

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** November 28, 2019 1:28 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: 1811 Oak Bay Avenue Residential Development

---

**From:** Garry Barsalou <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** November 28, 2019 1:24 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** 1811 Oak Bay Avenue Residential Development

Dear Mayor and Council,

The redevelopment of the site structure from 5 old antiquated rental suites to 14 rental new suites is a bonus to increase our rental housing stock. The risk is with the developer to create modern environmentally safe long term housing for future generations. Granted this housing does not help to eliminate the current shortage of affordable housing, it will provide additional market housing that will create competition and lead to rental rate stabilization.

To conclude the more market housing created the more opportunity rental rates will be become affordable in the near future.

I fully support the proposed redevelopment.

Garry Barsalou  
526 St. Charles Street  
Victoria BC

## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** November 28, 2019 10:37 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: Nov. 28th Opportunity for Public Comment - 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

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

From: Karen Ayers <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: November 27, 2019 5:08 PM  
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
Cc: Councillors <Councillors@victoria.ca>  
Subject: Nov. 28th Opportunity for Public Comment - 1811 Oak Bay Avenue

Dear Mayor and Council:

As I am not able to attend the Council meeting tomorrow, I am providing my comments in writing.

The proposed development is not appropriate for the site. Multiple significant variances are requested for site coverage, green space, and setbacks, with setback variances to all sides of the development. Setbacks have a purpose, and unless there is some unique or compelling reason to vary them, they should generally be respected. The setback to the rear of 0.00 from the parkade projection is particularly egregious, resulting in insufficient transition to the neighbour to the south, and the loss of a significant tree.

There is nothing unique or compelling about this particular development that warrants ignoring the setbacks to the degree requested. If it is okay for this development, why not all developments?

There will be a loss of 5 rental units. The development has changed from all rental (what the neighbourhood was told when the proposal came to the CALUC meeting), to strata, and now to a 10 year commitment to rental. The neighbourhood relied on the commitment to rental (understood to be in perpetuity) in expressing some level of support, because of the need for rental housing. We don't need more expensive strata developments. We need rental housing that doesn't disappear in ten years.

This development is clearly too big for the site and when combined with the lack of commitment to ongoing rental housing, this development should be rejected.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Ayers

Sent from my iPad