

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Annie Fisher [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 4:01 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1201 Fort Street Proposal

Hello Mayor and Council,

We thank you all very much for working for the citizens of Victoria.

Once again the neighbours in beautiful Rockland find ourselves defending our turf from the developer. Developers and Councils come and go but the residents of neighbourhoods have to live with the results of poorly planned developments. This one, as usual, wants to make as big a development as possible to make as much money as possible. The neighbours would be happy if only the developer would follow the Official Community Plan. Can the staff not just tell the developer that the plan is the plan and live with it? The developer will make plenty of money and the neighbourhood would not be as frustrated with having to defend the neighbourhood at every turn.

We ask that parking spaces not be necessary for every unit, in fact, only enough for car share and visitors. If the density is wanted on the Fort St. corridor where there is ample transit, what is the need for vehicles in these developments? Both traffic and parking are nightmares in Victoria, yet Council continues to approve developments with parking for every unit. Units would be more affordable without having to blast for underground parking garages, and the development, itself, would not be as intrusive to the neighbourhood during construction.

The front page of the Times Colonist on April 3 show a photo of Moss Street trees in full bloom. Beautiful streets like these are what give Victoria the beauty that visitors enjoy when coming to our city. We have many streets like Moss St. to enjoy. We are fortunate to have had marvellous planning in the past. It is setbacks and spacious boulevards that give us serenity in our travels about town. A smaller, more tasteful development, that preserves more of the available green space on this two acre piece of property, would be desirable for our neighbourhood.

Please deny the variances and only allow construction within the confines of the Community Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Barry and Annie Fisher,  
403-1115 Rockland.

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Loretta Blasco [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 6, 2018 2:14 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fwd: 1201 Fort/1050 Pentrelew Place

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Loretta Blasco [REDACTED]  
**Date:** April 6, 2018 at 2:12:05 PM PDT  
**To:** [mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca)  
**Subject:** 1201 Fort/1050 Pentrelew Place

Re: Proposed Rezoning Application/1201 Fort Street/1050 Pentrelew Place

To whom it may concern:

As the public hearing for this rezoning application is being held this Thursday, April 12th, I felt it was imperative that I write you once again to express my concerns on why I feel this development is absolutely not the right fit for this property. Here are some of my concerns.

- \*. This proposal has not made any changes to achieve an adequate transition between Fort Street to the residential neighbourhood as directed by this city council in the last committee meeting. Also, Abstract has not demonstrated how the proposal enhances the heritage character of the special zone of the Fort Street corridor on which it is sited.

- \*. The massing, height, and density is not appropriate for this site. Council should stop this rezoning and follow the Official Community Plan (OCP). Abstract has refused City Council's explicit directive to compromise by reducing the height, massing, and density of the south building. There is just too much massing, height and density being crammed onto this site.

- \*. Density and this form of housing stock does not improve affordability. A vote for this development is a vote for poor planning.

- \*. The developer has not put forward a viable need for this rezoning request and the 10 variance by-law changes other than his financial benefit and it is not supported by any claims of hardship. How do the citizens, the neighbours benefit?

- \*. The Fort Street heritage corridor has not been adequately considered.

- \*. The proposal results in the destruction of a unique park-like urban forest, where the Garry oak trees on this property will be destroyed.

Say no to amend the Official Community Plan Bylaw. Say no to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw. Please do not consider issuing a Development Permit for the land known as 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place, as well as granting any of the variances the developer is seeking.

Frankly, I'm disappointed in Abstract Development for not bringing forward any viable options after much attempted consultations that would better suit this neighbourhood.

Any compensation or promises Abstract Development makes to the city of Victoria to have this proposed development go through as it stands will not be worth the cost or the perceived

benefits. When a proposed development is wrong for a neighbourhood, no is a viable option. We are counting on you Mayor, and the council to do the right thing, and not amend the Zoning Regulation Bylaw, not amend the OCP Bylaw, or grant the Development Permit Application including the variances Abstract Development is seeking on this property.

There is an opportunity to build something special here, and the way this proposed development stands, it falls short, and really, is another example of a developer's greed, and the overdevelopment of our neighbourhoods.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Loretta Blasco

301-1025 Linden Avenue

██████████

████████████████████

Sent from my iPad

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Loretta Blasco [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 2:12 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1201 Fort/1050 Pentrelew Place

Re: Proposed Rezoning Application/1201 Fort Street/1050 Pentrelew Place

Dear Mayor and Council,

As the public hearing for this rezoning application is being held this Thursday, April 12th, I felt it was imperative that I write you once again to express my concerns on why I feel this development is absolutely not the right fit for this property. Here are some of my concerns.

\*. This proposal has not made any changes to achieve an adequate transition between Fort Street to the residential neighbourhood as directed by this city council in the last committee meeting. Also, Abstract has not demonstrated how the proposal enhances the heritage character of the special zone of the Fort Street corridor on which it is sited.

\*. The massing, height, and density is not appropriate for this site. Council should stop this rezoning and follow the Official Community Plan (OCP). Abstract has refused City Council's explicit directive to compromise by reducing the height, massing, and density of the south building. There is just too much massing, height and density being crammed onto this site.

\*. Density and this form of housing stock does not improve affordability. A vote for this development is a vote for poor planning.

\*. The developer has not put forward a viable need for this rezoning request and the 10 variance by-law changes other than his financial benefit and it is not supported by any claims of hardship. How do the citizens, the neighbours benefit?

\*. The Fort Street heritage corridor has not been adequately considered.

\*. The proposal results in the destruction of a unique park-like urban forest, where the Garry oak trees on this property will be destroyed.

Say no to amend the Official Community Plan Bylaw. Say no to the Zoning Regulation Bylaw. Please do not consider issuing a Development Permit for the land known as 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place, as well as granting any of the variances the developer is seeking.

Frankly, I'm disappointed in Abstract Development for not bringing forward any viable options after much attempted consultations that would better suit this neighbourhood.

Any compensation or promises Abstract Development makes to the city of Victoria to have this proposed development go through as it stands will not be worth the cost or the perceived benefits. When a proposed development is wrong for a neighbourhood, no is a viable option.

We are counting on you Mayor, and the council to do the right thing, and not amend the Zoning Regulation Bylaw, not amend the OCP Bylaw, or grant the Development Permit Application including the variances Abstract Development is seeking on this property.

There is an opportunity to build something special here, and the way this proposed development stands, it falls short, and really, is another example of a developer's greed, and the overdevelopment of our neighbourhoods.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Loretta Blasco  
301-1025 Linden Avenue  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Thomson Lynn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 6:48 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1201 Fort Street Proposal

Re-zoning Application 1201 Fort Street /1050 Pentrelew Place

Dear Mayor and Council:

I have lived and paid taxes in Victoria since 1975. In the last 3 years ( your tenure in office), I am sick of having sidewalks, streets and neighbourhoods disrupted by rampant development of expensive condos, many purchased for investment purposes not as homes for local people.

To the developers' benefit and the detriment of existing tax payers, you have failed to impose L.E.E.D. standards or Community Amenity Contributions and Density Bonuses gathered on developments in other BC municipalities. How short sighted are you?

We have a crisis in affordable housing for people who work in Victoria. They are forced to move to neighbouring communities and drive into town. Your bike lanes will not offset those carbon emissions!

Please think for the 21st century and the future. Make our city habitable and sustainable for ordinary families, not a vacation destination for the wealthy.

Please be informed that I am against the above Rezoning Application because:

- I am dismayed by the massing of the development, its size, the number of buildings, the height of the buildings, and the overall density.
- I am concerned about the number of heritage trees that will be destroyed by the size of this development. A smaller development would allow more of these trees to survive the amount of blasting needed for this development and thrive in direct sunshine, not the shadows of tall buildings.
- Since 2012, Victoria has vastly overshot its Official Community Plan target for building condo units, but has failed significantly to meet its target for building ground-oriented housing like townhomes or single family dwellings. Council has no mandate to rezone the southern portion of 1201 Fort property for condos, which is currently designated for much needed ground-oriented housing.
- I am troubled by the absence of a sufficient affordable housing component in the proposal. We do not need to build more of what we already have - too many expensive condominiums.
- How is this proposal sustainable when it is not built to L.E.E.D. standards?

Lynn Thomson  
102 936

Fairfield Road, Victoria, V8V 3A4



Tel: 250-920-5435  
Fax: 250-920-5437

3-772 Bay Street  
Victoria BC V8T 5E4

reception@groupedenux.com  
[GROUPEDEX.COM](http://GROUPEDEX.COM)

April 6th 2018

**City of Victoria**  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, BC

*via e-mail*

**Attention: Mayor Helps and Council**

**RE: Rezoning application for 1201 Fort Street – Abstract Developments**

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

This our further letter of support for this project by Abstract Developments. Our group owns and manages the 55 unit rental apartment building at 1025 Linden Avenue which directly borders the south west corner of this proposed development.

We believe that their revised proposal for the project fits in the neighbourhood and see that proponent has gone above and beyond to satisfy the concerns that were raised with their previous proposal. We are very pleased with quality materials used and the numerous additional trees and landscape improvements.

As immediate neighbours of the property, we would be proud to have such an attractive looking development next door and are in support of this development as we believe it is a great addition to the Rockland neighbourhood.

We look forward to having this development in Rockland.

Yours truly,

Nicolas Denux

For Groupe Denux & Diane F. Denux

**From:** Andrea Warner [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 3:18 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Re: Re-zoning Application 1201 Fort Street /1050 Pentrelew Place

April 7, 2018

Victoria Mayor and City Council:

Re: Re-zoning Application 1201 Fort Street /1050 Pentrelew Place

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am against the above Rezoning Application because:

- I am dismayed by the massing of the development, its size, the number of buildings, the height of the buildings, and the overall density.
- I am concerned about the number of heritage trees that will be destroyed by the size of this development. A smaller development would allow more of these trees to survive the amount of blasting needed for this development and thrive in direct sunshine, not the shadows of tall buildings.
- The current proposal does not adhere to the Official Community Plan which must be amended to allow the rezoning.
- The numerous variances requested to bolster the rezoning application (and increase the floor space to 10,219 square meters) are not supportable.
- The two multi-family buildings, up to 6 storeys in height, are too high for Rockland and exceed in height all multi-family buildings in Rockland, along the Linden corridor, and along the Fort Street Heritage corridor.
- I am concerned about the increased traffic and parking caused by this proposal . If this development goes forward as proposed it will create parking issues especially with patrons for the Langham Court Theatre & the AGGV park.
- I am concerned that the City is not looking after its own best interests by allowing this development to go forward without adequate income from Community Amenity

Contributions and Density Bonuses gathered on developments in other BC municipalities. Where will the money come from to pay for the community amenities demanded by these new residents for parks, community centres, transportation infrastructure, fire halls, emergency services, etc?

- I encourage you to insist that this proposal comply with the two directives given by Council to the developer October 26, 2017 to “revise the density, massing, height and setbacks of the building to the south” and to demonstrate how the condominium on Fort “enhances the heritage character of the Fort Street corridor.”

- Since 2012, Victoria has vastly overshot its Official Community Plan target for building condo units, but has failed significantly to meet its target for building ground-oriented housing like townhomes or single family dwellings. Council has no mandate to rezone the southern portion of 1201 Fort property for condos, which is currently designated for much needed ground-oriented housing.

- This development does not include enough affordable housing; too much emphasis on higher-end units.

In closing, I am disappointed that the city does not follow its own Community Plans. The Community Plans are as they are for good reasons; a great deal of time and thought (and money) went into creating them. It seems like it is just accepted that to get around them, you simply apply for a variation and then fairly easily receive one. I can see that sometimes a variation could be justified, but they must be very far and few between. I have seen the result of variations, and the repercussions are felt by nearby residents from that point, on....forever. Please follow the plans for our neighbourhoods so Victoria stays the special place that it is.

Thank you for your attention to this concern.

Sincerely,

Andrea Warner



B-2746 Shelbourne Street

Victoria, BC

V8R 4M2

Proposed changes to 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place – Abstract Developments proposal to build TWO LARGE CONDOS: 6 AND 4 STORIES (EST. 86 UNITS) and 9 TOWN HOUSE UNITS.

I am a senior (retired for 8 years) and live on a fixed income. I have lived/rented an apartment at 1070 Moss Street for 17 years. When I moved to Victoria, my rent was \$600 a month. It is now \$900 a month which is 30% of my income. My income is above the ceiling to qualify for the low threshold required for both SAFER and GIS. Low interest rates pay minimal return on retirement investments.

**I am absolutely opposed to the above proposed development for the following reasons:**

1. **The effect on affordability:** Current rent controls are all that has prevented my rent for sky-rocketing to an unaffordable rate. The huge influx of condos (many bought on spec to rent) and rental apartments currently being built in Victoria start renting at \$1,700 per month. When someone moves out of our building, there are no controls to prevent a landlord from upping the rent to match the buildings around it. If my landlord decides to reno or sell the building, I will be out on the street. The short sightedness of City council in not recognizing what is affordable to the majority of individuals currently renting in this city is astounding.
2. **Increased traffic:** Despite the fact that the proposed development includes underground parking for its residents (possibly another 150 to 200 vehicles), the City does not seem to have taken into consideration the increase in traffic proceeding to/from these buildings. Daily I watch children walking along Moss Street to both Central Middle School and Douglas Elementary between 7:30 and 9:00 am and 3:00 and 4:00 pm and having to cross Fort Street. Traffic on Fort Street is already increasing daily due to the fast pace of construction in the downtown area, squeezed in by the new bike lanes.
3. **Parking on surrounding streets:** The street parking for visitors to residents and businesses on Fort/Pentrelew/Moss, or the Art Gallery and Langham Court is already stretched to the max.
4. **Lack of community services (recreational/library, etc.) and medical services:** Services for the residents of Fairfield/Cook/Gonzales/Fernwood are already minimal. An influx of residents from this proposed development plus the new condo developments on Fort/Cook (notably by the same developer!) and on View/Vancouver Street stretch those facilities even further.
5. **Heritage forest/park setting:** One of the valuable and attractive aspects of Victoria has been the spectacular heritage trees throughout the Fairfield neighbourhood. This development will mean the destruction of dozens of trees dating back to the 1800s. They can never be replaced.

**The mass and scope of this development is completely out of character with the surrounding residential neighbourhood and community.**

Respectfully submitted

**Cathy Korpela**

**204 – 1070 Moss Street, Victoria, BC**



Residential"



Date	Printed Name (First / Last)
Apr 6 / 18	MARGARET HALVORSEN
	CHARLES H.
	SWEN H.
"	HARVEY HEND.
	CHRIS P.
	BREND.
	Lori
	Robin
	Cath
	Sam
10/11/18	B.











**Monica Dhawan**

---

**From:** Christopher Petter [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 3:29 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Aragon proposal for 1201 Fort  
**Attachments:** Scale\_model\_1201 Fort\_2.jpg; Scale\_model\_1201 Fort\_1.jpg; sequoias.jpg

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

Please take close look at a scale model of the proposed Aragon development for the property at 1201 Fort. This kind of overdevelopment of a residential neighbourhood belies the developer's spin that he is somehow creating a parklike commons in this large property. Were he to take out Buildings A and B and be permitted only to build townhouses around the periphery of the property with the centre portion remaining empty or with just the Truth Centre building as an auditorium, this would provide family housing and a community asset. Otherwise the massing is far too great and the setbacks around the buildings insufficient to earn your approval! And this is to say nothing of the loss of 2 100 year old oaks and two 60 foot sequoias in the so-called development zone.

Chris Petter  
(former member of the UVic Board of Governors)  
1220 McKenzie St.  
V8V2W5

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Telus [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 7:30 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1201 Fort Street Proposal

Please be informed that I am against the above Rezoning Application because:

We need to keep what beautiful green space we have left. I am dismayed by the massing of the development, its size, the number of buildings, the height of the buildings, and the overall density.

I am concerned about the number of heritage trees that will be destroyed by the size of this development. A smaller development would allow more of these trees to survive the amount of blasting needed for this development and thrive in direct sunshine, not the shadows of tall buildings.

The numerous variances requested to bolster the rezoning application (and increase the floor space to 10,219 square meters) are not supportable, and no hardship has been shown by the developer to consider allowing any of these variances.

The two multi-family buildings, up to 6 storeys in height, are too high for Rockland and exceed in height all multi-family buildings in Rockland, along the Linden corridor, and along the Fort Street Heritage corridor.

I am concerned about the increased traffic and parking caused by this proposal to the long-term viability of the Langham Court Theatre and the Art Gallery of Greater Victoria which rely on this parking.

And lastly, you will be losing my vote if this development goes ahead. I am extremely upset that the developers are taking over this city!! And you are not listening to us! Don't turn Victoria into another Vancouver!

Name: Christina Southern

Address: 3136 Stevenson pl. Victoria BC. V8x1c5

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** goodlight shawca [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 7, 2018 10:45 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Rezoning No. 000525 1201 Fort St & 1050 Pentrelew Pl

To whom it may concern:

### Question #1:

Is it up to the City of Victoria, *who is there to represent the citizens of Victoria*, to pander to the Developers, to change any and all variances to make it possible for the Developers to achieve their greedy profits???

1. Developers know what size of a building is allowed to be built on a property they are interested in buying.
2. Developers know what it will take to make their greedy profits.  
Then when their proposals are challenged they whine and cry about how they can't make their greedy profits unless the variances are changed.

### Question #2 & #3:

Is it up to the City of Victoria to ensure that Developers are able to make a profit on their projects??  
Or, is it up to the Developers to ensure they do their due diligence prior to buying a property?


Over the past 24 years of living in Victoria I have witnessed time and again that what the developers want ..... the developers get ..... regardless as to how it negatively impacts the quality of life of the citizens, regardless as to how it negatively impacts the natural world.....as long as they make their greedy profits!!!

Victoria is no longer the City of Gardens. Every year that goes by it is becoming more and more a Concrete Jungle.

You have been complicit in, to quote Joni Mitchell, "Pave paradise and put up a parking lot". It's a well-known fact that hard surfaces increase temperatures.

I have asked 3 questions.....are you going to give me the respect as a tax paying citizen to reply?



Sincerely,  
Jean Siemens  
44 Linden Ave  
Victoria  


--

"It is time to stop treating nature as a commodity that we own, and to acknowledge instead that nature is a community to which we belong." - David R. Boyd

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Jennifer Hamilton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 10:23 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Email to Mayor and Council RE: Pentrelew/ Truth Centre Development

Dear Mayor and Council,

This is a follow up to my prior letter (below) on the Pentrelew Development. I understand that there is a crucial meeting this coming week to either approve or deny this application for re-zoning. Please listen to the local voices on this matter.

The community has come together to express their concerns. Since my parents and their neighbours started their careful consideration of the project – and subsequent objection – there seems to be a groundswell throughout Victoria – of concerned citizens. People are not only concerned about their own neighbourhoods but the city as a whole. This hopefully will be an important issue in the upcoming election. Developers seem to have taken advantage of the city and its innocence. The populace is no longer innocent and is fighting back.

Please don't let the "Pentrelew neighbourhood" be a victim in advance of City Hall modernizing policy and recognizing a change in political sentiment throughout the city. This fight reminds me of what Vancouver went through after EXPO when people tore down houses in architecturally and environmentally balanced neighbourhoods – only to cut down the trees and build to lot limits. This catastrophe was not the fault of the newcomers – this was the fault of the legislators who did not keep up with the times and too late set building and tree removal limits. This caused so much disharmony in the city and could have been prevented by a wise city council. Please don't let this happen to Victoria. Be a wise city council.

Please stand up to the developers and insist that they stick to the SCALE and wishes of Victoria neighbourhood groups who have put so much time, energy and passion into saving their communities.

Again – we are counting on you to save Victoria.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hamilton  
(grew up at 1020 Pentrelew and Victoria property owner – #312-1030 Yates St)

-----Original Message-----

From: Jennifer Hamilton [REDACTED]  
Sent: November 24, 2017 10:20 PM  
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
Subject: Pentrelew/ Truth Centre Development

Dear Mayor and council,

I grew up on Pentrelew Place and my parents still live at the epicentre of the affected area. Lives are already being affected by this ridiculous development and it has not even been built yet! The neighbours have drawn together in a civilized organized fashion to first study, fairly consider and now fight this development which is completely out of SCALE for our neighbourhood. I believe that you as a council recognized this at the last meeting but -yet- the developer has not made any of the requested concessions - especially to height.

Speaking frankly, this proposed development is simply too big and is only satisfying the developers need for profit. When he bought the property he knew that his plans were contrary to zoning and given the increase in Victoria real estate prices since he bought, he would still make a tidy profit if he scaled back the number of residences.

I don't even want to get into parking !?!?! Especially with the Art Gallery and Langham Court crowds. I suspect that you have all spent time circling the neighbourhood looking for spots on an opening night.

Finally, I can't believe that this development would be allowed based on geology. Past blasting in the area has left cracks in foundations and significant insurance claims. You cannot imagine that this would not affect residents yet again. It seems totally unfair to your existing citizens to put them through this again.

Be brave, be strong and say "no" to this plan as it stands. We are counting on you.

Jennifer Hamilton



## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Axels Place [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 3:04 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Truth Centre development proposal

Dear Mayor and Council:

We are against the above rezoning application because:

- We are dismayed by the development's size, the number and height of buildings.
- We are concerned about the number of heritage trees that will be destroyed.
- The proposal does not adhere to the Official Community Plan 1.
- The numerous variances requested are absurd, and no hardship is possible under the existing real estate conditions in Victoria.
- 6 stories is too high for Rockland.
- Please serve the community: insist that proposal comply with the two directives given to "revise the density, massing, height and setbacks of the building to the south" and to demonstrate how the condominium on Fort "enhances the heritage character of the Fort Street corridor."
- We do not need to build more of what we already have - too many expensive condominiums. Let's do smaller, less expensive, in areas suitable to development of the sort.

We are not Victoria municipality residents – we live in Oak Bay, where the challenges are pretty much the same. But we ARE Victorians – always have been. Please, please reconsider. This is our beautiful, people-scaled, tree-rich community. It is not a real estate zoo. No developer will lose any money in the current environment. Let's preserve what we have. Spend money on rapid transit to the Western communities. Don't worry so much about making sure everyone who wants a piece of this, gets it (we'd like to live in Paris, but no-one is making sure that happens...)

But seriously, folks. Please be more responsible to your citizens, and make the developer comply. They have the skills to deliver something that will please all and make money too.

Sincerely yours,

Karen and Martin Nelson  
82 Sylvan Lane, Victoria, BC, V8S 2K8

[REDACTED]

5018 Munn Road, Victoria BC, V9E 1G7

April 7, 2018

RE: Rezoning of 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place, Victoria, BC

As owners of Suite 401, 1225 Fort Street, we wish to submit a rejection of the proposal to amend the zoning of the above properties.

There is very little positive about this proposal. It essentially ignores the countless hours and intense input that was undertaken to develop the Official Community Plan under a Local Area Plan. The OCP is just that: an official, well thought out indication of how the neighbourhood should develop.

To ignore that is to negate the whole process. Why even expend the effort to do proper planning for a community if it will all simply be ignored when a developer comes along with slick drawings and ideas.

We believe that the city council needs to encourage development, but not at the expense of losing its credibility. The city should not ever be perceived as being 'bought'.

It appears to us that the developer has not really even listened to the city planners. We believe they were requested to reduce height and density, and their return submission really was nothing more than pacifiers. There were not any substantial reductions. With this response in the past, this proposal should not be moving forward until there were more reductions.

We do object to the proposed removal of the oak trees on the property as well. The suggestion of the landscapers to replace the existing oaks with young trees, planted in 24" of soil over a concrete parkade seems almost ludicrous, particularly in terms of the length of time it takes for an oak tree to get to the height of the existing ones. That being said it is doubtful that these plantings would ever attain any semblance to what is there at present. We suspect an oak tree planted as they suggest would succumb in short order leaving in its place a concrete patio. Surely growing trees in shallow soil will limit the extent of the growth. With the proposed new setbacks from the street, concrete will replace the park-like setting that exists now.

While any development would have some negative impact on the natural park-like setting, this present proposal as it appears, would have significant negative impact. We need a more holistic approach to our city's development. You should not be approving proposals that are only in the best interests of the developers but not to the benefit of the neighbourhood and the whole city. An approval of this type of development will set a terrible precedent for all areas of the city.

We would ask what is the benefit of this proposal to anyone other than the developer. Does the city benefit? Do any of the neighbours benefit? Does the natural environment benefit? Does the heritage character of the city benefit? We think the answer to all the questions is a resounding NO!

We understand there has been much resistance to this project from the neighbourhood. As representatives of the community, it is imperative that you listen to and respond positively to the concerns. Contemplating making changes to the Official Community Plan and to existing zoning bylaws must be considered very seriously.

Respectfully submitted,

Deanna and Paul Henry

5018 Munn Road, Victoria BC, V9E 1G7

April 7, 2018

RE: Rezoning of 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place, Victoria, BC

As owners of Suite 401, 1225 Fort Street, we wish to submit a rejection of the proposal to amend the zoning of the above properties.

There is very little positive about this proposal. It essentially ignores the countless hours and intense input that was undertaken to develop the Official Community Plan under a Local Area Plan. The OCP is just that: an official, well thought out indication of how the neighbourhood should develop.

To ignore that is to negate the whole process. Why even expend the effort to do proper planning for a community if it will all simply be ignored when a developer comes along with slick drawings and ideas.

We believe that the city council needs to encourage development, but not at the expense of losing its credibility. The city should not ever be perceived as being 'bought'.

It appears to us that the developer has not really even listened to the city planners. We believe they were requested to reduce height and density, and their return submission really was nothing more than pacifiers. There were not any substantial reductions. With this response in the past, this proposal should not be moving forward until there were more reductions.

We do object to the proposed removal of the oak trees on the property as well. The suggestion of the landscapers to replace the existing oaks with young trees, planted in 24" of soil over a concrete parkade seems almost ludicrous, particularly in terms of the length of time it takes for an oak tree to get to the height of the existing ones. That being said it is doubtful that these plantings would ever attain any semblance to what is there at present. We suspect an oak tree planted as they suggest would succumb in short order leaving in its place a concrete patio. Surely growing trees in shallow soil will limit the extent of the growth. With the proposed new setbacks from the street, concrete will replace the park-like setting that exists now.

While any development would have some negative impact on the natural park-like setting, this present proposal as it appears, would have significant negative impact. We need a more holistic approach to our city's development. You should not be approving proposals that are only in the best interests of the developers but not to the benefit of the neighbourhood and the whole city. An approval of this type of development will set a terrible precedent for all areas of the city.

We would ask what is the benefit of this proposal to anyone other than the developer. Does the city benefit? Do any of the neighbours benefit? Does the natural environment benefit? Does the heritage character of the city benefit? We think the answer to all the questions is a resounding NO!

We understand there has been much resistance to this project from the neighbourhood. As representatives of the community, it is imperative that you listen to and respond positively to the concerns. Contemplating making changes to the Official Community Plan and to existing zoning bylaws must be considered very seriously.

Respectfully submitted,

Deanna and Paul Henry

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** RICK GONDER [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 4:51 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 1201 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council

I write in support of the Abstract Developments proposal for property located at 1201 Fort Street in the City of Victoria, scheduled for Public Hearing on April 12th. I am not a resident nor do I own property in the City of Victoria but I support this proposed development.

About forty years ago Saanich Council approved a townhouse development proposed for a property in Cadboro Bay. Local residents purchased units, allowing them to stay connected to their neighborhood and its services.

About fifteen years ago a multi unit seniors home proposal came before Oak Bay Council. It was approved and more than half of the initial purchasers were aging Oak Bay residents who were able to remain in a familiar neighborhood.

Mayor and Council, I mention these projects because they are typical examples of projects similar to the one before you and that promoted aging in place and walkable communities, benefits for residents that remain in those two neighborhoods to this day. I believe the proposal before you deserves your support because it will:

- \* Conform to the OCP.
- \* Provide needed housing in a neighborhood that has experienced almost zero growth in the past two years.
- \* Provide an opportunity for Rockland residents to age in place amongst friends and family.
- \* Create an opportunity for residents to remain in a walkable neighborhood that is close to commercial, professional and recreational services.
- \* Include a Pemberton Trail connector and protect green space in the development.

This proposal comes before you at a Public Hearing on April 12th. Mayor and Council, I urge you to support the Abstract Developments proposal for 1201 Fort Street.

Thank you

Rick Gonder  
2615 Cranmore Rd  
Victoria B.C.  
V8R2A1

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Rachel van Wersch [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 5:59 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 2101 Fort

Change is happening so fast in Victoria, and at the expense of the greenspace and heritage homes that make it's neighborhoods special. The height and size of this development are extremely concerning to me, as it will dwarf the existing homes. Areas downtown have begun to feel closed off due to the height of the new buildings.

Please be informed that I am against the above Rezoning Application because:

[ X ] I am dismayed by the massing of the development, **its size, the number of buildings, the height of the buildings, and the overall density.**

[ X ] **I am concerned about the number of heritage trees that will be destroyed** by the size of this development. A smaller development would allow more of these trees to survive the amount of blasting needed for this development and thrive in direct sunshine, not the shadows of tall buildings.

[ X ] **This proposal is based on an overly aggressive interpretation of the Official Community Plan which must be amended to allow the rezoning.** This proposal seeks to maximize the anticipated floor space ratio (FSR) of the smallest portion of the property (28%) by extending it over the residential portion (72%), arriving at a stated FSR of 1.29. The combined FSR should be much less, and the amount of new floor space created much closer to the 6,253 square meters allowed by the rezoning sought in this proposal.

[ X ] **The numerous variances requested to bolster the rezoning application (and increase the floor space to 10,219 square meters) are not supportable,** and no hardship has been shown by the developer to consider allowing any of these variances.

[ X ] The two multi-family buildings, up to 6 storeys in height, are **too high for Rockland** and exceed in height all multi-family buildings in Rockland, along the Linden corridor, and along the Fort Street Heritage corridor.

[ X ] **I am concerned about the increased traffic and parking** caused by this proposal to the long-term viability of the Langham Court Theatre and the Art Gallery of Greater Victoria which rely on this parking.

[ X ] **I am concerned that the City is not looking after its own best interests by allowing this development to go forward** without adequate income from Community Amenity Contributions and Density Bonuses gathered on developments in other BC municipalities. Where will the money come from to pay for the community amenities demanded by these new residents for parks, community centres, transportation infrastructure, fire halls, emergency services, etc?

[ X ] I encourage you to insist that this proposal comply with the two directives given by Council to the developer October 26, 2017 to 'revise the density, massing, height and setbacks of the building to the south' and to demonstrate how the condominium on Fort 'enhances the heritage character of the Fort Street corridor'.

[ X ] Since 2012, Victoria has vastly overshot its Official Community Plan target for building condo units, but has **failed significantly to meet its target for building ground-oriented housing like townhomes or single family dwellings.** Council has no mandate to rezone the southern portion of 1201 Fort property for condos, which is currently designated for much needed ground-oriented housing.

[ X ] **I am troubled by the absence of a sufficient affordable housing** component in the proposal. We do not need to build more of what we already have - too many expensive condominiums.

[ X ] How is this proposal sustainable when it is not built to **L.E.E.D.** standards?

Name: Rachel van Wersch

Address: #2-815 Linden Ave, Victoria BC



## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Taryn Mah [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 7, 2018 10:41 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place

Dear City Hall,

My name is Taryn Mah and I am the owner of a condo at 1225 Fort Street.

I am completely against the rezoning and amendments. I do not agree to the permission of changing to "Urban Residential" nor do I agree with the increase of maximum heights.

Such changes, including the construction and permanency affects our neighbourhood. Traffic patterns will change negatively, green spaces are being demolished, the carbon footprint too large, and it is just ridiculously too large and too much for our little quaint and friendly neighbourhood.

Our condo building will be directly compromised, as it towers over our building from top, left, and right. We will lose all privacy, including safety measures we have already will be compromised. I worry about my senior neighbours in my building who will not feel safe in their own home, and who do not have the ability to attend meetings nor will pen a letter to City Council. It is also our duty to take care of our senior citizens.

Thank you for this opportunity to pen this email. I am unable to attend the meeting.

Taryn Mah  
1225 Fort Street

Sent from Mah Mah's iPhone 😊

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Ashley Stewart [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 8, 2018 9:04 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Cc:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Development at 1201 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed development at 1201 Fort Street. I am unable to attend the public meeting on April 12. I live next door at 1225 Fort Street and my condo looks out over the development.

I'm pleased to see they are retaining so many trees on the property, especially on the front corner next to my property. With over half the space being retained as green space, this will be an excellent improvement to the neighbourhood and a better use of the space.

I know there are those who have expressed concern about the "massing" and "density" of this proposed development. Thanks to the large trees that are being retained on the property and the addition of new trees, neighbours and anyone walking by won't even notice the size of the buildings because the trees will still be taller. The proposed buildings aren't blocking anyones view either.

This is a prime location to build condos and add density to this area of town. Located on a major bus route and within walking distance of downtown, it is the exact type of property that should have a development of this size. One of the main reasons I bought my condo is because of it's location and that I could walk to work. I'm sure most people who will purchase units in this development will have the same idea and walk most places as I do. Located on a busy street, any additional traffic won't be noticeable. Adding density to transportation corridors is smart policy.

I'm not concerned about a potential loss of parking. There is plenty of street parking in this area, and being far enough out of the downtown core, it's never been an issue. I also find that my visitors take more environmentally-friendly options of walking, biking, or taking the bus.

I think the designs look beautiful and embrace the heritage corridor that is Fort Street, much more than plenty of other buildings in the area. With condo buildings located on three sides of this development, these new buildings will fit in with the surrounding community and be a beautiful addition to the neighbourhood.

This city needs more supply of housing and this development will provide an excellent home for many families. I hope the city will support this development.

Thank you,

Ashley Stewart  
102-1225 Fort Street

I would prefer my email address remain private and not part of the public record.

**To: Mayor and Council – City of Victoria**

**April 6, 2018**

**Re: 1201 Fort St & 1050 Pentrelew Re-Zoning Application**

I am responding to the proposed changes to the OCP and the Zoning Regulation Bylaws for the purpose of developing 1201 Fort St and 1050 Pentrelew Place. The development that Mike Miller, Abstract Design and their business partners have proposed, and as described on the Abstract Development website, is “master planned” for maximum size and maximum profit.

There is nothing about the design of these structures that integrates with the neighborhood. Mr. Miller’s intent is to leverage the existing Rockland neighborhood and character reputation, preserved by long term Victoria residents and their predecessors, for maximum profit. Many developers in our neighborhood have similarly built to maximum allowable limits of the existing zoning in order to maximize their profits. With the proposed rezoning Mr. Miller and Abstract have taken this approach to a whole new level.

Abstract Design’s website advertising for this project indicates that the design “responds to neighborhood context of the City of Victoria Official Community Plan”. Mr. Miller and Abstract Design’s “response” do not demonstrate any attempt to recognize this heritage neighborhood or comply with the existing zoning and the OCP.

I can understand council’s appreciation of Mr. Miller’s attempt to add a few affordable housing units in Victoria with his new company NVision. These units have not been delivered and represent a small fraction of his overall profit generated by the generous rezoning that he has already been awarded by the City of Victoria and District of Oak Bay. I am not aware of Abstract Design providing any tangible amenities to the City of Victoria and its residents in exchange for the support of his profitable projects.

City Council members are temporary stewards of all areas of our fine city. There is no council mandate to allow this type of construction that will have a such a permanent negative impact on my neighborhood. Approval of these bylaw changes will ensure elimination of rare green space and transform our heritage neighborhood into a valuable profit machine for a privileged few who operate for their own benefit.

I implore City Council to reject the bylaw changes requested by this applicant.

Respectfully,

R. Steven Jones

1541 Rockland Ave.

Victoria BC

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Daniel Tschudin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 9, 2018 10:56 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1201 Fort St. and 1050 Pentrelew Place

Dear Mayor and Counsellors

There are too many things wrong with the proposed development at Fort St and Pentrelew Pl for me to want to go into details: I am sure you heard the arguments many times before.

What concerns me is the lack of understanding of values and democracy the developers show. If this proposal goes forward the city sends a message to developers that nearly everything goes:

Zoning laws and neighbourhood plans; Profit is better  
Concerned neighbours; A pain, but eventually they will be ignored  
Development review process; Not important, just come back with the same plans  
Benefits for the public; "If the developer benefits, everybody benefits" (Ronald Reagan or so)  
Green and sustainable city development; Just a concept, like the tooth fairy

When my wife and I moved to Victoria 20 years ago, we thought it the perfect place to raise a family. Property prices, taxes, cost of living, traffic issues and unhindered development (e.g James Bay) that by-passed the needs of actual residents have changed Victoria in a way that we couldn't have imagined 20 years ago.

The real question this development raises is what future do want for the city we call our home. Will there still be room for middle-income families with kids, living in a neighbourhood with quiet streets, single family homes or townhouses with gardens or will it mostly be apartments for high income singles and houses for retirees whose children have flown the coop.

Don't get me wrong. This development does not threaten the idea of a City I would like to live in, but the constant erosion of visions, values, zoning plans does.

In this respect, I sincerely ask you to deny the developers vision of what the future of Victoria should look like

Thanks for your time

Daniel Tschudin

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** John Hughes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 9, 2018 2:35 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place

Mayor and Council

City of Victoria

April 9, 2018

**RE: Proposed changes to 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place:**

Mayor and Council,

The Craigdarroch Castle Historical Museum Society, as a member of the Rockland Neighbourhood Association, is keenly interested in how this community evolves. I am writing this letter in support of the proposed development at 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place.

I am pleased to see that building heights and number of units have been reduced to better address the concerns of the community and am impressed with the amount of green space, including retention of significant trees, included in the revised proposal. I'm also pleased to see an improved public pathway connecting Fort Street with Pentrelew Place as many of our visitors enjoy walking the neighbourhood on their way to or from the Art Gallery of Greater Victoria and Craigdarroch Castle. We currently hand out the neighbourhood association's walking tour pamphlets and adding more connectivity between Fort Street and the Rockland neighbourhood would be a welcome addition to the experience.

The other aspect of the proposed 1201 Fort/1050 Pentrelew development that is of great significance to me is the inclusion of the HOUSING AGREEMENT (1201 FORT STREET & 1050 PENTRELEW PLACE AFFORDABLE HOUSING) BYLAW (2018) for affordable rental units at 1010 Fort Street. The Museum Society employs many young people who are completing their education and starting families and one of the most frequently overheard conversations revolves around the struggle many are having finding an affordable place to live and grow. I've seen many of our junior staff leave the community and indeed the province to find an affordable place to live, work and raise a family and it's gratifying to know that the City and Developers are working together to find solutions to this issue.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely

John Hughes



**John Hughes**  
Executive Director, Craigdarroch Castle  
**Phone:** 250.592.5323  
**Website:** [www.thecastle.ca](http://www.thecastle.ca)  
**Address:** 1050 Joan Crescent, Victoria, BC V8S 3L5



April 6<sup>th</sup> 2018

Mayor and Members of Council  
City of Victoria City Hall  
1 Centennial Square  
Victoria, British Columbia  
CANADA V8W 1P6  
Telephone: 250.385.5711

**Re: 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place | Rockland Neighbourhood  
File No: REZ00525 and DVP00035**

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing today to support your decision to finalize and adopt applications REZ00525 and DVP00035 for 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place as the municipality, the proponents and the opponents have concluded a process that has resulted in the evolution of what was proposed, into a Rockland appropriate development.

I support approval of these applications because:

**1. The Local Government Process worked.**

- The project was subject to 20 community meetings, 6 of which were formal and 2 were facilitated by Abstract Developments;
- 1799 letters were sent to residents of Rockland, a neighbourhood of approximately 3500 people, which demonstrated the largest possible points of contact took place, such that many residents had the opportunity to make meaningful contributions that are reflected in the final design.

**2. The Design was driven by residents, professionals and elected representatives, resulting in a project which:**

- Maintains the greatest number of trees on site. If the proponent stayed with what was allowed there would be a parking lot against Pentrelew Place and a number of trees and public access eliminated. The final design allows for more trees;
- The final design allows for a proper neighbourhood greenway that connects, the first of six blockages to the connectivity of the neighbourhood greenway proposed years ago. Otherwise, it's just a square sidewalk beside a parking lot;
- The form and character of the project was modified in the town homes to reflect the existing single family homes on Pentrelew Place in the design, height and character of the proposed townhomes; and;
- The voluntary amenity contribution by the developer creates 10 new units in the other building underway down on Fort Street.

**3. Creates new opportunities for existing residents to downsize in their own community.**

The value of the units proposed are Rockland relevant. It's not a matter of placing a number of subsidized housing units on the edge of the area that doesn't fit the existing culture or character of the existing neighbourhood. The final design allows people to sell their existing homes and buy something smaller, while the proponent adds value down the street for other people to have the opportunity to live on Fort Street, closer to work and municipal amenities.

Our local economy has changed. We have a higher number of people that would appreciate the opportunity to live in Victoria, but are forced by availability, accessibility and costs to live outside the City. This project reflects the values of the Rockland neighbourhood, while opening a public access to private property that did not exist before, while at the same time providing new and smaller homes for existing residents and some new residents to have the Rockland neighbourhood life style.

I have also compared the applications to the Objectives of the OCP updated in 2017. It pretty much connects with all of the objectives that fit within the realm of a multi-family residential development. Please approve the applications as presented and move on to more neighbourhood relevant commercial, residential, institutional and industrial development.

**Respectfully Submitted**



Patrick N. Marshall  
Business and Economic Developer | Capital EDC Economic Development Company | Attachments



**City of Victoria | Official Community Plan Goals July 2017 compared to 1201 Fort Street and 1050 Pentrelew Place Final Plans**

Topic Areas	Goals	Yes
Land Management and Development	1. Victoria has compact development patterns that use land efficiently. 2. Victoria's bustling downtown and harbour are a prominent centre for business, government, arts and culture on Vancouver Island. 3. Neighbourhoods include centres of economic activity that serve the needs of residents within walking, wheeling or cycling distance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Transportation and Mobility	4. Transportation options reduce fossil fuel dependence, help conserve energy and produce low greenhouse gas emissions and other air contaminants. 5. Victorians move freely and efficiently via a safe, integrated and convenient network of public transit, bike routes, and a supportive, inviting pedestrian realm in preference to driving alone. 6. Services, amenities, buildings, facilities, and public space are accessible.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Placemaking	7. Victoria is vibrant and attractive with unique character and sense of place. 8. Victoria's cultural and natural heritage resources are protected and celebrated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks and Recreation	9. Victoria is an active community where everyone enjoys convenient access to community parks, open spaces, facilities, amenities and programs close to where they live.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Environment	10. Victoria's urban environment, including urban forests, and public and private green spaces support healthy and diverse ecosystems. 11. Victoria's Harbour, coastline, ponds and streams support healthy populations of fish and other aquatic life.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Infrastructure	12. Victoria's well-maintained infrastructure and facilities meet the needs of residents and business utilizing best management practices. 13. Victoria's healthy, clean, high-quality drinking water is used in a thrifty way and maintained through generations. 14. Efficient and effective liquid waste management protects human health and the natural environment and makes use of resource potential. 15. Rainwater resources are carefully managed with collection, diversion, and re-use practices that moderate runoff volumes and maximize water quality. 16. The waste stream to the regional landfill is reduced to a minimum, with recovery, re-use, recycling and composting of resources undertaken as	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Climate Change and Energy	17. Victoria and Victorians are more resilient to climate change and energy scarcity and costs. 18. New and existing buildings are energy efficient and produce few greenhouse gas emissions. 19. Transportation options reduce fossil fuel dependence, help conserve energy and produce low greenhouse gas emissions and other air contaminants. 20. The waste stream to the regional landfill is reduced to a minimum, with recovery, re-use, recycling and composting of resources undertaken as standard practice. 21. Victoria relies on clean, renewable, diverse and efficient energy sources.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Housing and Homelessness	22. All residents have access to appropriate, secure, affordable housing. 23. A wide range of housing types, tenures and prices gives residents choices.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Economy	24. Victoria generates economic growth, through innovation, entrepreneurship and new business formation, and attracts and retains sustainable enterprises well-suited to the region. 25. Victoria contributes to global knowledge, produces and attracts talented researchers, incubates innovation, and brings new goods and services to market. 26. Victorians have the knowledge and abilities to support a vibrant regional economy and the capacity to creatively adapt to economic change. 27. Victoria is the headquarters of the Provincial Government, a premier tourism destination, and a gateway to Vancouver Island. 28. A broad range of employment opportunities exist across the city and region providing workers with income to financially support themselves and their families.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Topic Areas	Goals	Yes
Community Well Being	<p>29. All Victorians have income and access to public services to be able to flourish and live with dignity.</p> <p>30. Lifelong learning opportunities that are culturally appropriate are available for diverse learners of all ages and income levels.</p> <p>31. High quality, affordable formal education is available and accessible for students of all ages.</p> <p>32. Victorians know their neighbours, are connected to communities of interest and have diverse opportunities for social interaction.</p> <p>33. Victorians can support themselves and their neighbours in difficult times.</p> <p>34. Victoria is a place where people come to live, work and play, regardless of age, ethnicity, religion, culture, income, sexual orientation, ability and family status.</p> <p>35. Victorians are healthy and have a network of health-related amenities, facilities and programs to promote wellness and meet the needs of all levels of mental and physical care.</p> <p>36. Victoria is a safe city, where everyone feels secure in public, in their homes, and workplaces.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
Arts and Culture	<p>37. Victoria is a place where artists are able to thrive and where people from all walks of life enjoy formal and informal opportunities to create and enjoy the arts, culture, and entertainment activities.</p> <p>38. Victoria's cultural and natural resources are protected and celebrated.</p> <p>39. Lifelong learning opportunities that are culturally appropriate are available for diverse learners of all ages and income levels.</p>	
Food Systems	<p>40. A healthy share of the food that supplies Victoria's daily needs is sustainably grown, processed and packaged in the city, in surrounding agriculture areas, and on Vancouver Island.</p> <p>41. Victorians have access to skills, knowledge, and resources to produce and process their own food in urban areas.</p>	
Emergency Management	<p>42. Victoria is prepared to deal with known hazards and emerging threats, to limit the adverse impacts of events, and effectively manage emergencies.</p> <p>43. Victoria is able to respond rapidly and effectively to all emergencies, including events with long-term impacts and recovery times.</p> <p>44. Victorians can rely on significant local sources for food, energy and materials to meet daily needs under emergency conditions.</p>	
Plan Administration	<p>45. Corporate and community decision-making processes are clear and open to the public.</p> <p>46. Victorians are interested, informed, empowered and involved in their communities and the process of democratic governance.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
Local Area Planning	<p>47. Corporate and community decision-making processes are clear and open to the public.</p> <p>48. Victorians are interested, informed, empowered and involved in their communities and the process of democratic governance.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
Adaptive Management	<p>49. The City monitors and reports on progress for to learn and adapt as needed</p> <p>50. Corporate and community decision-making processes are clear and open to the public.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>51. The City monitors and reports on progress for to learn and adapt as needed.</p> <p>52. Corporate and community decision-making processes are clear and open to the public.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>