

June 12, 2025

INTRODUCTION

In their response to my appeal regarding the denial of my STR license (the "Appeal Response"), City of Victoria bylaw inspectors have stated numerous egregious inaccuracies, errors, judgments, and assumptions as facts, and have purported to use these erroneous facts as evidence to deny the reinstatement of my STR license.

For example, they erroneously declared that I am married, and cohabitating (including, presumably, sharing a bed) with the tenant who occupies Suite #1, 1140 Arthur Currie Lane. To add insult to injury, these inspectors also attacked and ridiculed my fashion and décor preferences, and those of my Suite #1 tenant. These invalid conclusions and irrelevant judgmental comments are defamatory and damaging to both my own and my tenant's personal and professional reputations and lives.

Furthermore, this Appeal Response also includes the erroneous allegation that I co-owned a now-deceased dog, Natasha, with my Suite #1 tenant (Mr. Cleveland, a man to whom I am not now, nor have I ever been, married). They support this with a photo found online, taken in February 2011, of Natasha and me. As distressing and stressful as defending myself of the many false accusations contained in the Appeal Response is, I struggle to comprehend how a beloved and deeply missed deceased pet is in any way relevant to my STR license application. I demand an apology from the City of Victoria for the hurt and harm caused by this attempt to appropriate a cherished memory of a beloved deceased pet into the City of Victoria's bylaw inspectors' attempted character assassination of me, and to use it as 'evidence' in support of the denial of my STR license.

These and other judgmental and subjective characterizations of my clothing, decor and sense of style are highly offensive, irrelevant, and distressing, and cast a shadow of distrust on the intentions and capacities of the City of Victoria's bylaw officers to make fair, reasonable and informed assessment of relevant facts and to draw accurate conclusions from them. What's more, they reveal jarring biases against individuals whose décor, fashion, and aesthetic choices do not conform to an arbitrary, capricious and apparently rigid set of conventions ... which have been relied upon in an attempt to characterize me as non-conventional, and therefore untrustworthy and possibly even deceptive. This is a classic case of 'othering,' defined by the Cambridge Online Dictionary as "the act of treating someone as though they are not part of a group and are different in some way."

In the following pages, I have attempted to address the erroneous accusations, assumptions and conclusions of these bylaw officers in an effort to reinstate my STR license, defend myself as an STR licensee with a history of compliance to City of Victoria bylaws, and repair the hurtful, harmful and targeted damage to my personal and professional reputation.

I trust that, as City of Victoria Councillors, you will review my response to City of Victoria bylaw inspectors' false accusations and conclusions with compassion and respect for the truth, and act fairly in reversing the City's unfounded and unjust denial of my STR license.

Kind regards,

S. Strangway
Suite #2, 1140 Arthur Currie Lane
Victoria, BC V9A 7H3

CITY OF VICTORIA DOCUMENT DUMP

After nearly four months of waiting for a response from the City of Victoria regarding my appeal, I received 173 pages of exhibits attached to the Appeal Response, very few of which are relevant to my application. This 'document dump' appears designed intentionally to bombard and overwhelm me in the face of the brief seven-day timeframe allotted to prepare my response.

Without exception, appeal processes involving individual citizens and any level of government need not only to *be* fair, they need also to *be seen* to be fair. The City of Victoria's STR license appeal process fails to measure up to this standard. This process is inherently unfair, particularly in light of the City of Victoria's admission that the license inspectors intentionally withhold particulars of the reasons from their license denial decisions for the purpose of securing a tactical and strategic advantage and only disclose those particulars in response to an appeal by the applicant. An applicant has a *limited* period of time to file an appeal, after which the City has an *unlimited* amount of time to prepare and file a response. The applicant then has a paltry seven days to respond. This process and the City inspectors' approach to it appear to be a deliberate attempt to impede an applicant's ability to prepare a full response and effectively eliminates any possibility of obtaining proper legal advice.

Since, in my estimation, the case the City of Victoria presents against me lacks substance, and contains outrageous accusations and unfounded and false conclusions, this document dump appears as an attempt to make up for a lack of quality evidence with sheer quantity.

That said, I begin my critical and careful examination of the allegations and accusations of bylaw inspectors from the City of Victoria.

MY ALLEGED 'HUSBAND'

The tenant in Suite #1, 1140 Arthur Currie Lane is Weave Cleveland, a long-time friend and collaborator. Both Mr. Cleveland and I are artists and met decades ago at graphic arts college. Though we briefly dated, our relationship evolved into that of a friendship, and a professional, collaborative one. We have worked together professionally for over 20 years.

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors believe they have uncovered a dark secret in the fact that Mr. Cleveland was a tenant in my former home, in White Rock, BC. That fact is not now nor ever was a secret. As a tenant and contracted service provider, Mr. Cleveland maintained the grounds and performed maintenance tasks on my White Rock property. I have also contracted Mr. Cleveland as my camera operator and video editor for over 20 years.

There is nothing nefarious or covert in this arrangement. He is a fellow artist, and I am distraught that City of Victoria bylaw inspectors have made him a target of their condescending remarks, characterizations, and judgments. Furthermore, Mr. Cleveland has had a girlfriend with whom he has been involved since 2019. This girlfriend's jewelry was spotted in his suite by City of Victoria, which was then referenced as evidence of my 'cohabitation' with Mr. Cleveland, as was a bathrobe belonging to Mr. Cleveland that bylaw inspectors deemed to be too feminine for a man.

Finally, both Mr. Cleveland and his girlfriend find these allegations distressing and disturbing, and highly intrusive and offensive.

It will become increasingly clear as you review this reply, that City of Victoria bylaw inspectors went to outrageous efforts to distort simple and individual décor, style, and conversational details to draw erroneous conclusions regarding my personal life and relationship with Mr. Cleveland— and wrongfully accuse me of lies and deception. ***[Please see the statement provided by Mr. Cleveland in the Appendix, Exhibit A, confirming that he has never been my husband.]***

AMATEUR SLEUTHING & OUTRAGEOUS CONCLUSIONS

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors embarked on a strange amateur sleuthing expedition of Google searches and social media, and cherry-picked random tidbits of social media content to conclude that I am married to my Suite #1 tenant.

I cannot imagine a world where it is legal or acceptable for City bylaw inspectors to falsely accuse a woman of being married. From the City's Appeal Response, I quote, verbatim, three of several allegations:

"The appellant was asked about the person in unit #1 and she stated the person was a friend, however other sources of information show that the person living in unit #1 is the appellant's husband."

"The Appellant's claim that she resides in unit #2, which she verbally stated in person to staff when asked very direct and specific questions about where she lives, as recently as during the inspection on February 10, 2025, is in fact false. The Appellant's principal residence is not unit #2, but is instead, unit #1 where she lives with a person, who has been identified as her husband by numerous sources of information."

"In addition, bylaw inspectors discussed similarities in clothing, and lifestyle and combined with the casual interactions observed between the Appellant and CLEVELAND and concluded that it was more likely than not that the two were a couple and that they lived together in unit #1."

I emphatically state for the record that I am not now, nor have ever been, married to or have had a spousal relationship with Mr. Cleveland. Furthermore, my marital status is a matter of official record.

[Please see my tax return complete with official marital status in the Appendix, Exhibit B.]

Notably, not one of the City of Victoria bylaw inspectors who attended any of my various inspections ever once bothered to ask Mr. Cleveland or myself whether we were married or cohabitating. Taking this simple and obvious step could easily have prevented the extraordinary squandering of limited City resources that has followed.

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors' Google search unearthed an article written in 2011 about my White Rock home, in which the journalist erroneously identified Mr. Cleveland as my spouse. This journalist did not ask but merely assumed this as fact. We were not asked if we were husband and wife, or we would have said the truth — that we were not. As a private citizen, I was not concerned enough to correct this journalist's error. A major point that City of Victoria bylaw inspectors failed to take into account in this same article, is that numerous details in the article reveal that we lived on different floors of my White Rock home. *"Strangway's personal bathroom boasts bright splashes of yellow, red, and pink. Cleveland's devoted bathroom plays off the absence of colour, with mostly matte black finishes."*

The content of this article is unreliable hearsay on which the on which the inspectors have placed undue reliance.

MY HOME — SUITE #2, 1140 ARTHUR CURRIE LANE

When I sold my White Rock property and moved to 1140 Arthur Currie Lane, Victoria, I temporarily lived in Suite #1, alone. Suite #2, the premiere suite in the home — due to its sweeping waterfront views and two-bedroom layout — was temporarily tenanted, and in dire need of upgrades and maintenance. As a result, I lived in Suite #1 — again, alone — from April 2022 to November of 2022. I then moved into Suite #2. Later, in January 2023, once necessary maintenance and upgrades to Suite #1 were complete, I offered Suite #1 to Mr. Cleveland. He accepted and assumed the same general duties that he had carried out to my property in White Rock.

Any and all accusations that I did not change my address from Suite #1 to Suite #2, and therefore reside in Suite 1 are moot, irrelevant, and categorically false. I changed my address where and when I could, but I was not overly concerned, as I rarely receive mail, and therefore my exact mailing addresses mattered little to me.

Other subjective observations appear designed to categorize my decor choices as somehow nefarious. As an example, the following poorly written paragraph declares that one bedroom looks exactly like the other, while the inspector's own pictures show that not to be true: "[t]he Bylaw Officer inspected the primary bedroom, which the Appellant stated was her bedroom and noted that the room was indistinguishable from the bedroom designated for short-term rental use." In fact, both bedrooms are part of the short-term rental unit. Even if the rooms looked alike, which they do not, it is not relevant.

There are several references to a curtain over a door in Suite #2. "...and had led them through a locked door hidden behind a curtain in unit #2." This door is in no way hidden. City of Victoria bylaw inspectors' accusation of a curtain "hiding" a door is beyond the pale, and I fail to see what law my beautiful curtains are breaking.

Furthermore, City of Victoria bylaw inspectors categorized Suite #2 — my personal residence — as "very pink," lacking in personal items, and featuring minimalist décor. "The Bylaw Officer observed the entire unit to be clean and have little to no personal items beyond decorative items." I am unclear what is wrong with this and fail to understand what law this is breaking. This is quite the claim, given that, among numerous personal items, that I keep the ashes of my beloved great aunt in my suite!

[Please refer to my inventory of contents of Suite #2 in the Appendix, Exhibit C.]

[Please watch the February 2023 CTV TV video segment on my home — Suite #2, 1140 Arthur Currie Lane. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/vancouver/vancouver-island/article/bc-woman-transforms-house-through-dynamic-designs-with-connection-to-moon-mission/>]

TRAVEL AND SHORT-TERM RENTAL SUITABILITY WITH RESPECT TO SUITE #2

I am at a time and place in my life where I have the freedom and resources to travel to destinations near and far. What's more, I feel privileged and to live on Vancouver Island, and the City of Victoria, an enchantingly beautiful destination for tourists from all over the world.

In my unique, historically designated Victorian home, which, after years of neglect by absentee owners required a great deal of care and attention, I intentionally created a beautiful owner-occupied suite that would also be suitable for short-term renters, including AirBnB guests and guests who came to me via word of mouth, while I was temporarily away. To be able to share my beautifully restored, historical home, its stunning surroundings and my unique furnishings, collectibles and décor with others, including friends, family, neighbours and guests, brings me great joy.

ATTACKS, ASSUMPTIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO MY PERSONAL STYLE

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors made great efforts to comment on not only my personal clothing and decor preferences, but the clothing and decor preferences of my Suite #1 tenant, Mr. Cleveland. Remarking on similarities in clothing and the decor of units #1 and #2 ... they conclude that "CLEVELAND and the Appellant share exactly the same taste in clothing, home decor, and lifestyle."

Specifically, they report: "The inspection of unit #1 located on the main floor revealed a dwelling unit that had been decorated in the same eclectic way as unit #2, but to a much greater degree with vibrant colours and with a vast array of figurines and other collectibles, the result being what can be described as a circus-type theme."

This demeaning circus description was used more than once and intended to insult and diminish my taste and preferences and bolster their false claims of my intimate relationship and co-habitation arrangement with my tenant, Mr. Cleveland.

Since when are City of Victoria bylaw inspectors granted the power to enter the home of a private citizen, make ignorant, egregious and condescending judgments on décor and style, and claim these judgments as ‘evidence,’ and allow them to stand as a matter of public record. This is hardly democratic and represents an unjustifiable intrusion by the government into the private lives of its citizens. Reliance on uninformed, and highly subjective opinions and judgments to bolster false accusations and to deny a license application perverts and oversteps the role and capacities of inspectors and is patently egregious and unacceptable.

FALSE ACCUSATIONS ABOUT WORK WITH NO PERMIT

When I applied for my 2025 license, I was met with an egregious accusation of having done work with no permit. This is untrue, as the work in question was related to a previous owner, in 2016. When I bought the home in 2022, my realtor did her due diligence and had the answer officially from the City that there were indeed NO open permits on the property.

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors have painted an inaccurate picture of me as non-compliant, in an inference designed deliberately to prejudice City Council against me, with allegations that are irrelevant to my application by their own admission. These references are categorically highly prejudicial, and irrelevant to the issues in the appeal.

[Please see two emails in the Appendix, one from my realtor to the City of Victoria asking about open permits, Exhibit D, and an eventual email from the City of Victoria to my realtor that there were indeed no open permits, Exhibit E. This email was authored by Chelsea Lewicki who signs off as a bylaw clerk for the City of Victoria.]

WHAT CITY OF VICTORIA CHOSE TO IGNORE ON MY SOCIAL MEDIA

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors have cherry picked certain posts from my social media, while excluding others, including a Valentines Day post about feeling single and alone ... and hesitant to take myself out to lunch in case I ended up in restaurant full of happy couples. Furthermore, they ignored posts about my dating life, and life as a single woman. As a single woman, such egregiously misogynistic assumptions, mischaracterizations, and mistreatments are not unexpected, but coming from City of Victoria bylaw inspectors, are nevertheless deeply upsetting and disturbing.

AN ANONYMOUS NEIGHBOUR’S UNFOUNDED COMPLAINT

The City of Victoria brought forth an alleged complaint from a neighbour, dated July 7, 2024, stating that they saw me greeting strangers. This act does not contravene any rules at all!

With my highly flexible traveling schedule, I make every effort to greet guests whenever possible. On occasion, I have arranged or postponed by departure time to greet guests and show them around. I take great joy in doing so, and I reiterate, this does not contravene any rules.

Furthermore, I have had several guests who are strangers to me that have stayed in my spare bedroom while I am home — at which time I was licensed to do so. When I rent my spare room while I am at home, the source of these guests is word of mouth, which the City of Victoria categorizes as breaking a law. However, word-of-mouth referrals are not illegal. It is the duty of the City to protect citizens from baseless complaints. In this case, the City of Victoria has failed miserably in its duty to shield me from groundless complaints by a neighbour.

CITY OF VICTORIA BYLAW INSPECTORS’ LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF AIRBNB PROTOCOL

The lion’s share of my guests are checked in by the woman who does my cleaning, not me. Although I enjoy greeting guests, most of my short-term rental guests rent Suite #2 while I am away from Victoria, and travelling.

AirBnB guests correspond with a designated 'host,' which, in my case, is my name, "Susan". It is impossible for anyone entering my account on my behalf not to correspond with "Susan." AirBnB hosts respond to online questions and welcome guests using only the host's name. Therefore, the name Susan appears in every single interaction.

I am shocked to find that City of Victoria bylaw inspectors do not understand this basic convention and therefore feel empowered to accuse me of always being present for guests and conclude that I live in Suite #1 with my imaginary and non-existent husband and thereby circumvent the terms and conditions under which the City of Victoria dictates short-term rental operators must abide.

FURTHER FALSE ACCUSATIONS

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors also accuse me of picking guests up at the ferry and conducting tours. *"The reviews describe the Appellant providing tours, picking guests up from the ferry, and the Appellant's husband escorting guests to the rental unit."*

As I have previously stated, I do not have a husband, or anybody who would claim to be my husband or life partner. Most likely, my cleaner's husband may have escorted a guest to the unit. As for the ferry pick-ups, or tours, I fail to see how a short-term rental host engaging in such acts of generosity and kindness in any way contravene any applicable rules.

BC PORTAL ACCUSATION

City of Victoria bylaw inspectors refer to the "BC Short-Term Rental Data Portal". (I have no idea what the "BC Short-Term Rental Data Portal" is.) They claim that I declared my address as Suite #1 1140 Arthur Currie Lane in an application to the BC Short-Term Rental Data Portal that I allegedly submitted, and that they found this information in 2024. Yet they fail to show said application — an application which would presumably have been signed and dated by me. Therefore, I am completely in the dark and not responsible for this information.

City of Victoria's Exhibit I appears to be a document from the BC Portal, but is, in no way, an application made by me. Without clear dates and references, I cannot determine if this is an innocent mistake or information automatically generated by the BC Portal system without my involvement or knowledge. To correct any misinformation, I request that the City of Victoria provide me this application, signed and dated by me where I indeed declare this address to be fact. Again, the BC Portal is an entity that is invisible to me, and I would have no clue how to correct something that I did not, myself, submit.

THE ABSENCE OF THE WORD 'EVIDENCE' FROM A CRITICAL CORRESPONDENCE

I was denied my license via a perfunctory, distressing, and highly confusing denial letter dated February 18, 2025, from the City of Victoria referencing undefined "open-source data" as proof that I do not live in my home, and in which they had left out the word 'evidence' when quoting their own bylaw. As a result, my letter read: *"Section 3(2) (e) of the City of Victoria's Short-Term Rental Regulation Bylaw requires operators to provide satisfactory that the premises where the short-term rental will be operated are their principal residence."*

This omission rendered the referenced bylaw meaningless and anxiety-provoking. I was confused and distressed as I had already submitted the three requested pieces of evidence (as prescribed in the City's own website FAQ's): my driver's license, proof of insurance, and a hydro bill. Leaving out the word evidence in such a formal correspondence is a major, and egregious error.

Presumably, all such license denial letters quote the same excerpt from the bylaw and this should involve a simple cut-and-paste exercise to ensure consistency and accuracy. The fact that the denial letter misquotes the bylaw by

excluding perhaps the most important word combined with the City's admission in its Appeal Response that it is its policy to deliberately withhold particulars from its denial letter, suggest that the exclusion of the critical word "evidence" from the quoted bylaw excerpt was hardly an innocent "clerical error" (as asserted in the Appeal Response), but is rather part of a deliberate and strategic pattern of confusion, obfuscation and lack of transparency on the part of the City's license inspectors designed to prevent applicants from understanding the true basis of the inspector's decision and to discourage them from pursuing an appeal.

The omission seemed intentional, procedurally unfair and underhanded. It is critical to bear in mind that following the receipt of this correspondence, I heard nothing from the City for nearly four months, at which time they characterized their error as an innocent mistake, rather than a serious mistake. In any court of law this case would rightly so be thrown out due to such an error — innocent, clerical, or otherwise. However, this is the response from the City of Victoria:⁷

"The Appellant's appeal appears to rely on a clerical error in the denial letter, where the word 'evidence' was unknowingly omitted in referencing section 3(2)(e) of the Short-Term Rental Regulation Bylaw. This is a clear attempt to distract from the reasons for the denial and to discredit City staff."

The word evidence is critical to the essence of this bylaw, and its absence perverts the meaning of the bylaw and lead to needless distress and confusion in the four-month wait for a response from the City of Victoria. Please refer to paragraphs 6 to 12 (inclusive) of my Appeal concerning the matter of the evidence I submitted with my application, as expressly set out in the City's own website FAQs) and the absence of evidence and adequate reasons in the City's denial letter. In partial response to paragraphs 48, 54 and 55 of the Appeal Response which purport to suggest that the kinds of evidence expressly referenced in these FAQ's is insufficient evidence to meet the established application requirements, there is nothing in the Short-Term Rental section of the City's website (<https://www.victoria.ca/building-business/business-licensing/short-term-rentals>) that remotely suggests that the stipulated evidence may be viewed by the City as inadequate. Further, in response to the bald assertion contained in paragraph 57 of the Appeal Response, please refer to paragraphs 10 and 11 of my Appeal. The principal residence evidence submitted with my application was in the form expressly required by the City's application form and as referenced on the City website. Further, in determining whether an applicant has met the requirements of the *Short-Term Rental Bylaw*, the License Inspector must exercise their authority reasonably and objectively, and not in an arbitrary or capricious manner or on the basis of incorrect, incomplete, irrelevant or subjectively assessed evidence. In order for the License Inspector to achieve a reasonable and objective decision, they have a positive duty to consider all of the relevant facts and evidence (and not just the cherry-picked facts and evidence they consider to support their subjectively pre-determined and prejudged desired outcome while ignoring relevant facts and evidence that undermine their desired outcome) and to weigh such facts and evidence fairly and impartially. The fact that the License Inspector finds the task of discharging this duty to be "challenging" or a strain on the City's resources does not excuse the License Inspector from this obligation.

OPEN FOR BUSINESS IN 2025

The City of Victoria oddly accuses me of being open for business for a single day in March of 2025, and a second single day in April of 2025. In fact, my calendar has been closed since mid-January 2025, when my license expired. These accusations are categorically and provably false, and I demand an apology.

A CASE FOR DEFAMATION OF CHARACTER

In totality, the false accusations contained in the Appeal Response are so egregious that they constitute the basis for a case of defamation of character.

Over the course of my professional life, I have built a reputation in the fabric design world as a talented and innovative designer. City of Victoria bylaw inspectors' attempt to belittle me, characterize me as a liar who has been operating illegally for years, and state falsehoods as facts and enter them into public records as such, amounts to libel and slander at its worst. Furthermore, their egregious false characterization of a long-standing friendship with a tenant inflicts damage both on my tenant and myself.

Last year, four high-profile designers from New York flew to Victoria specifically to photograph my decor, my fabrics, and myself. This was an exciting milestone in my career. Imagine if the vicious lies made by the City of Victoria were to exist as public documents where insinuations regarding my covert sex life, design decisions, my personal style, and my friends were inexplicably and unfairly on display for all to see! I doubt that my reputation and career would withstand the hurt and harm.

To this end, I am, at present, exploring my options regarding legal remedies to address these unfounded and hurtful accusations, and am compiling a list of requested redactions to all public records related to my application and this appeal. I respectfully ask that all references to Weave Cleveland and his suite number be redacted from the record, as Mr. Cleveland is an innocent third party. I also request that all references to my suite number and directions to my suite (which effectively reveal the layout of the home) be redacted, as they provide the public with clear instructions on how to find me, and my bedroom! I have kept the home layout information out of the public on purpose and have spent years being very careful about that, in an instant the City of Victoria has compromised my safety in making the home's layout clear to the public. All references to my social media should be redacted as I am on under a fictitious name with no references to my physical address. The city tied my social media to my actual name and address which could endanger me. All references to the fact that I am unmarried should be redacted for my safety and privacy. I request that all accusations that I am married to and co-own a dead dog with Mr. Cleveland be redacted. Finally, I request that all references to my clothing and decor be redacted.

IN CONCLUSION

Former prime minister Pierre Trudeau, whom I dated many years ago, once famously remarked: *"There's no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation."* I have thought often of his words this past week, as I have rushed to respond to the tsunami of accusations levelled against me by City of Victoria bylaw inspectors. If Pierre were here today, I can only imagine how he would react to the City of Victoria's fanciful fabrication of a fictional intimate relationship, the long list of false assumptions, and the unfounded accusations that led City of Victoria bylaw officers down a dead-end path of falsehood and character assassination.

If Dr. David Strangway, my father, were alive today, I assure you that he would storm a path to City Hall and deliver a scathing lecture on the egregious nature of this shameful exercise.

However, today I must stand up for myself, as an artist, a homeowner, and a woman. To this end I humbly ask that you take a stand for truth, honesty, fairness, and due process, and right the injustices, accusations, and false conclusions of the City of Victoria bylaw inspectors who have sought to damage my reputation and standing in our beautiful city.

Appendix

Exhibit A

(attached)

June 8, 2025

Dear City of Victoria,

I am not now nor have I ever been married to Susan Strangway. Susan Strangway and I have never been in a spousal relationship.

Sincerely,

Weave Cleveland

Exhibit B

(attached)

	Canada Revenue Agency	Agence du revenu du Canada	Protected B when completed
Income Tax and Benefit Return			T1 2021

If this return is for a deceased person, enter their information on this page.

Attach to your paper return only the documents that are requested to support your deduction, claim or expense. Keep all other documents in case the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) asks to see them later. See the guide for more information about supporting documents.

Step 1 – Identification and other information

BC 7	
Identification First name <u>Susan</u> Last name <u>Strangway</u> Mailing address _____ PO Box _____ RR _____ City <u>White Rock</u> Prov./Terr. <u>BC</u> Postal code _____ Email Address _____ By providing an email address, you are registering to receive email notifications from the CRA and agree to the Terms of use in Step 1 of the guide.	Social insurance number (SIN) _____ Date of birth (Year Month Day) _____ If this return is for a deceased person , enter the date of death (Year Month Day) _____ Marital status on December 31, 2021: 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Married 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Living common-law 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Separated 6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single Your language of correspondence : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English Votre langue de correspondance : <input type="checkbox"/> Français

Residence Information Your province or territory of residence on December 31, 2021 : <u>British Columbia</u> Your current province or territory of residence if it is different than your mailing address above: _____ Province or territory where your business had a permanent establishment if you were self-employed in 2021: <u>British Columbia</u>	If you became a resident of Canada in 2021 for income tax purposes, enter your date of entry: _____ (Month Day) If you ceased to be a resident of Canada in 2021 for income tax purposes, enter your date of departure: _____ (Month Day)
--	--

Your spouse's or common-law partner's information	
Their first name _____ Their SIN _____ Tick this box if they were self-employed in 2021. 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Net income from line 23600 of their return to claim certain credits (even if the amount is "0") _____ Amount of universal child care benefit (UCCB) from line 11700 of their return _____ Amount of UCCB repayment from line 21300 of their return _____	

Do not use this area									
Do not use this area	17200					17100			

5010-RE (21)

Exhibit C

List of some personal items in my suite

The fridge has various foods at any given time, including during the February 10, 2025, inspection, that include coffee cream, eggs, yogurt, cheese, broccoli, celery, other vegetables, salad dressing, mayonnaise, soy sauce, lemon juice, margarine.

On the kitchen counter I generally have and did have on the February 10, 2025 inspection cereal, cooking oil, bananas, coffee.

The kitchen is well stocked with my beautiful dishes and pots and pans. In one of the kitchen cupboards, I have various prescriptions that I won't list due to privacy.

In the living room I have various electronics that I am using, there are often hats and coats that I mean to put away but don't always. Art projects are also often in progress here.

On the shelves I have many personal items including my Great Aunt Bessie's ashes.

I have many pairs of socks, several pairs of leggings, some of which are black, some white, some striped. I have lots of lingerie that I will not list due to privacy. I have coats, blazers, blouses, dresses, skirts, shirts, sweaters, hats, purses, boots and shoes, scarves, jewelry, nightgowns, robes.

I have many forms of cosmetics, face creams, foot scrub, Gaviscon, ointments. hair dye, toothbrushes, toothpaste, shampoos and conditioners, water pic, steamer, two irons, blow dryer, salon pas, face masks.

I have my passport and other personal papers. Decks of cards. The place is decorated with original artwork, high end appliances, antique furniture, family heirlooms and gorgeous collectibles.

Exhibit D
(attached)



Cindy Russell

1140 Arthur Currie Lane

To: bylawServices@victoria.ca, Cc: susan dundee <



Siri Found a Contact
Cindy Russell

Hi City of Victoria, i have an authorization (attached) allowing myself to get information regarding the property located at 1140 Arthur Currie Lane.

I am the Agent for the lovely Buyer, we would like to know the following regarding **1140 Arthur Currie Lane**.

Are there any outstanding permits on file?

Are there any red flags in the file? - any notices, charges, fines or bylaw infractions?

Do you have a SURVEY Certificate?

To confirm that this property is a legal 4 PLEX?

Is there a gas line that runs down Arthur Currie Lane?

Do you know how old the services are for the property Sewer & Water?

If there is anything else in the file that you would think a buyer would want to know about this property, please include this information in your reply email

Thank you,

Cindy Russell

eXp Realty



DocuSign Envelope ID: BB5DD678-044D-468C-B062-0F054357018E



Permits and Inspections Division
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

T 250.361.0344
E permits@victoria.ca
www.victoria.ca

**Permission to Access
City Plans**

Owner / Company: Elite Accommodations Ltd BC 1062975

PROPERTY OWNER OR COMPANY NAME AS REGISTERED ON TITLE	PHONE	EMAIL
1140 Arthur Currie Drive	Victoria	BC V9A 7H3

Please be advised that I, _____
being the registered owner of 1140 Arthur Currie Drive, Victoria BC V9A 7H3

give permission to Cindy Russell

of eXP Realty

to view and request copies of the plans the City has on record for the address listed above.

Owner / Officer's Signature: _____ April 13, 2022
DATE (D/M/Y)

There is a \$25.00 charge to carry-out the plan search. An email with payment instructions will be sent after your form has been processed. Additional fees apply for copying plans.

Exhibit E
(attached)



Cindy Russell

Inbox - Google April 15, 2022 at 9:26 AM

Fwd: 1140 Arthur Currie Road urgent authorization letter attached

To: susan dundee

Good morning Cindy,

Thank you for contacting Bylaw Services.

There are no bylaw files for the address of 1140 Arthur Currie Lane.

"...Neither the City of Victoria, nor the party signing below warrants or guarantees the accuracy or completeness of the above information. The information is provided on the following conditions:

(a) that neither the City nor the party signing below shall be liable for any damage or expense should, for any reason including negligence on the part of the City or the party signing below, the information be inaccurate, incomplete or misleading; and

(b) that should any or all of the information be inaccurate, incomplete or misleading, for any reason including negligence on the part of the City or the party signing below, the City shall, as against any person or corporation who may rely on the contents of this letter, be able to assert and enforce its full legal rights as if this letter had not been signed and as if any and all persons and corporations who may rely on the contents of this letter had not relied on the contents of this letter."

Kind Regards,

Bylaw Clerk

Bylaw and Licensing Services

City of Victoria

1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

