

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Karen Brown [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 25, 2019 11:52 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** I want to support the project on 1712/1720 Fairfield Road

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing you to show my support for the development proposal at 1712/1720 Fairfield Road.

Sincerely,

Karen Brown

702 - 960 Yates Street

Sent from TalktoAryze.ca, [talk@talktoaryze.ca](mailto:talk@talktoaryze.ca)

## Monica Dhawan

---

**From:** Victoria <noreply@123formbuilder.io>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 11, 2019 3:40 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** I want to support the project on 1712/1720 Fairfield Road

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing you to show my support for the development proposal at 1712/1720 Fairfield Road.

Sincerely,

Victoria

601 83 Saghalie Rd

Sent from TalktoAryze.ca, [talk@talktoaryze.ca](mailto:talk@talktoaryze.ca)

## Lucas De Amaral

---

**From:** Karen Ayers [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** June 12, 2019 10:47 AM  
**To:** Councillors  
**Subject:** COTW - 1712/1720 Fairfield Road

Dear Mayor and Council:

Approval to proceed to a public hearing was subject to developing a more sensitive transition to Hollywood Park, as well as a voluntary contribution to Victoria's Housing Fund. Neither of those conditions has been fulfilled.

The encroachment on the park is a function of building height (38 feet to mid-point of roof), proximity to the park (as close as 5 feet), and the buffer/screening. The developer has added a 4 foot high metal fence and a small hedge. A fence and hedge were part of the original Rhodo proposal that went to the CALUC, so from the neighbourhood perspective nothing has been added. The Parks Department will now be on the hook to provide additional planting on the park side. Why are City taxpayers paying for a vegetation buffer in support of a private development? Rotating the buildings does not adequately address the overall height, proximity and overlook of these units to the park. I am not aware of any other development that has been approved so close to and overlooking a City park, and this one should not be permitted as proposed.

The voluntary contribution of \$112,080 has been rescinded by the developer.

The # of units has increased from 17 to 20, and 2 one bed units are proposed for sale in perpetuity at 15% below market rate. Given these units can be expected to sell for well over \$1M, 15% below market is still not by any definition "affordable". The City would be far better served by having a substantial contribution to the Housing Fund which could actually be used to provide the inclusive and affordable housing so desperately needed. I also expect the CRD has better things to do with their time than manage in perpetuity the sales price of expensive townhouses in Gonzales.

If the City is going to approve the level of density and encroachment of the Rhodo, we need much more in return. The land lift between the current zoning and this proposal is in the multi-millions of dollars, and what we are getting in return is a mere pittance.

Karen Ayers