

JAMES BAY NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION MINUTES - General Meeting December 13th, 2017

1. Welcome 7:00 pm; 45 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

Marg explained the difference between CoV presentation and the January CRD wastewater presentation.

Thank you to Thrifty Foods for their generous donation of cookies, cakes, and grapes for our December meeting.

Wayne Shillington made a presentation of the current status of our General Meeting location, at 234 Menzies Street, occupied by New Horizons. He also provided a timeline of events and what has been determined by the city as to our access to the building. JBNA will have accesses to the building for the monthly meetings. New Horizons will not provide staff or audio/visual equipment or microphones as equipment is owned by New Horizons, not the city. A commissionaire will be provided by the City for security and opening and closing of the building.

4. Minutes of November 8, 2017 general meeting: m/s/c as distributed

5. CALUC: 672 Niagara - Niagara Mews: REZ 00609 Richard Iredale, Iredale Group

Marg Gardiner reported on the project from September, 2016 to November, 2017. Niagara Mews was considered at a JBNA Development Review Committee (DRC) on September 19, 2016 and at the October 12, 2016 CALUC community meeting. Comments were forwarded to the City on October 21st, 2016.

A second proposal, somewhat different from the one presented at the October meeting, was submitted to the city. In November, 2017, JBNA was advised of a third proposal, which we considered to be significantly different from the first proposal. On November 14, 2017, JBNA wrote to the city, requesting that the proposal come back to the committee for review. Wayne Shillington reported on the DRC meeting held November 22, 2017 attended by Trevor Moat, Marg Gardiner, Wayne Shillington, and Janice Mayfield and proponent, Richard Iredale.

Key Issue: PARKING

- 3 parking spaces are proposed in the current plan as opposed to 4 included in the 2016 plan. Current plan includes 2 garages for 2 of the vehicles (which adds more pavement to the development) and 1 parking space off Violet Lane.
- Builder says the City will not allow him to have a fourth spot as initially planned towards the south of the lane entrance.
- This house conversion, while not currently intended as for strata, is being built to allow strata without major renovation.
- There is no rental covenant on the is property (unencumbered) and therefore should be following the parking guidelines for condos/multi-family, however it was clarified that different parking ratios are applicable to house conversion as opposed to new rental.
- There is to be bike parking and intends to purchase car share membership for each of the 4 units.
- Developer is willing to share communication about reducing the parking to 3 that he received from the City (not received as of December 13).
- JBNA board requests that the Developer follow Schedule C in James Bay.

Key Issue: AESTHETICS

The schematic shows a significant stone wall at the south of the development. Suggestions had been made to soften it by breaking it up through side treatment and/or plantings.

COMMUNITY MEETING PRESENTATION:

Richard Iredale described the proposal with the assistance of several schematics. The existing house would be lifted 4 ft permitting the building of a new lower floor. With an addition to the north side, 4 rental units would be created. Originally made application to the city as a development permit however current city planner requires a rezoning of the property. It was the floor area ratio that changed the application from a DP to rezoning. 3 parking stalls will be provided as required by CoV. The builder has offered to purchase car sharing memberships for the purchasers and will provided 6 parking for bikes.

Questions/comments:

Q/A all those who live within 100m of 672 Niagara

Q: Feels a larger structure than proposed in Oct 2016. Questions about the difference between the two proposals with regard to height at rear (north) end of building.

A: Height is as originally proposed. Structure addition on north side is higher than first proposed and is 10.31m. Current structure 9.3m

C: feels originally proposal received positive reviews but the new proposal has not been a readily accepted. Feels it is higher and denser than what was originally shown – feels building is “heavy”. Greater shading of apartments to the east.

C: Parking is a huge concern thinks 4 parking stalls should be allowed.

Q: Are any units wheelchair accessible?

A: Two lower units will be wheelchair accessible.

C: Supportive higher of density, alternate transportation, feels the number of parking spots would have been appropriate for the proposal. Feels the city’s demands don’t make sense.

C: Thinks it is odd to reduce parking spaces when developer is prepared to provide 4 (1 per unit), 2016 proposal is more attractive than current proposal.

Q: The 2016 was outlined as a rental. The new proposal indicates it is strata as per the city website. Will it be rental? The 1.8 parking indicates the units will be rental. Will you impose a covenant on the property that it will remain rental? Yes or no?

No answer

C: Clarify that the parking requirements are not for rental, but the 1.8 parking comes about due to the conversion of a house conversion to a multi units.

C: Concern that the city doesn’t take into consideration affordable housing. What will be the rate of the rental units or sale units?

A: Wants to rent, but can’t guarantee what future owners will do. Won’t be placing a covenant on building. Plan to rent. Rents will be market rents.

C: Likes design, unfortunate the city has demanded parking stalls be garages and one surface. At the end of the day the cars will sit outside of the garages not inside of them.

6. Expectations and the City of Victoria role in the Wastewater Conveyance project

Brad Dellebuur, Ass't Director Transportation, City of Victoria

Mr. Dellebuur spoke about changes to Clover Point, the public realm and the Forcemain/cycle Track from Clover Point to Pilot St along Dallas Rd. Council has instructed City staff to get JBNA feedback on traffic areas of

Dallas at Douglas

Dallas at Government

Dallas at Menzies

Dallas at Oswego

Dallas at St. Lawrence

Dallas at Niagara

The CRD Project team will make a presentation of the 50% design and alignment of the cycle track and alignment of Clover point Forcemain in January 2018. City representatives will also be in attendance.

Feb 2018 CRD Project Team to present 50% design to the CoV Council – presentation will reflect input received from the community associations in January 2018

March 2018 – the public realm improvement, cycle track design and alignment, exterior of the Clover Pint pump station building and Clover Forcemain alignments is subject to CoV approval in accordance with the criteria set out in the CoV licenses.

April 2018 CRD provides a public engagement plan to CoV Director of Engineering.

Questions/comments:

Q/A for JB residents

C: JBNA is meeting with the CRD Project Team – this is an opportunity to deal with the Douglas – Beacon Hill – Dallas Rd triangle and take it back into the public realm as discussed with the CoV more than 15 years ago.

A: Some of this discussion goes back to 1990 and will depend on the excavation and how pipes are being placed. This will be considered as a budget item by Council.

Q : Will it take Dallas Rd out of access for a period of time and how long will that be

A: CoV asking the CRD Project Team, will depend on how they will place the pipe which is a 1.5m wide – details will start to be fleshed out when alignment is finally determined and type of excavation to be done.

Q: St Lawrence/Dallas Rd – is city arborist going to be involved as there are heritage trees along Niagara Street at Dallas Road, and what about the sidewalks? Along Dallas Rd, east of the Harrison Yacht pond is the last of the native grass meadows. How will that be protected, given its significance? Will parks will be involved?

Q: Is route along Dallas cast in stone? Wondered if Niagara St was ever considered?

A: CRD will answer that question about Dallas Road route, but City has not seen anything to indicate it won't be placed along Dallas.

A: Chair notes that CRD reports that Dallas Road is do-able.

Q: How is pipe going to be pulled?

A: That is a question for CRD. You will get answers from CRD at January 10, 2018 meeting

Q: Cycle Track what does that mean?

A: There will be a separated bike lane along Dallas Road

Q: Can consideration be given to one way streets during construction

A: Consideration can be given. City will have to assess when construction route and time is determined by CRD.

C: Want improvements to sidewalks on south side of Niagara between Menzies and Dallas.

Q: Will any private property be affected by construction

A: The pipe will be in the public right of way

Q: I live on Dallas Road and have a disabled person in home and need access to our vehicle and to the sidewalks. How will access be addressed for personal vehicle.

A: We will look at that when we know details of Dallas Road plans.

C: JBNA has heard of the importance of angle parking on Dallas Rd as city amenity. Will this be eliminated due to bike lane?

A: There are some choices to be made. Angle parking vs cycle track. That will be up to the community to identify preferences at the January 10 meeting.

Q: What the interface of cycle *vis a vis* vehicles and pedestrians.

A: Plan is for separated cycle path, roadway for vehicles, and pedestrian routes.

C: Pedestrian walk ways need to be of same width as bike lanes

Q: I have a serious concern about odour from project – will not be current acceptable standard.

A: Not something I can address. Raise issue with CRD in January.

C: Chair clarified that CRD team reported that there is no intention to measure OU at the site boundary. Only H2S to be measured and JBNA asked what levels of H2S were to be considered acceptable by CRD

Q: Will Dallas and Niagara be impaired for traffic at the same time?

A: Still waiting for confirmed construction timeframe and will consider what will be a tolerable level for the area. Will be working with the CRD project team timeline for Dallas and Niagara to determine how to sequence the work.

Q: Why is bike lane on Dallas why not Simcoe, Niagara or Superior?

A: Because 1000's of people use Dallas Rd and would like to cycle along safely along Dallas Rd similarly walk or use scooter on pedestrian path ways. Cyclists are as entitled as pedestrians and those in vehicles to enjoy Dallas Rd.

Q: Is the city getting compensated for the investment the city if make for the all the discussion/design the city staff have had to conduct in preparation of this pipeline work.

A: Anything outside of the trench work and remediating of the road way by the CRD will be borne by the city.

Q: Concerned about width of 1.8m sidewalk on seawall area. A lot of people find it difficult to transit with number of people that use the sidewalks, especially when there are cruise ships in port. Concerned about end of a bicycle lane at Dock St. Will the end of the sidewalk/bike track be congested with bikes, pedestrians, and cruise ship visitors? How can this be addressed? What about talking to GVHA.

A: CoV has sat down with GVHA about looking at this area.

C: Just a thought – if you bury electricity along Dallas Rd I would be supportive of that. GVHA shore power for cruise ships if working on a 30 yr. master plan for OP then wire should be buried. Also encourage charging stations for vehicles.

C: Difficult to cross Dallas Road as no crosswalk between Douglas and Menzies Streets. Additional crosswalks at Government would help slow traffic flow. Supportive of bike lane on Dallas Rd. Does not feel safe on roadway especially when cruise ship season and number of buses that transit road.

C: City needs to address the impact the cruise ship industry has had on the James Bay area, this didn't happen 10 – 20 years ago and has had a huge impact on our roadways which does not lend itself to all forms of traffic, buses, cars, bikes, etc. Our roads were never built to accommodate the traffic we experience as a result.

7. Community Concerns:

No time for questions

8. Adjournment: 9:10 pm