does the Property Ma..." with 👍

20:49:40 From Anne Duchesneau to Everyone:

Removed a 👍 reaction from "Does the Property Ma..."

20:49:42 From Anne Duchesneau to Everyone:

Reacted to "Does the Property Ma..." with 👍

20:50:01 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

TO Shannon: what about overnight guests. What happens when a tenant has a romantic partner or sibling show up unexpectedly from up island perhaps in a health emergency. People on our island need cars and visit here. There are not buses to Port Hardy!

20:50:12 From Billy Page to Everyone:

I would like to know what their fair rental rate is?

20:51:51 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "According to statist..."

And Niall states that this is housing for seniors. Where do their foot nurses, their caregivers park. Where does the disabled bus stop to load them. Where does an ambulance park.

20:52:01 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

When I first moved to Victoria I saw numerous suites that had no parking and at each every site the management company encouraged me to either find a paid parking spot somewhere or to simple park my car in the adjacent residential neighbourhoods — it is naive to think that a property management company can control parking with their tenants.

20:52:10 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "And Niall sates that..." with 👍

20:52:21 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "When I first moved t..." with 👍

20:52:26 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "When I first moved t..." with 👍

20:52:34 From Anne Duchesneau to Everyone:

Reacted to "When I first moved t..." with 👍

20:53:00 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "When I first moved t..." with 👍

20:53:03 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "According to statist..."

When there was a squatter fire at 139 last month, there was nowhere for police and fire to park. They had to close the road and take over the Thrifty's parking lot. That lot will not always be there.

20:53:14 From Laurie Abel to Everyone:

Reacted to "Hat tip to proponent..." with 👍

20:53:30 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "When I first moved t..." with 👍

20:54:02 From Mary Koyl to Everyone:

I agree with Kirk, the City should show some leadership in building out north of Chinatown before allowing developers to damage the integrity of the James Bay Community Centre. We are property owners and tax payers, why is there no consideration for our contribution to the community?

20:54:10 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

thank you Priscilla. You speak to a higher ideal than just cramming as many people as possible on a lot - no matter what impact it has on others. I'll say it.....it's all about the money. Not what is right for the neighborhood.

20:54:13 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "thank you Priscilla...." with 👍

20:54:20 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Removed a 👍 reaction from "When I first moved t..."

20:54:21 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "I agree with Kirk, t..." with 👍

20:54:22 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "When I first moved t..." with 👍

20:54:26 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "I agree with Kirk, t..." with 👍

20:54:27 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "thank you Priscilla...." with 👍
20:54:40 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:
Reacted to "I agree with Kirk, t..." with 👍
20:54:56 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:
Reacted to "When I first moved t..." with 👍
20:55:03 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:
Reacted to "thank you Priscilla...." with 👍
20:55:45 From Gayle Nelson to Everyone:
Could Joanne post a link to that CRD study
20:56:15 From Mary Koyl to Everyone:
Like Patricia, I wonder what the point is of being on the phone for two hours, if the our City representatives are not present and are not getting the community feedback expressed here.
20:56:19 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:
Let's build housing where it makes sense — this would be a perfect site for family focused housing — -it makes no sense to try to force such a large building into such a small property.
20:56:25 From edy bradley to Everyone:
Reacted to "thank you Priscilla...." with 👍
20:56:34 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:
Reacted to "Like Patricia, I won..." with 👍
20:56:38 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:
Reacted to "Let's build housing ..." with 👍
20:56:39 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:
Reacted to "Let's build housing ..." with 👍
20:56:42 From Lynda Cronin to Everyone:
Reacted to "Like Patricia, I won..." with 👍
20:56:44 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:
Reacted to "Like Patricia, I won..." with 👍
20:56:45 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Reacted to "Let's build housing ..." with 👍
20:56:46 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:
Reacted to "Let's build housing ..." with 👍
20:56:46 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:
Reacted to "Like Patricia, I won..." with 👍
20:56:55 From edy bradley to Everyone:
Reacted to "I agree with Kirk, t..." with 👍
20:56:56 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:
Reacted to "Like Patricia, I won..." with 👍
20:57:04 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:
Reacted to "thank you Priscilla...." with 👍
20:57:59 From Joanne Thibault to Everyone:
T
20:58:17 From Joanne Thibault to Everyone:

Check the

20:58:37 From Priscilla Tumbach to Everyone:

I was speaking more to the fact that Geric comes out and hears through appreciative inquiry what is important to this neighbourhood and create a shared vision.

20:59:13 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "I was speaking more ..." with 👍

20:59:48 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Niall has just stated that they are giving land to the street giving more parking, but the land ceded to the street provides no extra parking.

20:59:53 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

The dated James Bay LAP highlighted development and expansion NORTH of Simcoe — and there are wide open lots that would be ripe for development moving North on Menzies. These may be currently used for parking, but with creative planning, both people and parking can be accommodated while respecting the neighbourhood.

21:00:01 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "The dated James Bay ..." with 👍

21:00:13 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "The dated James Bay ..." with 👍

21:00:57 From Joanne Thibault to Everyone:

For the CRD information see the original documentation on Development Tracker that was submitted when it was originally a CRD project. As well JBNA w

21:01:02 From Mariann Burka to Everyone:

(Mariann) Can you please provide some sources and statistics for the information you have just provided as to investment returns being double as between rental and ownership?

21:01:13 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

James bay is accessed by three intersections. Dallas will be closed next week. With any protest or celebration at teh Legislature, James Bay will be cut off. Adding density makes no sense (unless we have a tunnel under the harbour!)

21:01:22 From Mary Koyl to Everyone:

Sure yes the shop owners might gain, off the backs off the people on Medana who will lose considerably in terms of the property values of their homes. Not to mention the privacy and wellbeing issue given the stress they will endure and are enduring as a result of this proposal. Is it really fair to let them carry this negative impact?!

21:01:29 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "James bay is accesse..." with 👍

21:01:42 From Graham Hawkins to Everyone:

Reacted to "Sure yes the shop ow..." with 👍

21:01:44 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "Sure yes the shop ow..." with 👍

21:01:46 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "Sure yes the shop ow..." with 👍

21:01:55 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "James bay is accesse..." with 👍

21:02:15 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Sure yes the shop ow..." with 👍
21:02:18 From Joanne Thibault to Everyone:
Has posted the transcript of the presentation where the CRD cited this.
21:02:23 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:
Reacted to "Sure yes the shop ow..." with 👍
21:03:24 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:
Replying to "Sure yes the shop ow..."

Niall and Geric have not heeded the zoning rules. This is about profit. Niall can rezone Central Sannich large sites rather than profit off of our backs.

21:04:58 From Mary Koyl to Everyone:
Thanks to Trevor for moderating this meeting - great job!

21:05:13 From Soressa Gardner to Everyone:
Reacted to "Thanks to Trevor for..." with 👍

21:06:08 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:
Reacted to "Thanks to Trevor for..." with 👍

21:06:30 From Priscilla Tumbach to Everyone:
What happened to Lorne's initiative?

21:06:40 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:
Reacted to "Thanks to Trevor for..." with 👍

21:07:08 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:
We could talk about the OCP survey which does not give any choice even with the first question. Do you want A or A? The survey is biased in order to bolster a defined solution rather than get real feedback..

21:07:29 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:
Reacted to "We could talk about ..." with 🙌

21:07:34 From Soressa Gardner to Everyone:
Reacted to "We could talk about ..." with 👍

21:07:40 From mike jones to Everyone:
Province mandate

21:07:45 From mike jones to Everyone:
city has no choice

21:07:47 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:
Replying to "We could talk about ..."

I looked at it today...completely biased
21:07:58 From mike jones to Everyone:

just like Saanich, just like oak bay
21:08:01 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:
Reacted to "I looked at it today..." with 👍

21:08:06 From mike jones to Everyone:
just like i said would happen 2 years ago

21:08:11 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

I will agree with Kirk the City's OCP survey appears designed to reach a pre-chosen outcome

21:08:19 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:

Reacted to "I will agree with Ki..." with 👍

21:09:08 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Reacted to "I will agree with Ki..." with 👍

21:09:39 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

can you share what the mandate is?

21:09:58 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "I will agree with Ki..." with 👍

21:10:00 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

Yes they should. We need to revolt.

21:10:04 From mike jones to Everyone:

there is several layered bills

21:10:19 From mike jones to Everyone:

that when put together allow a bypass

21:10:36 From mike jones to Everyone:

12 storeys near transit zones.

21:11:46 From JBNA to Everyone:

<http://engage.victoria.ca/ocp>

21:11:59 From mike jones to Everyone:

james bay isn't on much rock given mapping, will be 6 storeys to reach housing goals.

21:12:12 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

We are a UN satellite office. I attend council regularly. The legislation is part of the agenda 2030.

21:13:11 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "james bay isn't on m..."

There is solid rock under the Menzies site, there are many rock outcroppings even above grade.

21:13:35 From mike jones to Everyone:

Replying to "james bay isn't on m..."

totally true just saying not enough tower sites to meet goals

21:13:41 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

survey is very biased!

21:14:28 From mike jones to Everyone:

Nov 2025 OCP closes.

21:14:44 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

I could not even start the survey as I could not agree with A nor B. It was like a choice between having your head cut off or your torso sawed in two. There is no appropriate choice.

21:14:44 From mike jones to Everyone:

as in final decision issued.

21:14:53 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

We spoke at Oak Bay council Monday Mar 11. We plan on speaking at all town councils.

21:15:22 From Ingrid Holm to Everyone:

Reacted to "I could not even sta..." with 👍

21:15:46 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "james bay isn't on m..."

Most European great cities have few towers. Towers are not the answer

21:15:58 From mike jones to Everyone:

Replying to "james bay isn't on m..."

agreed

21:16:36 From mike jones to Everyone:

Replying to "james bay isn't on m..."

work live townhouses with back density.

21:16:54 From Soressa Gardner to Everyone:

Linda - it is since the LAP was ditched that JBNA asked for people to join a committee about the OCP

21:17:24 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "james bay isn't on m..."

London is dense but is a city of low rise villages. It works. And most lots are 120' deep, with back gardens to keep green space and Victory gardens to grow food in hard times.

21:17:34 From Ben Ziegler to Everyone:

Gregor Craigie's new book (published last week), How we solve Canada's Housing Crisis, is a great resource for future JBNA creativity forums on how JBNA evolves. Inspiring read. Great organization, data, personal stories... He presents/explores housing solutions from cities around the world.

<https://www.amazon.ca/Our-Crumbling-Foundation-Canadas-Housing/dp/1039009387>

21:18:15 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

It is a powerful thing that the community has so much concern over building. Yes we need all write to city and get your neighbors to do the same. It is the time of community involvement to make a difference here!

21:18:38 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "It is a powerful thi..." with 👍

21:19:25 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Reacted to "It is a powerful thi..." with 👍

21:19:38 From mike jones to Everyone:

He motioned for a separate OCP to put the units in the communit yhubs rather than blanket zoning

21:19:42 From Halli MacNab to Everyone:

A donut economy! Look it up! A good theory!

21:19:43 From mike jones to Everyone:

towers over midrise

21:20:05 From Mariann Burka to Everyone:

(Mariann): I think there is still value in community residents getting together and agreeing on some common messaging even if there are differences of opinion on certain issues. I think the City wants to ensure that feedback is fragmented, few and far between and we are playing into their hands.

21:20:20 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "(Mariann): I think t..." with 👍

21:22:06 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

Replying to "towers over midrise"

Cities with towerstypically have higher crime rates and less feelings of community

21:22:20 From kelly drabit to Everyone:

Replying to "He motioned for a se..."

It was my understanding he motioned to increase height from 3 stories to 6

21:23:06 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

I really want to say thank you to our hosts JBNA and the community for staying on this forum so long.

21:23:20 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

Reacted to "I really want to say..." with 👍

21:23:52 From Mariann Burka to Everyone:

Thanks, Soressa, for making this clear.

21:24:32 From Kirk Buhne to Everyone:

We are grassroots and JBNA is what community planning is about. Yes we are mostly grey hairs but we represent community. I have had four generations of my family in my house so I speak for multiple generations. I figure that other participants on this Zoom speak for community as well.

21:24:47 From Dennis Bolen to Everyone:

Reacted to "Thanks, Soressa, for..." with 👍

21:24:54 From Joan and Colin O'Connor to Everyone:

Reacted to "We are grassroots an..." with 👍

21:25:09 From Anne Duchesneau to Everyone:

Reacted to "We are grassroots an..." with 👍

21:25:42 From Elizabeth Stone to Everyone:

I;m with you Priscilla!

21:26:28 From kelly drabit to Everyone:

Well said Priscilla

21:27:49 From Priscilla Tumbach to Everyone:

Great job, Trevor!

21:27:51 From Laurie Abel to Everyone:

Thank you

21:29:26 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

I would encourage the JBNA to invite absolutely anyone -- whether on Council or Within development to come out for a community discussion on the OCP.

21:29:32 From mike jones to Everyone:

3.0 fsr is really low set backs.

21:29:57 From mike jones to Everyone:

like 7' ish back and side 6 stroey

21:30:06 From kathleen bligh to Everyone:

We need to protest the bill 44

21:30:16 From Kevin Youck to Everyone:

I would also encourage the JBNA to support our Medana Street Heritage Conservation Area application and plan to preserve the 5 Corners