



Community Meeting Feedback Form

This form is intended to help establish a more standardized approach to recording feedback from the Community Meeting. The CALUC may either complete this form and submit it to the City or ensure that the same content is reflected in a letter provided in lieu of this form.

Location of proposed development (address):

1906 – 1912 Duchess St. _____

COMMUNITY MEETING DETAILS

Date: September 25, 2018

Location of Meeting (address): Victoria College of Art _____

Meeting facilitated by (please name the Community Association Land Use Committee (CALUC)):

South Jubilee Neighbourhood Association

Approximate total number of people in attendance:
35

Meeting Chair (please name):
Ben Ziegler

Note Taker (please name):
Kevin Ziegler

CALUC Chair or designate signature: Ben Ziegler Date: Oct 3, 2018

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT DETAILS

Applicant represented by:

Tony James (architect) and Cary Hayashi (property owner)

The applicant explained that this proposal is to change the zoning and/or Official Community Plan for the subject property to accommodate the following proposal:

32 unit residential building underground parking

Community Questions and Answers:

(There were 35 attendees at the meeting, on September 25 -. 32 were from South Jubilee, 3 from North Jubilee.)

Zoning and economics:

- Q: Your requirement is for rezoning - what would your project look like without rezoning? A: doesn't know, as he hasn't been able to make it work – current FSR (floor space ratio) is 1.2; maximum allowable, with bonuses in place, is 2.5. Almost any change in use would require rezoning. (note: applicant is requesting 1.8:1).
- Q: Re: proposal economics – why 1.8 density? 3 criteria for the zoning? A: it has to work in terms of economic sense (underground parking, land, mechanical, materials, consulting fees, etc.) – ending up with the rental cost of the unit. (not established yet)
- Q: How do you know economics if it you don't know (exactly) what you'll be renting the units for? A: We are basing our estimates on current market rates; e.g., for studio, 1 and 2 bedroom. Mix is 25% studio, 50% 1-bedroom, 25% 2-bedroom.
- Q: What's the rental rate (e.g. will it be affordable rental or subsidies)? A: Would be market rent.
- Q: Why don't you reduce height by one floor? A: That would shift the costs, and it would then be a condo building (to make it work, economically).
- Q: Setback? A: No setback, due to angles. It's increasingly common to have no setbacks. Noted that zero setback is only at certain points; e.g., setbacks vary along Fort St.
- Q: Considered mix rental and condo? A: Condo zoning typically prohibits rentals.
- Q: What are the restrictions on condos vs apartments' in terms of the approval process? A: rentals are approved more easily by the City. More parking is required for condos – higher ratio of parking/unit required.
- Q: What's in the formula related to site (area) coverage? A: Factors are sight coverage, height, and density.
- Q: How many units in current buildings? A: 6-7.
- Q: Distance from the road vs last presentation (February 7, 2018)? A: Similar.
- Q: Will the building's address be on Fort St.? A: Hopefully, as the main residence entrance will be there.
- Q: Are you a city-wide (established) developer? A: Own other rental properties. Currently, this is only proposed (new) project.

Parking and transportation infrastructure

- Q: Parking - how many spaces will be lost on Duchess St.? A: 3-4?
- Q: Is driveway (to underground?) covered? A: It's open. Would be trees of some sort along resident's side.

- Q: Would ramp go down quickly? A: Meets basic engineering standards.
- Q: Rental cost for parking space? A: Not sure, also most rental projects uncouple parking and units.
- Q: Clarify parking on Duchess St, would it be designated for building? A: No, it would be public parking.
- Q: Parkade going to the curb lot line? A: Pretty much.
- Q: Can you have big trees? A: No.
- Q: Mitigation for sound going down to parking? A: (Tony) Showed where gate is on the map (impact?).
- Community comment: If parking is additional cost, people will park on street. (Architect) response: That is a long-standing claim.
- Q: Parking on street would be public, e.g., for hospital? A: No street parking is for residential-only.
- Q: Considered requiring no car units? A: Hasn't looked into restricting it to no parking units on site
- Architect note: costs 40,000 per parking slot in underground...
- Q: Where does garbage pickup go? A: It will be in underground parking.
- Q: Bike stalls? A: 1 per unit, plus 6 visitor.
- Q: Where are the current property lines? A: (Tony) Showed property lines on map.
- Q: How could you mitigate right turns onto Duchess St, from building parkade? A: Some form of traffic calming, along Duchess St., heading south, can be considered.
- Q: Concerns expressed at last meeting concern about traffic, and location (Duchess St.) of parking entrance – can't this be changed (eg to Fort St)? A: City's call on in this. It is not the developer's choice.

Construction, process, non-transportation infrastructure:

- Q: Earthquake resistant? A: Will meet the earthquake code standards.
- Q: Site coverage with current zoning is 20%, and developer want 37.7%... has city asked for any trades, community contributions? A: Not yet at that level of discussion. If condos, they would likely ask for something, but rentals aren't treated the same way.
- Q: Wood frame construction? A: Yes
- Q: Will the big trees come down? A: Yes.
- Q: Construction time? A: Typically, it's 1 year to get City rezoning approval, 6 months for getting the necessary permits, 1.5 years to actually build; possibly, longer.
- Q: At what point do you talk to City about water supply? A: Don't know yet, but developers have to absorb cost if significant upgrade required.
- Q: Will there be blasting? A: Don't know, because no soil tests done yet (to determine what the ground underneath is like).
- Q: HVAC - where does that go? A: Not yet at that level of design.
- Q: How will building be heated? A: Not yet at that level of detail, possibly hot water or in-floor heating.
- Q: Fire code - how many floors could wood go up to? A: 6 stories
- Q: What happens to existing 2 homes on the property? A: 1 torn down, 1 relocated.

Design:

- Q: Concern over modern design, though notes colours are toned down (from February presentation)? A: I heard it was too contemporary and modern. I was asked by City to take into consideration Fort St. and hospital and make this (proposed) a transition (visually) into the neighbourhood (older properties).
- Q: Seems a bit modern, what materials are proposed for exterior? A: Paneling, stucco, and wood-with stone on elevator.
- Q: Height? A: Just over 50 feet high

- Q: Thought on greening up the south wall? A: That would be easy to do
- Q: What's the ratio of unit types? A: 50% 1 bedrooms, 25% 2 bedrooms, and remainder studios
- Q: Square footage of unit types? A: studios 400 sq. foot, 1 bedrooms, 550-600, 2 bedrooms 750-850
- Q: Don't need to build larger buildings to make a profit: A: business opportunity for property owner
- Q: Trees coming down? A: Almost all trees on site will come down, will be putting up new trees as per city requirement. Doesn't know number of trees on site- hasn't done inventory yet.
- Q: Is there a laundry room? A: every unit will have dedicated laundry

Community Comments (including positive, negative, and neutral):

Key Areas of Concern:

- Traffic flow – direction and volume, and public safety
- Parking – vehicles to/from parkade, on-street parking
- Building's visual appearance and design – degree of variance to neighbouring buildings
- Building size/density – neighbourhood impact
- City planning process – currency of neighbourhood plans
- Green space

Positive comments re: proposal:

- Kudos to Developer for rental housing; we need more of it, especially if affordable
- Supportive of rental vs condo
- Architect made changes based on previous meeting with community (February 7) – e.g., reduced number of rental units from 34 to 32.
- Supportive of pathway to ground floor units

Other Comments:

- Traffic:
 - Transportation routes will become an issue, particularly as traffic would increase on Duchess and Leighton, as it is difficult to turn left onto Fort to head towards downtown
 - More vehicles will be heading south on Duchess St to avoid turning left (towards downtown) on Duchess St. Duchess is already a narrow street, and Leighton (where traffic would end up) is barely a lane.
 - Concern over safety – biking with kids
 - Fewer on-street parking places for residents
 - cut off street just after driveway for development
- Building's visual appearance and design:
 - "Would look better in Langford." "Developer should look at housing in Vancouver's West End for ideas"... (Architect) Response: asked by city to take into consideration Fort St. and hospital to transition into the neighbourhood.
 - Comments about the facade, and other buildings in area that are a better fit in terms of view. Reference made to Abstract's building on corner of Richmond and Oak Bay Ave being preferable (another resident noted Abstract has a different business model; e.g., focused on condos)
 - This is a modern design in a 1912 neighbourhood
 - Reference made to sections of previous community plan (proposal at variance with)
 - Seems a bit stark, colours seem a bit grim.
 - Issue with the 'four squares of colour' – sees it as token gesture

- Doesn't see why hospital would influence design – noting chestnut trees (between Fort and hospital buildings, and brick on hospital site).
- Reminded of Cook St Village concerns (conflicts around design)
- Building size/density
 - Resident noted that condos are already on Bank St sided, and voiced concern over increase density and use. Voiced concern over current parking trouble on street. Light pollution on the open stairs/ light column.
 - Too big, if economically not feasible, perhaps it shouldn't be done.
 - Looks gigantic.
 - Massive, particularly for a 1 block street.
 - Density of Duchess Street would be doubled.
- City planning process
 - Comment about current infrastructure capacity, and potential development of site across road (White Spot area) from proposal – “land is being acquired, there” – Architect notes that this is an issue for the City to address
 - Almost everyone expressed frustration with the slow pace of City updating of Local Area and Neighbourhood Plans, and City “abdicating responsibilities”, i.e., , South and North Jubilee Plans are 1996
 - Existing plan is out-of-touch with current realities (e.g., sky high property values, low vacancy rates...)
 - 6 projects currently in or bordering South Jubilee – we are working blind (without a neighbourhood plan) – each development being dealt with separately and individually with not enough understanding and concern as to how it fits in with larger neighbourhood.
 - How can we honestly address developer's plans when there is no current neighbourhood plan to guide us
- Green space
 - Concern over loss of current trees. Keep in the arbutus tree. Lack of set-backs in underground parking limits ground depth for deep rooted trees; loss of tree canopy that is essential to neighbourhood health / well-being.
 - Co2 emission concerns over tree loss
- Other
 - Community amenity fund contribution?

CALUC Chair or designate signature:

Ben Ziegler

Date:

Oct 3, 2018