

## **Pamela Martin**

---

**From:** John Sherber [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 25, 2018 1:04 PM  
**To:** Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Chris Coleman (Councillor); Lisa Helps (Mayor); Pam Madoff (Councillor)  
**Cc:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Truth Center property changes

Good day to all,

I hope you will read this and listen with your heart. The business of the city "is what it is" but the future of our city is always in your hands.

### **Truth Center Property**

April 25, 2018

#### **Respectfully:**

Mayor and councillors:

The note in the mail from the city says:

*"It's your neighbourhood"*

I feel like this is a David vs. Goliath situation. There is millions of dollars and a conglomerate of companies and people moving this development forward.

We are residents of the Rockland area.

Today I ask you to deny the change in bylaws from traditional, single-family dwellings for the 1201 Fort and 1050 Pentrelew. This is a neighbourhood not an urban site. The property has been used for a long time as a Spiritual centre and along with prayer gardens, sanctuaries and majestic trees it is a pivotal spot in the Rockland area. The development will cause serious problems with traffic congestion, parking and over use of a property that could be used to work within the parameters of the bylaws already in place, homes and townhouses.

It opens the doors for other lands (art gallery property) to have the same done to them.

The amount of building going on in this city is overwhelming. Abstract has properties in Oak Bay, Saanich and Victoria and is moving vigorously to make substantial profits from all of them. There must be at least 15 or more large developments under construction less than two blocks away in the cities core. A perfect place for development.

We have heard from architects, students and people living in developments built by the company who do not live in the area. There is no issue with the quality of their buildings or their reputation as a builder. It is about a Victoria neighbourhood that has maintained its culture for a long time. The solution is a combination of homes and apartment building built along Fort street utilizing above ground parking.

#### **Access to town:**

Many people talked about the direct access to town. If you look at the direction of Fort, it travels west. Every car will have to find routes to get to and from this location.

Here are some things to think about:

#### **Traffic:**

If you look at the “not to scale” renderings by the developer the Fort st entrance to building A; you will notice it is directly across the street from Ormond st. Ormond is a cross over street from either Yates to Fort or vice versa. I lived at 1147 View (between Ormond and Cook) st for 10 years before my move to Linden Ave.

Ormond is a fast moving and busy street already. There are some serious considerations to look at.

#### **Ormond moving traffic south:**

When traffic is moving south on Ormond you can only turn left of Fort. If the entrance to this building is directly across from this street it will be a challenge to navigate. If you turn left and want to turn right on Pentrelew this will be even more of a dangerous situation. Navigating across the two lanes and a bike lane. The speed of traffic coming up over the Fort St hill is quite fast and heavy during peak times.

#### **Ormond moving traffic North:**

Even more so this volume of traffic moving on to Ormond from building A will create situations with traffic travelling up Fort. There is also a school within one block of this site. There is another way out and that is down Pentrelew to Rockland. Not a good thing.

If you travel either end of Ormond you will find vehicles stopping at the stops sign pull out well past the white line. This creates problems for those turning on to Ormond from either direction. Very hazardous.

#### **Filling station on Yates:**

If someone from the area wants to fill up at the gas station up the street one way to get back to their home is to travel Yates to Cook. I believe most will turn at Ormond and create more traffic problems.

More importantly, the other is to cut thru at Craigdarroch st, Royal Terr. and down on to Rockland. Multiple units with 80 or more people, possible cars travelling down a 30k Rockland is going to put a strain on the use of the roads in the area. If you walk that road you know drivers to not pay attention to the speed limit.

#### **Pentrelew:**

If you look at the not to scale rendering of the south Pentrelew entrance you will see there is very few cars parked on the street. Living on Linden there is minimal parking already on our street and the increased density will be overwhelming to the area. If you consider there is the “Langham Court” theatre in the neighbourhood this is going to be a real challenge for the area. Speaking to neighbours in the area we find at those times the play house has even gone as far as paying tickets for people attending events who parked where they are not supposed to. If you stand near the Langham theatre and look north up Pentrelew you will see quite a rise on the street. This complex will tower over everything in the area. Houses would fit in nicely.

#### **Blasting:**

If this was a development within the standing bylaws there would be very little blasting necessary as there would be homes or town homes that would not need an over abundance of parking.

Western Grater has decades of urban blasting, not residential, blasting of this magnitude in a residential neighbourhood is unacceptable.

#### **Height of building A:**

If you look at the Black and White which this company is building at Fort and Cook you will note it towers over anything that is on this side of Fort and Cook. If you allow a 5 story building on this site it will definitely be a first in the neighbourhood. Even if you go south to Fairfield, or north to Fernwood there are very few residential buildings of this height and they are on a very steep hill away from other developments.

If you look at what a 5 story building would look like from the rear of 1039 Linden you will see it will tower over the area. There is a steady rise to the land (looking east) starting at Linden. This will make the height of this building even higher.

#### **Sequoias trees:**

I was dismayed by the removals of one of these giants of trees awhile back at Fairfield and Foul Bay. There are two of these on the property and they are 90 years old. I guess this is taking advantage of seniors again. All other buildings built previously on the property were built around them. If you go to Pandora and Fernwood, Rockland at Royal Terrace, Moss and Richardson, Meares St by the B&W you will see it is quite possible to build around the magnificent giants. Houses or town homes on this property could accommodate the trees.

### **Length of time to build:**

2 years of construction, every working day at 7 plus they have no control of what there contractors do on other days.

### **PENTRELEW PLACE AFFORDABLE HOUSING BYLAW**

The change to the bylaw would say you can not monitor the amount of rentals in the complex. This takes the freedom from the members of the strata to make decisions about their property. This is unacceptable as it profoundly affects the ability of the owners to be able to make decisions about what is best for them.

Rentals mean absentee owners and it if you speak with anyone who has lived in a building with rentals it is a serious issue trying to maintain the building.

My partner and I attended a meeting just before the last council meeting on this subject and Mike was very respectful. However, I did hear him say that if this does not go thru they are going to build the 5 story the way they want. Developers and those in business situations honestly cannot have the interest of the residents at heart, they do not live there and need to promote their interests because of our “for profit” system.

Victoria has a culture that people come here and live here. Let us ensure that culture of neighbourhoods and people are put before developers. For a \$7 million investment it will change, the landscape forever and there will be more money made that will go into the pockets of a small amount of people and few in the community will benefit.

About who lives there? You will have to be quite wealthy to do so, (it has been made clear these are high end properties) there is no benefit for those would “need” housing, this is an over the top development that does not fit with the community plan and I am asking you to not pass this change to the community plan.

John Sherber  
Karen Burgess

206-1039 Linden Ave.  
[REDACTED]

Desire is what you do when you want,  
Will is when you can do what you do not want.....P.D. Ouspensky

**Altruist on the Move**

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Anna Cal [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 26, 2018 12:03 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** Pam Madoff (Councillor); Chris Coleman (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Lisa Helps (Mayor)  
**Subject:** 1201Fort/1050 Pentrelew proposal

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I have read all the correspondence for this proposal.

These are the arguments from the proposal's supporters.

1. Opposing residents are NIMBYs - false. Characterization which points to a very weak argument.
2. Opposing residents do not want any development - no, we only strive for a smaller, less massive development. The floor space ratio is still too large. We have been suggesting a development in the range of 50 or so units with an FSR in the range between 1.10:1 and 1.15:1, but this has fallen on deaf ears for more than a year.
3. Any housing will help the housing crisis - no, Victoria has an abundant supply of housing, but it is ALL at market rates, and is unaffordable for most people. More luxury condos will only serve the well-to-do.
4. Affordability component is an excuse for granting the applicant massive rezoning and numerous variances - no, the housing units at \$25,000.00 below market rates is an ephemeral promise.  
The applicant has now bound those units to two proposals, 1201Fort and 1010 Fort, asking for variances and rezoning in both proposals.
5. The proposed project will enhance the area - well, a less massive proposal will enhance the area even better.

Remarkable amount of supporters have some kind of connection to Abstract Developments. Remarkable amount of them do not live in the area.

Please listen to those most affected by this proposal and decline this application.

Respectfully

Anna Cal  
1059 Pentrelew

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** Anthony Danda [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 26, 2018 9:05 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council; Lisa Helps (Mayor); Pam Madoff (Councillor); Chris Coleman (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor)  
**Subject:** Summary of 1201 Fort Correspondence  
**Attachments:** Correspondence Summary.xlsx

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

Given the scale of the correspondence received regarding the 1201 Fort application, I took the liberty of analyzing the responses on your behalf. Please see attached spreadsheet.

Key messages:

- **65%** of identified Victoria residents or businesses **oppose** the application.
- **80%** of identified residents or businesses within 200m of the site **oppose** the application.
- These figures do not include the 321 signatures from the online petition opposing the application captured in a 2 week period earlier this month or the 29 signatures collected at the rally on 06-Apr.

Approach:

- Identified unique respondents, i.e. only counted an individual once even if he or she submitted multiple pieces of correspondence.
- Segregated correspondence where the address was not provided.
- Identified Victoria residents
- Identified Victoria residents within 200m

Unique respondents	168	
Oppose application	103	61%
Support application	65	39%
Included address	131	
Victoria residents	110	
Non-residents	21	
Residents opposed	72	65%
Residents support	38	35%
Residents within 200m	35	
Opposed application	28	80%
Support application	7	20%
Withheld address	37	
Withheld opposed	21	57%
Withheld support	16	43%

Thank you,

Anthony Danda  
1075 Pentrelew Place



#	Address	Support application	Oppose application	Reside Victoria	Within 200m	Km to site
1	610 St. Charles Street	1		1		1.3
2	1115 Rockland		1	1		0.5
3	1025 Linden		1	1	1	
4	936 Fairfield		1	1		1.3
5	772 Bay for Groupe Denux	1		1		2.4
6	2746 Shelbourne		1	1		2.6
7	1070 Moss		1	1		0.3
8	1220 McKenzie		1	1		6.1
9	3136 Stevenson		1	1		3.4
10	44 Linden		1	1		1.7
11	1030 Yates		1	1		0.7
12	82 Sylvan Lane		1			3.1
13	1225 Fort		1	1	1	
14	2615 Cranmore	1				3.3
15	815 Linden		1	1		0.4
16	1225 Fort		1	1	1	
17	1225 Fort	1		1	1	
18	1541 Rockland		1	1		1.5
19	Withheld		1			
20	Withheld	1				
21	Capital EDC	1				
22	1225 Fort		1	1	1	
23	1535 Despard	1		1		1.5
24	1642 Warren Gardens		1	1		1.7
25	1642 Warren Gardens		1	1		1.7
26	Babak Oriental Carpets	1		1		0.7
27	Withheld		1			
28	1059 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
29	1225 Fort	1		1	1	
30	1225 Fort	1		1	1	
31	Withheld		1			
32	1765 Hollywood Crescent		1	1		2.7
33	1361 Rockland	1		1		0.8
34	Withheld		1			
35	1024 Pentrelew	1		1	1	
36	2607 Capital Heights	1		1		2.0
37	1144 Fort Lojo Holdings	1		1	1	
38	8006 Northwind		1			120.0
39	Withheld		1			
40	234 Moss		1	1		1.4
41	2635 Bowker		1			3.4

42	Withheld		1			
43	1059 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
44	817 Linden		1	1		0.4
45	Withheld	1				
46	Withheld	1				
47	1542 Shorncliffe Heights		1			5.7
48	Withheld		1			
49	1119 Ormond		1	1	1	
50	810 Linden	1		1		0.4
51	2574 Cavendish Avenue	1				3.4
52	2650 Belmont	1		1		2.2
53	2181 Haultain	1				3.1
54	Withheld	1				
55	1685 Warren Gardens		1	1		1.7
56	75 Cook	1		1		1.9
57	1010 Pentrelew	1		1	1	
58	628 Dallas		1	1		3.0
59	1245 Oxford	1		1		1.3
60	1009 Southgate		1	1		1.3
61	1200 Vancouver	1		1		0.7
62	1152 Leonard	1		1		1.6
63	520 Dunedin		1	1		3.4
64	Withheld	1				
65	1261 Fort		1	1	1	
66	1075 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
67	118 St. Lawrence	1		1		3.6
68	735 Moss		1	1		0.6
69	Withheld	1				
70	1770 Rockland	1		1		1.5
71	Withheld	1				
72	Withheld		1			
73	3690 Doncaster	1				5.0
74	Withheld		1			
75	525 Rithet		1	1		3.0
76	1969 Oak Bay	1		1		2.0
77	55 Gorge Road East	1		1		4.4
78	1005 Joan Crescent		1	1		0.8
79	240 Wildwood	1		1		2.4
80	1024 Pentrelew	1		1	1	
81	1000 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
82	Withheld	1				
83	7675 East Saanich		1			20.7
84	1025 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
85	1524 Bywood	1		1		1.2

86	Withheld		1			
87	Withheld		1			
88	1119 Ormond		1	1	1	
89	1025 Moss		1	1		0.3
90	Withheld		1			
91	Withheld	1				
92	Withheld	1				
93	3522 West 17th Ave, Vancouver	1				
94	4062 Licorice Lane		1			6.7
95	460 Tuscan Lane	1				14.1
96	1221 Rockland		1	1		0.4
97	1035 Moss		1	1		0.4
98	Brentwood Bay		1			20.0
99	57 Wellington Ave		1	1		1.8
100	1121 Fort		1	1	1	
101	1113 Fisgard		1	1		1.3
102	1765 Rockland		1	1		1.5
103	1545 Pandora		1	1		1.0
104	1255 Fort		1	1	1	
105	1254 Fort		1	1	1	
106	1025 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
107	735 Moss		1	1		0.6
108	2945 Gosworth Road		1	1		3.0
109	3130 Frechette		1			3.6
110	1011 Moss		1	1		
111	1859 Feltham	1				7.8
112	Withheld	1				
113	Withheld	1				
114	1380 Rockland		1	1		0.9
115	1039 Linden		1	1	1	
116	1252 Wilspencer		1	1	1	
117	Withheld	1				
118	538 Pandora	1		1		1.8
119	Moxies on Yates	1		1		0.7
120	5 Price Bay Lane		1			
121	The London Chef	1		1		0.7
122	1380 Rockland		1	1		0.9
123	1070 Moss		1	1	1	
124	1020 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
125	1014 Rockland	1		1		0.6
126	1765 Rockland	1		1		1.5
127	107 Wellington	1		1		1.6
128	1075 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
129	Withheld		1			

130	1327 Clover	1		1		2.1
131	1039 Linden		1	1	1	
132	Victoria Downtown Residents Assoc		1	1		
133	2574 Cavendish Avenue	1				3.4
134	408 Cavallin	1				7.5
135	1760 Denman	1		1		1.9
136	3724 Harriet Road		1			5.3
137	Withheld		1			
138	Victoria Residential Builders Assoc	1		1		
139	Charge Fitness		1	1		
140	Walk On Victoria	1		1		
141	Withheld	1				
142	Withheld		1			
143	Withheld		1			
144	Withheld		1			
145	827 Fairfield	1		1		1.3
146	505 Quadra	1		1		1.5
147	1234 Fort		1	1	1	
148	Withheld		1			
149	1137 View	1		1		0.3
150	Withheld	1				
151	1220 Fort		1	1	1	
152	1020 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
153	1149 Rockland		1	1		0.4
154	126 Hallowell Road		1	1		7.6
155	903 Linden		1	1		0.3
156	Withheld		1			
157	727 Linden		1	1		0.4
158	1505 Bywood	1				1.1
159	1190 Fort		1	1	1	
160	188 St. Charles		1	1		2.3
161	Withheld		1			
162	1025 Linden		1	1	1	
163	1149 Rockland		1	1		0.4
164	1020 Pentrelew		1	1	1	
165	1566 Despard		1	1		1.6
166	Withheld		1			
167	200 Dallas Road		1	1		3.6
168	Withheld	1				

65  
39%

103  
62%

110

35

**Lacey Maxwell**

---

**From:** Harry Swain [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** April 26, 2018 8:05 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Committee of the Whole, 26 April 2018--1201 Yates  
**Attachments:** 1201 Yates.jpg

838 Pemberton Road,  
Victoria BC V8S 3R4  
April 26, 2018

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

Re: 1201 Yates Street (Abstract Development)

Unhappily we can't be at tonight's meeting to speak on the proposal for 1201 Yates. You already have our February 27 letter expressing our support for this version of the Abstract proposal; a copy of it is appended for convenience. Our purpose in writing is to make a larger point we would have made verbally but for another commitment.

The larger point is that some parts of Victoria have to change if the City and its many neighbours are to accommodate the considerable increase of population that our planners observe now and foresee for coming years. We have not much undeveloped land. Our housing prices have become prohibitive for the younger people who will power the future regional economy. We have a conflict between some older people who wish nothing would ever change, and others who would like to downsize in the same neighbourhoods they now inhabit. Some of our existing housing stock is obsolete from energy conservation or earthquake preparedness perspectives. Too many people cannot find housing near the employment centers of the region, thus jamming our roads with cars and straining regional public transportation.

Yet everywhere we see those who have secured places in the lifeboat pulling up the ladder against swimmers. NIMBY indeed.

Our city planners applaud selective densification—along major transportation corridors, for instance. They see no conflict between higher density, neighbourhood amenities and excellence in design.

This is precisely what Abstract is offering for 1201 Yates: higher density on the fringe of the downtown core supporting better retail and public services, along a major regional street, with a design that has been improved since its original presentation following suggestions from (some of) the neighbours. If a proposal of this quality can't be approved by our elected Council there is little hope that anything can, or at least anything that respects the principles of city planning that we officially espouse.

Sincerely yours,

Julie Swain

Harry Swain

838 Pemberton Road,  
Victoria, BC V8S 3R4  
Feb. 27, 2018

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

Re: 1201 Fort Street (Abstract Developments)

To our annoyance we are being told by anonymous postbox-stuffers how to think: see the enclosed. As you may be getting a number of these missives from those who cannot think for themselves or are too lazy to put pen to paper, we thought we'd let you know directly what we think.

Since first proposed, the project has been substantially modified to meet the concerns of the neighbours. The bigger building masses are now concentrated on the north side of the property, where they are bordered by other apartment buildings of the same general size, and by a busy arterial road. Townhouses face existing houses on Pentrelew. Circulation routes for pedestrians are provided through the property. The architectural details of the present proposal are markedly better than the original.

Overall, the proposal is entirely consistent with the city planning intent to densify along major corridors, and to protect existing single-family neighbourhoods.

None of this has stopped the anonymous circulators of the enclosed flyer. It seems their thought is that Abstract should turn their expensive purchase into a park for the neighbourhood.

We disagree. Victoria is a growing city, with many younger residents longing for a place to live within walking or cycling distance of their central city employment areas. It is not a time capsule of 1950. It is not a place where complacent oldsters (we are no spring chickens) should play Johnny-bar-the-door to the coming generations. Abstract as a developer has a fine reputation for quality construction, architectural sensitivity, and customer satisfaction.

We believe the project should be approved.

Sincerely,

Julie Swain

Harry Swain

## Lacey Maxwell

---

**From:** webforms@victoria.ca  
**Sent:** April 26, 2018 1:18 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Mayor and Council email

From: Samantha Sherman  
Email : [REDACTED]  
Reference : <http://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/city/mayor-council-committees/contact-mayor-council.html>  
Daytime Phone : [REDACTED]  
Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing again regarding the proposed development of 1201 Fort Street by Abstract. I have owned and lived in my condo at 1225 Fort Street for over 6 years. I was married in the summer and my husband and I now both live in the condo, and we plan to own it for many more years. I was born and raised in Victoria (43 years) and spent part of my childhood in Rockland at 808 St. Charles in a home my parents owned and restored. I was very happy to be able to return to Rockland as an adult, but certainly could not have afforded to purchase a house there when I was in the market in 2011. We probably still could not afford to purchase a house there, despite us each having a full time well-paying job. The ones listed for sale seem to be over a million dollars.

I have attended several of the community meetings hosted by Abstract during which they garnered input from the neighbours of the proposed development. I have also attended several meetings they have held for the residents of my and the surrounding strata properties to address our unique questions and concerns. I am impressed at how they have tried to incorporate many of the varying interests of the neighbours into their proposed development, and continue to do so even as those interests become more numerous and varied it seems as time goes on. I approved of the first proposed development and of the zoning changes it would have required, and I like even better the second proposed development and approve of the zoning changes it will require. I still much prefer what they are proposing over the development that they could build given the current zoning. There is certainly no way to address every different concern I heard voiced at the neighbourhood meetings, as many of them are directly at odds with each other. I do think what Abstract has proposed is reasonable for the land and neighbourhood. I believe it will invigorate the neighbourhood with new residents, and look forward to having new neighbours, rather than an old building that was not really being used. I like that the current design has kept many of the Gary Oaks and will have a community walkway through it.

I really appreciate all the effort Abstract has put into listening to the concerns of the neighbourhood and in trying to find the best and most reasonable way to address them and wish to offer this letter in support of their requested zoning change and proposed development.

Sincerely,  
Samantha Sherman  
403-1225 Fort St.

**IMPORTANT NOTICE:** This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The City of Victoria immediately by email at [publicservice@victoria.ca](mailto:publicservice@victoria.ca). Thank you.

IP Address: 142.36.106.118