



# BROWN BROS.

December 10, 2019

Dear Mayor and Council,

RE: 953 Balmoral Road

We write to you in regards to a Rezoning and Development Permit application before Council for the property at 953 Balmoral Road. The proposal is for an 11-unit market rental building spread over 4 storeys. We are in strong support of the efforts of private developers to create more affordable housing in the Victoria facility, however we are concerned about the impact that this will create on the already difficult parking situation in the vicinity of Balmoral.

We manage a property at 975 Balmoral and have found, over the last year that parking near our building has become a challenge. We have received concerns from not only our tenants, but visitors to the building as well as contractors that they have had extreme difficulty finding appropriate parking.

We are concerned that the lack of available parking at the proposed location will only add to the challenge that is currently present in the neighbourhood by flooding the streets with additional cars making it impossible for individuals that visit, work and live in the neighbouring buildings to park their vehicles.

In summary, we strongly encourage additional affordable rental housing and stand behind any developer that proposes such properties however our concern lies with the lack of proposed parking that could potentially cause issues for the neighbourhood with unnecessary congestion.

Sincerely,

T. Blane Fowler

President

Brown Bros Agencies Ltd.



**BROWN  
BROS.**

A PROUD PAST.  
A CONFIDENT FUTURE.  
SINCE 1918.

1125 Blanshard Street,  
Victoria, BC V8W 2H7



## Pamela Martin

---

**From:** Lucas De Amaral  
**Sent:** December 10, 2019 1:26 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** FW: 953 Balmoral Road - Public Hearing 12 December 2019

**From:** Rajinder Sahota <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** December 9, 2019 9:49 AM  
**To:** Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** 953 Balmoral Road - Public Hearing 12 December 2019

Dear Lisa,

I write with respect to the public hearing return of this DP and Rezoning application.

By way of brief summary, this parcel was investigated by the applicant in the fall of 2012 when the applicant reached out to the then local area planner (**LAP**) about what the City envisioned for the parcel. The LAP advised that the parcel is designated Core Residential in the OCP, and falls within the Downtown Core Area Plan; as such the applicant should design a proposal with up to a 2:1 FSR, up to six residential stories, to allow Staff to develop a site-specific zone.

In the context of these recommendations, the applicant acquired the site in late 2012 and began working with the City (albeit a different LAP) to design a proposal. Over seven years, this resulted in three substantial re-designs.

The first design was a four- to six-story brownstone style brick residential apartment that was not well-received by Staff, though the North Park Neighbourhood Association preferred the design.

The second design was a six-story residential apartment with significant setbacks from all property lines as requested by Staff. Feedback with respect to this design was that, although the setbacks were sufficient as outlined, the height of the building was a concern, and the applicant should reduce the building to four stories with setbacks on the higher floors.

The third design is a four-story purpose-built residential apartment building that meets all *objective* criteria with respect to setbacks and height. The top two floors are set back. The proposal is well short of what is possible for the site with four as opposed to six floors, and a 1.38:1 FSR instead of 2:1 FSR.

Critically, to provide further benefit to the local community, the proposal includes a 25-year, s.219 housing agreement that commits the entire proposal to remain a purpose-built residential apartment building that may not be stratified and sold (even if vacancy rates reached levels where the City would permit such a process). In addition, the proposal includes a s.219 commitment to ensure two of the 11 (18%) units will be below market rentals. Unlike projects I am involved with as a board member of Pacifica, all of this is being proposed entirely with private funding and without any tax-payer dollars.

Should this proposal not proceed after seven years of concerted effort, the applicant will revert to constructing a high-end urban duplex as permitted by the current zoning. Such a proposal will not be subject to any development or design oversight as it will only require a building permit. With a walk-out basement, such a proposal will retain approximately 70% of the density of the current multi-family proposal, provide for the same setbacks, and reduce the height of the proposal by 1.5 stories. It will offer none of the positive benefits that come with the current proposal relating to affordability and workforce housing. The applicant has also committed to provide over \$70,000 in amenity contributions to the City of Victoria in conjunction with this proposal.

The decision that you now face is whether to approve this project with its substantial social benefits in creating 11 new, purpose-built, workforce rental units in the urban core. The alternative to not proceeding with this project will be a beautiful and high-end urban duplex which would provide housing for two affluent/professional families in the urban core.

Should you have any further questions or wish to discuss this proposal further, **please do not hesitate** to call (██████████) or email me. I look forward to receiving your support on this proposal.

Thank you,

Raj

--

Kind regards,

Rajinder Sahota

[www.methodbuilt.ca](http://www.methodbuilt.ca)

--

N.B.: This message may have been dictated to Siri. Please excuse any typographical and other errors.

Important: This communication is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may be privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments.

--

December 11, 2019

Mayor and Council,

We are writing in response the public hearing notification we received on December 4, 2019 regarding 953 Balmoral Road: Rezoning Application No. 00598 and Development Permit with Variances Application No. 000506.

We are writing to express our support for this proposed development. We agree with the information provided by the developer, that “new, affordable housing, particularly an apartment building geared towards non-professional renters is precisely what this neighbourhood requires.” In addition, as noted, the site accommodates other transportation demand management measures which we believe are sufficient to address the parking variance included in this application.

Within the developer’s letter to Council we have also learned that neighboring property owners to the east and west of the development site are supportive of the application. We, as neighbors (one lot) to the south of the site are also generally supportive of this application. However, we seek clarity related to the reduced property setbacks in relation to appropriate landscape measures to the south.

The site’s landscape plan includes greenery and vegetation along three sides (north, east, and west), however there is no provision for a privacy barrier, or details beyond “privacy fence” as shown on Landscape Plan 1 for the south lot line. We understand this lack of setback is necessary to accommodate the development as proposed. However, the current site plan will result in vehicles parked immediately adjacent to a residential backyard. We understand this is a necessary characteristic in order to accommodate this site plan but would like but seek assurance that this ‘privacy fence’ will provide substantial privacy measures, be appropriate to a residential setting, help alleviate exhaust or noise associated with parking vehicles, or at the more extreme end, the risk of an incident that could result in a vehicle coming through a typical wooden or chain-link fence. Our backyard is often occupied with young children playing and this is of critical importance to us. We would also like to note that the lot to the west of the proposed site is also a surface parking lot, with an approximately 1m grade separated buffer between properties to the south.

We seek assurance that this fence or barrier will be constructed by the developer early in the construction phasing and to the highest quality to minimize disruption during this phase, and to mitigate privacy and safety concerns. We are happy to work with the developer to identify appropriate fencing/barriers for this project but would like assurance that the appropriate privacy and safety measures will be put in place.

Thank you for your time and consideration, North Park is a wonderful neighborhood and we look forward to sharing it with more families in the coming years.

Sincerely,

Beth Hurford and Chris Heesterman

944 Mason Street  
Victoria BC, V8T 1A2

