

Name	Date	Comment
Chris Klassen	June 19/22	<p>I currently live at ----- . I am wondering with the proposed new condos at 130 Victoria and 146 Victoria adding to the condo population of the Garment St condos, has anyone thought of providing more greenspace for the dogs? There are already a lot of dogs just in the Garment St condos (which are not even fully complete and occupied.</p> <p>There are limited places to take dogs for a quick pee. The people who have houses and yards across Victoria St are going to be having lawn problems if we are adding that many more dogs to the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Perhaps the developers need to give up some space for a dog park?</p> <p>Thanks</p>
Elaine Reed	May 20/22	<p>Here we go again. Here are my concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No green space. A tree in a pot is not green space, nor is something on the roof.</li> <li>2. Where is the affordable housing for families? This city talks a lot about this, but I see no action</li> <li>3. Traffic..Park St is already jammed up, also Victoria St. Don't tell me all these people will be taking the LRT... I don't believe that.</li> <li>4. I won't live to see it,but I predict Park and Victoria St area will become the slum area of the city,30 years from now</li> <li>5. I see in the ads for all these high rises in this area, they talk about the "vibrant " downtown..seems like false advertising to me</li> <li>6. Please add me to the mailing list for all future meetings, decisions on this project.</li> <li>7. When is the city going to go back to in person meetings, rather than virtual?</li> </ol>
Mike Canivet and Jane Harding	May 18/22	<p>Response to the Development Proposal for 130 – 142 Victoria St. S.</p> <p>Gwen Wheeler submitted a response that more than adequately expresses our exact thoughts. Additionally, we are wondering what function the City of Kitchener planners perform when projects such as this one come forward, other than seeming to be cheerleaders and box checkers.</p> <p>It is obvious that most of the recent high rise tower proposals far exceed intensification targets in our Official Plans and are only financially viable if these excesses are permitted. Are planners who are in favour of concrete, glass and steel towers the only ones assigned to shepherd these towers through the system? Is there any process where alternatives are proposed? Do the planners take the larger community into consideration as they guide the developers through the regulations or is their function strictly to make sure all the boxes are checked?</p> <p>We are also wondering about the future of the Bramm Yards and the rest of the vacant land in that area. This tower, along with the 3 proposed at the corner of Park and Victoria, along with the multiple towers</p>

		<p>presently going up just across the tracks, along with the large parking structure at the end of Stewart will nearly encircle that area and severely diminish future uses. Unless of course the plan is to fill in that area with more concrete towers. The shadow and wind studies for an intimate grouping of 10 or 15 more concrete towers would indeed be very interesting.</p> <p>Respectfully yours, Mike Canivet and Jane Harding</p>
Katherine Moore	May 20/22	<p>Hi Katie,</p> <p>I'm a homeowner on -----.</p> <p>I'm pleased to see that the concept for the Victoria/Park development has made some changes including a reduction in the number of stories from 38 to 25.</p> <p>I'm concerned about the number of Parking Spots (51 for 249 units) as I worry that condo owners will take up the few parking spots in downtown Kitchener which would ideally be available for people coming from further out of the downtown core to enjoy its restaurants and the Park. What is the city's plan for accommodating more parking?</p> <p>What is the mix of unit types? Kitchener needs some three bedroom units to entice young and growing families to remain downtown as opposed to moving to the suburbs.</p> <p>How many units will be earmarked for affordable housing? What limitations exist to exclude foreign buyers and investors from buying up any such units?</p> <p>In what way is the developer contributing to the development of the community? I.e public art, community center, public pool, dog park, etc?</p> <p>Thanks for your attention,</p> <p>Katherine Moore</p>
Sheldon Atos	May 19/22	<p>I hereby wish to register my extreme opposition to this proposed development. There are many bylaws, guidelines and recommendations that this proposed development egregiously transgresses. Further, I</p>

		<p>have noted that there are a number of technical inaccuracies and factual mis-statements in the supporting documentation. I look forward to discussing these and other matters at the Neighbourhood Information Meeting.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sheldon Atos</p>
<p>Sandrina Dumitrascu</p>	<p>May 20/22</p>	<p>Hi Eric, Katie,</p> <p>Following up on the February 8th Public meeting for the 146 Victoria St S Development - are there any further updates on this project you could share? I haven't received any email notifications from the City on this project since the email below from January.</p> <p>The Kitchener Planning Application website offers the following status update, but not more on the next steps:  Status Update: A Neighbourhood Meeting was held on February 8th, 2022. A recording of the meeting can be found here: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JZI7Hd9ch2s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JZI7Hd9ch2s</a></p> <p>Will City Staff post their comments/ recommendations to Council to the public as well, ahead of any of the Council meetings? Also, will City Staff address any of the comments raised ahead of the public consultation meeting (such as the lengthy email below) / as well as any comments raised during the public consultation meeting? It would be great to have an official platform to share this information on for all development applications (such as the EngageWaterloo website) - so that public support / concerns are clearly heard and taken into account. These conversations should not take place on separate platforms that many of my neighbours seem to be turning to to raise awareness about this projects, such as the ones below:  <a href="https://you.leadnow.ca/petitions/reduce-the-heights-victoria-and-park-towers">https://you.leadnow.ca/petitions/reduce-the-heights-victoria-and-park-towers</a>  <a href="https://livableparkandvictoria.com/">https://livableparkandvictoria.com/</a></p> <p>We've also recently received a notice for development for the adjacent site, 130 Victoria St S (which is why I'm looping in Katie Anderl on this email) - this development application does not show any of the proposed development at 146 Victoria St S. in their supporting documentation.</p>

		<p>If each of these developments is reviewed as a stand alone project, on a first come first served basis, against current as of right conditions not in the context of what is being proposed - there is no accuracy to any of the supporting documentation presented with the applications - servicing reports, traffic studies, shadow, wind, etc.</p> <p>Given the high scale and density of the two adjacent development applications currently underway, as well as the unknown future use/designation of the large City owned lands at Bramm Yards Lands, will the City engage in a larger scale Master Planning exercise for the area, rather than taking a piecemeal approach to urban design / City Building? I've raised these questions (along with others) in the email below ahead of the Public meeting, but have not yet come across a clear answer on this so far.</p> <p>Other municipalities, like the City of Toronto require a Master Plan to be done for larger sites - Section 1.2, page 21 of the document:  <a href="https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/96ea-cityplanning-tall-buildings-may2013-final-AODA.pdf">https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/96ea-cityplanning-tall-buildings-may2013-final-AODA.pdf</a></p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Sandrina</p>
Ron MacDonald	May 23, 2022	<p>Good morning Katie</p> <p>I have a few important concerns regarding the future of my neighborhood! I appreciate that development happens but I think there should be a balance when introducing it. I live on ----- and many of us fear that with this upon us, pardon the pun, our street will become unhinged by the sheer numbers of people and cars that will be using it.</p> <p>Word around here is that development will continue west on Victoria St. in the near future! I'm thinking the winds will change, the shadows will grow...the traffic will multiply....! I think the consensus is that development....ok, but let's pull back away from it being so grandiose! Smaller in this case is our choice!</p> <p>I'm hoping others in and around Park and Victoria will comment as well!  THANKYOU Katie for the time!</p>

		Ron MacDonald
Maureen McMahon	April 28/22	<p>Good morning all:</p> <p>I am writing this email as a: 1) home owner located at ----- and 2) tenant at -----.</p> <p>My, along with our resident neighbours and tenant colleagues, are concerned about numerous problems related to this project.</p> <p>On our street now, we have rapid, large volume traffic that proceed down our street at unsafe speeds. I have taken the liberty of purchasing signs validating the SLOW DOWN message to no avail !!! When you get to the bottom of our street – at Victoria Street – if you want to turn left, even without the new and proposed project – you CANNOT turn left due to the massive amount of vehicles using Victoria Street. It is highly unlikely that somebody in their wisdom will think to put a 4-way stop sign at this end, put speed bumps on our street, post and reduce the speed on our street, etc. Some neighbours have called City Hall to complain about the speeding, going the wrong way – and nothing still has not been done!!! Some neighbours are willing to go to the Record for answers.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the ‘shadow effect’ and INCREASED TRAFFIC FLOW, which you all will agree will traverse down our street. How will EMS, fire department, crucial medical assistance not be inconvenienced by the increased VOLUME OF TRAFFIC. We are a heritage designated area and lets scale down, if anything, the site proposal.</p> <p>As a tenant at -----, we now have to re-locate our business that has been at this location for 35 years. Is there a subsidy available to us and other tenants to do so????????? How about offering this up to us – if you can afford to build this project why not find some funding in good faith to us all !!!!!</p>

		<p>Looking forward to a reply.</p> <p>MAUREEN MCMAHON  -----  -----  H: -----    OWNER-OPERATOR: -----  -----</p>
Sue Savor	April 27/22	<p>To Katie Anderl, City planner for 130-142 Victoria Street South Proposal:</p> <p>This is another poorly planned proposal for Victoria Street South.</p> <p>In addition to the predictable requests to ignore the Official Plan and Zoning bylaws to allow for drastic changes to floor space ratio and massive changes to height allowance, the parking reduction is so impractical it borders on absurd.</p> <p>This trend of eliminating parking for condos will inevitably result in congested street parking as well as full public parking lots. This will create havoc for visitors to the area, as well as frustration and added expense to condo/apartment dwellers.</p> <p>Some dwellers who are physically challenged require easy access to personal transportation. Restricting parking to them is discriminatory. People who are in need of practical access to parking include those who use wheelchairs, those requiring walkers, the aged, people who are temporarily challenged in mobility, including those who have broken a leg, those receiving chemo treatment, post surgery residents, and people requiring help from professional or family caregivers who need easy access to transportation for appointments. PSWs and family caregivers who provide essential care cannot bear the extra cost of parking.</p> <p>Personal transportation is shifting toward more environmentally sustainable electric cars. In addition to the use of public transportation, people will continue to require cars as well. Eliminating parking will not eliminate the need for personal methods of transportation.</p>

		<p>This proposal, like all the others, has no truly affordable housing, no accessible housing, no family sized affordable units, no environmentally forward construction, no attempt at an aesthetically pleasing design, and no green space of any kind.</p> <p>If this proposal and the proposal for three towers at Victoria and Park goes through, this block will have a density of 5000 people. This is not well thought out, and it is not a sustainable, healthy way to live. This is warehousing.</p> <p>This is another purely profit driven proposal that further strips the city of Kitchener of its culture and humanity.</p> <p>As Councillor Dennie Chapman pointed out in a recent Waterloo Region Record article regarding this proposal, the city is reworking its downtown plan, and until the plan is finalized, a moratorium should be put in place on any further development in the core. The city's density goals have been met, so there is no need to rush development projects until a new plan is put in place.</p> <p>I am opposed to this development. This city is in crisis. We have tripled the homeless rate. There is an eight year waiting list for accessible housing. Truly affordable housing is nonexistent. Our city is becoming more abrasive, and less welcoming. This proposal is another opportunistic money grab that is contributing to the erosion of our once caring community.</p> <p>Please, a moratorium is necessary on all proposals at this time. We must wait until we have an intelligent, inclusive, comprehensive plan put in place for the city of Kitchener.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sue Savor</p>
Sue Savor	July 12, 2023	<p>Dear Ms. Anderl,</p> <p>I am unable to attend the NIM for this development proposal.</p> <p>Please accept this email as my submission for feedback on this project.</p>

	<p>This development looks identical to practically every tower in Kitchener. It is environmentally regressive with its floor to ceiling windows, lack of meaningful green space, and shadow casting on neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>It's height, as has been pointed out in numerous studies is psychologically damaging to people. It alienates and isolates people from one another. It contributes to depression, loneliness, and poor physical health.</p> <p>We can achieve more housing with better proposals and better planning than this. There are boarded up schools, abandoned houses, brownfields, and suburban areas that can accommodate buildings with fewer floors that result in healthy communities where people know their neighbours.</p> <p>All buildings should be required to meet better environmentally forward designs. The ubiquitous floor to ceiling window design means the air conditioning is on all summer, and the heat is on all winter. The design itself is unimaginative, generic, and does not reinforce a sense of place in any way. This has a deadening effect on its inhabitants and the people who have to walk by it.</p> <p>The inflated price of land has led developers to justify the increased height of their designs, claiming that they cannot make a profit otherwise. This predicament was created largely by the developers, investors, and speculators themselves. I would counter with the suggestion that it's not that they cannot make a profit, but rather that they cannot make as much profit for their investors.</p> <p>We are living through an era of extreme greed and desperate poverty. We have financialized housing.</p> <p>This development proposal does nothing to offer a meaningful contribution toward the community we critically need.</p> <p>The system of artificial demand created by speculators and investors has wreaked a depressing amount of damage on our city. This building proposal does nothing more than add to the mess we are making.</p> <p>I cannot support this proposal.</p> <p>Sue Savor</p>
--	--



Seth Wynes	May 8/22	<p>Dear Ms Anderl,</p> <p>I am writing to you in support of the new development on 130 Victoria St. S. I actually live ----- ----- and am very excited by many features of the new building. First I am happy for more housing to be created during an affordability crisis, but I also am happy for there to be more businesses in my local area. Hopefully it will make the neighbourhood more walkable!</p> <p>I'm also pleased to see that there are only 50 parking spaces allocated for the building. I live ----- so I know that it is a short walk to the LRT station and a short bike ride to the iron horse trail. During a climate crisis it doesn't make sense to build more car infrastructure.</p> <p>My one concern is the suggested plan to widen Victoria St for an addition left hand turn lane. If anything, my neighbours and I have found the traffic already dangerously fast on this street. Perhaps it is time to consider the pedestrians who live in the towers at Victoria St and already have no safe way to cross Victoria. If any changes to Victoria St are needed because of this plan it would be traffic calming and a pedestrian crosswalk between Bramm and Joseph.</p> <p>Thank you so much for taking the time to consider my response!</p> <p>Warm regards,</p> <p>Seth Wynes Resident of Victoria St. S, Ward 9</p>
Gwen Wheeler	May 16/22	<p><b>Response to the Development Proposal for 130 – 142 Victoria Street South Submitted to Katie Anderl, Senior Planner City of Kitchener</b></p> <p>It is disheartening to review another proposal for a development that far exceeds the current zoning and falls short of many of the urban design policies set out in the city's Official Plan. This is the second proposal that fails to recognize that Victoria Street South is situated in two established neighbourhoods – Cherry Park and the historic neighbourhood of Victoria Park. Instead, the developer recognizes only the very recent development to the east of 130 – 142 Victoria. While the proposal is similar to the Garment Street Condos, as the developer notes, it is not <i>in keeping with the existing neighbourhood</i>. Developers</p>

attempt to make the case that the Victoria Street towers are not adjacent to the residential streets, but the City of Kitchener Official Plan definition of adjacency includes separation by a road:

City of Kitchener Official Plan - A Complete & Healthy Kitchener

Adjacent - lands, buildings and/or structures that are contiguous or that are directly opposite to other lands, buildings and/or structures, separated only by a laneway, municipal road or other right-of-way (A-1)

Here is an opportunity for the city planners to work with the developers to achieve a better urban design for the neighbourhood.



There is a growing concern that the urban design of the City of Kitchener is moving in the wrong direction. In February of this year the Waterloo Regional Record published an [editorial](#) called for city council to *stick to the height levels set down in their own planning regulations so existing residential neighbourhoods aren't overwhelmed by the sheer scale of new builds*

It has also become clear that intensification along Victoria Street in not solving the problem of affordable housing. In February of this year, the Waterloo Region Record also published an article by Dawn Cassandra Parker ([Larger builds lead to less-livable cities](#)) in which she explained: *Investors smell upzoning like sharks smell blood in the water, with similar responses. Expectations for approval of high density builds drive land prices too high for cheaper lowrise high-density builds to be economically viable.* When city planners endorse an increase in FSR like the one being proposed for this development land prices go up. Parker goes on to say *Dismantling urban design protections such as setbacks, setbacks and shadowing guidelines is a terrible idea. While it may result in larger builds, it won't result in more viable cities.*

More recently (May 4<sup>th</sup> 2022) the Waterloo Region Record published an [editorial](#) about the issue of intensification with the heading *Kitchener must rethink core values*. The editors characterize this specific proposal as one that *wouldn't just tinker with the city's zoning regulations it would run over them with a bulldozer*.

The need for housing is pressing and this proposal is compelling in that respect. But this project exploits that need. The *Kitchener Growth Management Strategy 2021 Annual Monitoring Report* shows that the city is on target to meet residential and employment growth targets. Notably, the number of residents and jobs per hectare in the Urban Growth Centre is 212 RJs/ha, surpassing the provincially mandated target of 200RJs/ha by 2031. In addition, the City's current intensification level of 67% exceeds the Regional intensification target and existing land use and density policies support future intensification practices. That is, a development with a floor space ratio of 13 is not needed to address the intensification goals of the city.

I am not unhappy with the façade design of this development. However, the developments along Victoria Street have failed to make provisions for mail, food or parcel deliveries, as currently delivery trucks stop on Victoria street in the curb lane resulting in traffic backups. This should be addressed with better design in all future developments.

---

*Great mid-rise buildings are a vital component to any well-designed city. They are the bonding agent that links together downtowns with central neighbourhoods and intensification areas with low-rise communities. They create and reinforce the urban fabric in ways that make a city feel seamless, contiguous and crafted to the scale of the human experience. City of Kitchener Urban Design Manual.*

---

My primary concerns are:

- a tower with a life-cycle carbon footprint that contributes to the climate emergency,
- lack of family size units and too many small units (studio and one bedroom),
- an inappropriate number of parking spaces that will adversely impact adjacent properties especially the streets in the Victoria Park neighbourhood,

- cumulative shadow impact on the residential streets to the south of the Victoria Street towers (note: the justification report refers to the Shadow Studies for the City of Waterloo on page 48),
- incompatible scale with the established neighbourhoods,
- the assumption made in section 5.5 of the Justification Report that the development will contribute to the vibrancy of the neighbourhood and nearby green spaces,
- reductions in setbacks that thwart any possibility for green space especially in the case of the rear yard,
- lack of attention to a streetscape strategy for Victoria Street,
- overuse of black coloured building materials.

It is important for city planners to ensure that this development meets the following policies in order to achieve the vibrant city that city staff and councillors so often promise:

**The Official Plan – Section 4 Housing**

4.C.1.8. Where a special zoning regulation(s) or minor variance(s) is/are requested, proposed or required to facilitate residential intensification or a redevelopment of lands, the overall impact of the special zoning regulation(s) or minor variance(s) will be reviewed, but not limited to the following to ensure, that:

a) Any new buildings and any additions and/or modifications to existing buildings are appropriate in massing and scale and are compatible with the built form and the community character of the established neighbourhood.

4.C.1.9. Residential intensification and/or redevelopment within existing neighbourhoods will be designed to respect existing character. A high degree of sensitivity to surrounding context is important in considering compatibility

**Official Plan – Section 11 Urban Design – Neighbourhood design**

11.C.1.30 The City will, through the Site Plan Control process:

d) provide landscaping which enhances each building or project as well as streetscape;

11.C.1.31. The City will ensure new buildings are designed, existing buildings are redeveloped, expanded, converted or renovated to enhance pedestrian usability, respect and reinforce human scale, create attractive streetscapes and contribute to a rich and vibrant urban places

**Official Plan – Section 15 Land Use Policies – Urban Growth Centre – Preamble**

	<p>Downtown should have green, pedestrian-friendly streets...</p> <p><b>Official Plan – Section 15 Land Use Policies – Urban Growth Centre –Streetscape</b>  15.D.2.32 Where new development or redevelopment is proposed between two land use districts or between a land use district and a central neighbourhood, the scale and massing of both sides of the street should be coordinated to provide a uniform streetscape and pedestrian experience.</p> <p><b>Official Plan Section 15 – Mixed Use – Land Use Objectives</b>  15.4 6 To ensure uses, built form and building design are compatible with surrounding low rise neighbourhoods and are pedestrian-oriented and human-scale in order to positively contribute to the public realm.</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual- City Wide Design – Age and Family Friendly Design</b>  All development in Kitchener should be designed as age and family friendly</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual- City Wide Design – Design for Sustainability</b>  Provide street trees along all streets with sufficient soil volume to ensure healthy, mature canopy.  Create complete communities that include mixed densities and an affordable housing option for people of all ages and socioeconomic status</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual- City Wide Design – Street Design</b>  Provide street trees with the goal of creating a continuous mature tree canopy wherever possible.  Design the public realm to be human-scaled, varied, visually appealing and landscaped.</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual- City Wide Design -Compatibility Scale and Transition</b>  Provide transitions in mass, height and density between areas of different scales and densities in order to mitigate potential impacts and preserve compatibility.</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual- City Wide Design – Site Design – Landscaping</b>  Provide landscape areas between the buildings and the sidewalk with plant beds, planters, trees, street furniture and walkways to the public sidewalk</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual – Major Transit Station Areas – Community Design- Inclusive design, Age and Family Friendly Design</b></p>
--	--

		<p>Residential or mixed-use buildings are to consider unit design and amenity spaces which are appropriate for seniors and families, including storage options, play areas, seating options, etc.</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual – Major Transit Station Areas – Compatibility – Scale and Transition</b>  Higher density development adjacent to established neighbourhood areas is to provide a suitable transition in scale, massing, building height, building length and intensity through setbacks, stepbacks, landscaping and compatible architectural design/material selection.  Provide a mix of building types and sizes, concentration height and density closest to the LRT stops.  Transition in height, density and mass between the station stop and low-rise established neighbourhoods to preserve, compatibility, privacy and access to sunlight.</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual – Design for Tall Buildings – Public Realm – Streetscape</b>  Provide a high-quality, sustainable streetscape and landscape design</p> <p><b>Urban Design Manual – Design for Tall Buildings – Public Realm – Compatibility</b>  Implement Setbacks  Tall buildings should not interrupt or impose upon an existing or planned neighbourhood character or the public realm.</p> <p>Please consider the need for intensification equally with other city priorities such as tree canopy, equitable access to greenspaces, affordable housing, family friendly housing and vibrant streetscapes.</p> <p>Gwen Wheeler  -----  Kitchener, Ontario</p>
Gwen Wheeler	July 19/23	<p>Hello Katie,</p> <p>I attended last night's information session on 130 Victoria. At this point I feel the developers are listening to the concerns of residents. Here are a few things I heard that I feel need to be addressed.</p> <p>Generally, the process seems flawed in that the developer could receive approval for significant zoning amendments without designing to the most stringent sustainability standards. Several times it was mentioned that it is too early in the process. This is not reassuring. I asked about the contribution of the</p>

		<p>colour of the building materials on the heat island effect and I just don't believe the answer that the colour of cladding is insignificant. City planners should correct this misinformation when such a claim is made at a meeting.</p> <p>I also don't agree that a development close to the LRT and dense is sustainable and climate friendly. This position total ignores the carbon cost of construction. The city planners should be assessing the whole-life cost of a development. We are in a climate emergency and the construction sector is responsible for a significant impact on the environment yet city planners seem unconcerned and absent from the conversation.</p> <p>I was glad to see Lenore Ross at the meeting and hopeful that she will ensure that the streetscape is better than what we have been given todate by developers. Again city planners seem to be incapable of delivering acceptable streetscapes. Beautiful should be the goal.</p> <p>Such a big deal was made of a triangular canopy on the outdoor amenity space. I can't understand why that was deemed such a significant design feature when no one will see it. There is insufficient outdoor amenity space and this is a result of zero setbacks from the property line. As trees, greenspace and parks disappear in the city center, setbacks are the solution. This is especially true for developments that make no cash contribution to parks provision.</p> <p>And finally, please stop using the skyline as a reason to endorse a building that exceeds zoning. Who benefits from a skyline? People on the ground don't see it and people living in the neighbourhood see tall buildings which block the sky.</p> <p>The skyline was mentioned in response to a question about why buildings farther from the LRT stations are getting taller. (This was the case with the 146 Victoria development) The guideline which states that buildings should be shorter further from the LRT stations should not be disregarded by city planners. As the sign says Stick with the Plan.</p> <p>I'm sorry to be so harsh but the urban design that is emerging along Victoria streets will shape the city for decades and you will not be able to correct the mistakes you have made. My intention is to see something better.</p> <p>Gwen Wheeler</p>
Mario Chilanski	May 20/22	Good morning,

		<p>I would like to be included in updates and appropriate meeting, regarding the development proposed for 130 Victoria St S. Among my concerns is the practicality of the proposed Bicycle storage facilities.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Mario Chilanski</p>
Zehr Group	May 25/22	No comment – please keep informed.



Peter Kapshey

April 22/22

APRIL 27  
2022

TO KITCHENER PLANNING DEPT.

AND DEBBIE CHAPMAN WARD 9 REP, —

NO - NO - NO - NO - NO - NO - NO - NO - NO  
TO THE APPLICATION FOR PARK & VICTORIA ST.  
THE TRAFFICK IS BAD NOW. WHAT WILL IT BE.  
THE PARKING ON THE SIDE ST. ARE BAD NOW.  
IS ANY ONE FROM THE PLANNING DEPT. GOING TO  
LIVE THERE. IS DEBBIE CHAPMAN GOING TO  
LIVE THERE. IS THE OWNER GOING TO LIVE  
THERE, DOES HE EVER LIVE IN THE CITY,  
WHAT NEXT ARE YOU GOING TO CHASE THE  
DUCKS FROM VICTORIA PARK AND BUILD A  
HIGH RISE THERE. SO VOTE NO TO ANY  
EXPANSION. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

PETER KAPSHEY

May 20, 2022

Katie Anderl  
Senior Planner  
City of Kitchener  
PO Box 1118  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4G7

Dear Ms. Anderl,

I am writing on behalf of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Association (VPNA) Development Committee in response to the proposed development at 130-142 Victoria Street South. Although this development is located in the Cherry Park Neighbourhood, Victoria Park residents live directly across the street and will be affected, as will others living and working in the downtown area. Our Development Committee's purpose is to advocate for sustainable and livable development in and around Victoria Park. Our four priorities for development, are to:

- Provide a supply of affordable homes;<sup>1</sup>
- Balance green spaces with development;
- Develop with climate change in mind;
- Include the community as an integral part of the development process.

We would like to stress that most downtown residents welcome and understand the need for, and benefits of, urban intensification. We prefer to see our surrounding farmland and wildlife habitats preserved, rather than disappear under urban sprawl. What we need is a more diverse approach to intensification, and a healthy mix of housing options that will continue to accommodate people from a different range of backgrounds, incomes, and family compositions.

We have reviewed the supporting documents related to the developer's application and would like to share the following comments and recommendations related to our priorities.

**Affordability** – The developer does not note any plans to provide affordable housing. Kitchener is experiencing a serious housing crisis for people in low to moderate income brackets. A duplexed house and small apartment building, currently providing affordable housing to approximately 20 low income

---

<sup>1</sup> *Housing for All: a blueprint for a more caring community*, December 2020, is the City of Kitchener's comprehensive strategy to realize the right to housing and make housing affordable using the tools and resources available to a local municipality. In defining affordability, it calls for the following:

- 450 Supportive Housing and 5,000 Community Housing units for those whose household incomes range from \$23,314 to \$37,266 and \$37,267 to \$49,932;
- 9,000 Affordable Rental Housing units for those whose household incomes range from \$49,933 to \$63,263;
- Affordable Home Ownership for those households earning \$63,262 to \$77,566.

households will be demolished to make way for the new development. Where will these people find housing they can afford on social assistance or minimum wage?

**Recommendations:**

- that the developer provides 10 % of his units, whether rental or owned, at affordable rates, as defined in Kitchener’s recent report “Housing for All”;
- that there should be a portion of units that include 3 bedrooms for larger households.

**Green Spaces** – The recently released Spaces Report shows 6 of 9 downtown neighbourhoods in need of park space, based on previous census data. Given the recent high rate of population increase in the downtown core, with more people living in high rises with no green space, the need to create more downtown parks and insist that developers contribute to livability has never been more urgent.

**Recommendations:**

- that the developer not be exempt from contributing to green space through cash-in-lieu, and should be charged according to the rates defined by the City of Kitchener;
- to improve walkability along Victoria Street, that the developer step back the building by enough space (at least 2 metres), to allow space for a ribbon of green space (including, for example, easy-to-keep perennials and pollinator plants) and sufficient room for trees to be planted and thrive.

**Climate Change** – In 2019, the City of Kitchener joined all other Region of Waterloo municipalities in declaring a climate emergency. It is incumbent on all new developments to maximize ways of protecting the environment and minimizing their green house gas emissions.

Little is said about the developer’s specific plans to conserve energy and water, other than to note that an Energy Strategy Report has been done and that the developer will explore ways to maximize ways of achieving higher levels of energy and carbon performance. We are eager to know what those will be.

More specifically, the developer notes that there will be 51 parking spaces for cars but doesn’t mention any plans for EV charging. In light of the rapid ramping up towards electric vehicles, this is a significant oversight. He further notes 60 bicycle parking spaces will be provided in the garage. Given plans for 249 units, 51 car parking spaces, and the likelihood that more than one person in many units will have a bicycle, substantially more bike parking is needed, including for visitors. As some tenants are likely to want e-bikes, EV charging stations will be needed for these, as well as for cars.

**Recommendations:**

- that maximum efforts be made to construct all aspects of the building with climate change in mind, including: energy sources, choices, and conservation; water conservation; rain water run-off and heat mitigation; choice of building materials; bird die-off from collisions with tall building windows;
- that all car parking be equipped with EV charging stations;
- that storage for 200 bicycles be provided, including 20 EV charging stations; and that secure visitor bicycle parking be provided;

**Community Engagement** – During the pre-application stage, there is a great deal of discussion that takes place between developers and planners, prior to any consultation with citizens. Both developers and planners are understandably committed to a design that is already far advanced before citizens have a say. It is our belief that it would be helpful to all – developers, planners, and citizens – if the community were engaged earlier in the process.

**Recommendation:**

- that a Citizens' Engagement Committee be formed, composed of residents from affected neighbourhoods, including Victoria Park, the developers' representatives, and City Planners, to ensure ongoing consultation and communication throughout the development process.

We are committed to a positive and collaborative approach to development in our neighbourhood. We want to work with developers, city staff, and other neighbourhoods to continue to make our City a healthy, vibrant, and inclusive place to live.

We would like to be informed of all opportunities to contribute to this development process. Thank you for your consideration of our comments and recommendations; we look forward to hearing you.

Sincerely yours,

Peggy Nickels

Peggy Nickels, Chair  
VPNA Development Subcommittee  
c/o Victoria Park Neighbourhood Association  
Downtown Community Centre  
35B Weber Street West  
Kitchener, ON

CC Councillor Debbie Chapman, City of Kitchener, [Debbie.chapman@kitchener.ca](mailto:Debbie.chapman@kitchener.ca)  
Members of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Association Development Committee