

**CALUC Meeting Report:
November 7th, 2019**

Address: 931 McClure

CALUC Members: Joanna Fox,
Don Monsour, Dave Thompson,
Owen Sieffert

Developer: Aryze
Presenter: Luke Mari, Partner
Architect: D'Arcy Jones
Architects



Attendance: 20

Rezoning Re- requested	Current	Proposed	
	RK	Site specific zone	
Variances	No	Yes	
OCP Amendment required?	No	No	
Number of Units	5	16	
	Current Zone	Proposed	
Site Coverage	33%	72%	
Number of parking stalls	1.5 per unit	10	
Set Back East	2.5m - Blank walls and windows of non-habitable rooms 4m - Habitable rooms other than a living room 7.5m - Living room	2m (6 – 6 ¾")	

Set Back West	2.5m - Blank walls and windows of non-habitable rooms 4m - Habitable rooms other than a living room 7.5m - Living room	2m (6 – 6 ¾")	
Set Back South	Same as West & East	3m (9' – 10 1/8")	
Set Back North	6m (19.69')	5.7m (18' – 9 1/2")	
	Actual Building	Proposed Building	
FSR (Floor Space Ratio)	0.6 – 1.0	1.5	
Height	8.5 M (27.91')	18.1m (59' – 3")	

The Community Land Use Committee (CALUC) facilitates dialogue between land use applicants and the community to identify concerns regarding land use applications which may influence the proposal and result in changes more appropriate to the neighbourhood. The CALUC encourages a respectful meeting environment allowing everyone the opportunity to speak and be heard. The meeting is about the proposal not about the applicant or others involved in the project. There is no decision by the CALUC to support or oppose an application made at, or after, community meetings. Community members are encouraged to share their views with City Council via email (mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca). If an application is submitted to the City, information can be obtained through the Development Tracker feature of the City's website. (<https://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/residents/planning-development/development-tracker.html>)

Themes

Density and Growth Areas

- Site is located in the neighbourhood's northwest corner, which has been identified for increases in density and housing stock. Fairfield generally has had slower growth rates than other neighbourhoods in the city.
- Located in a transitional area between lower density in South and West Fairfield, to the Urban Core and Downtown.
 - The OCP places the lot in the Urban Residential designation, which allows for 6 stories and an FSR of 2
- Surrounding housing is mostly multi-family dwellings, with many larger buildings built in the 1980's

- Current zoning is RK
 - Permits 4-plex

Design

- Despite being allowed for under the Urban Residential Designation, didn't believe that 6 stories would be appropriate for the site
- Two blocks, four and five stories, with 6 one-bed and 10 two-bed condos
 - One-bedroom: 4x 522 sq ft, 2x 535 sq ft
 - Two-bedroom: 10x 789 sq ft
- Interior atrium between the two blocks with landscaping and exterior stairwells
- 10 interior parking stalls and 22 bicycle spaces at street level
- Taller block features a rooftop courtyard with a private sundeck
- Trees will be planted along the perimeter landscaping, interior atrium, and roof courtyard
- Shadow study concluded that there would be large winter shadows, consistent with the shadows throughout the neighbourhood. Fall shadows would fall on neighbouring properties

Community Consultation

- Third design iteration, having changed housing typology from townhouses to condominiums
- The design's vertical massing has changed in order to provide a setback from the lot line
 - Previous design featured no setback
- New design features windows on east and west walls to provide more detail to walls

Neighbourhood Comments/Feedback on Development Proposal:

Parking

- Concern that the ratio of parking spots and to units, and no visitor parking, will result in spillover on to streets that already have limited space taken by visitors of other buildings or uses, i.e. law courts. Neighbouring properties more closely adhere to the parking by-law providing space for every residence and some for visitors.
- Developer says that parking supply was determined by perceived falls in car ownership resulting in lower demand for spaces.
 - As part of agreements with the CRD to increase affordable housing supply, there will be a restrictive covenant eliminating parking spots for the development's affordable units (15% below market rate in perpetuity).
 - Buyers will know in advance that their unit will not come with parking.
 - EV charging will be available for some stalls with Flow Chargers, not billed to the strata electricity bill
- Some recent developments have proposed or proceeded with even lower parking to unit ratio
- Additional concerns over traffic on McClure, which is a cul de sac, creating a bottleneck on Vancouver. This effect could be more pronounced once traffic calming measures are introduced on Vancouver as part of the bike route project.

Light & Privacy

- Participants feel that the height and mass of the design will shade their residences in some units that already have limited light; some participants say they moved to this neighbourhood for the housing with light and walkable locations.
- After dark, there is concern that there will be light spillage from the open atrium and stairwells in to neighbouring apartments.
 - The atrium and stairwell also introduce additional privacy concerns for residents.

Neighbourhood Compatibility

- Concern that the balance between grey and green cover on the lot is not suitable. Considering that most adjacent properties have ample greenery, this property will not provide suitable amount or conditions for trees to flourish.
 - Sentiment that the area provided for landscaping and the chosen species will not be sufficient.
 - Concerns over losing older trees for saplings.
- Participants feel as though they are being pushed out of the area. There is general uncertainty over purchasing character homes in the area since buyers have no idea what type of development could be built next door.
 - Developer also owns property on same side of McClure, two properties west; says there is no immediate plan for development
- Concern that the development's size and architecture does not complement other surrounding properties.

Further Comments

- The city's Advisory Design Committee meeting on this property should not have taken place before bringing this design to the public
 - Community meeting had been requested for May but was not arranged; city staff made the decision to move forward as next available opportunity was six months later
 - Developer says a second community meeting was not required by City, however he wanted to hold one to maintain communication with residents
- Why not build a character 4-plex like adjacent property?
 - Developer says that building costs wouldn't allow a similar design to be financially viable
- Will these be rental units?
 - These units will be strata with 6 affordable units (the ones without parking spaces)
- EV chargers are adjustable to requirements for cars, bicycles, or accessibility scooters
- What is the purpose of the fin at the top of the building?
 - 4-foot fin at the top of the building is purely for aesthetic purposes and to soften the roofline transitions
 - Not entirely closed off to catch all debris, there is also access for cleaning
- A suggestion was proposed to consider reducing the number of parking stalls and thereby reducing the back height of the building