

**Monica Dhawan**

---

**From:** Patricia Manly <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 16, 2019 9:43 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 1224 Richardson proposed development

Dear Mayor and Council:

I regret that I will be out of town on Wednesday, June 19 and will thus be unable to attend the community information meeting regarding this development proposal.

I have been informed by neighbours who live closer to Richardson that the proposal is to develop the lot from its current duplex to a 24 strata units with 10 parking stalls.

Personally, I support increasing density in Victoria in order to mitigate our housing shortage, provided that this can be done wisely. I do not object to increasing the density at 1224 Richardson to provide additional housing in the neighbourhood. In particular, I support efforts to make our neighbourhood more affordable for families with young children.

I do have some concerns:

- The scale of this development seems excessive. I would be much more agreeable to a proposal half this size.
- The site is close to the intersection of Harbinger and Richardson. The potential of additional traffic along Harbinger is a concern that could affect our quality of life and property values. Traffic calming strategies may be helpful and should be considered.
- The lane that runs between Richardson and Rockland to the west of the property is actually a family friendly resource that needs to be protected, in my view. The lane currently has next to no traffic, which makes it an ideal place for children to learn to ride bicycles, skateboards, etc. without danger. Although I do not have children myself, I would hate to see the loss of a bike friendly space that is currently suitable for young children to develop their skills.
- Preserving and enhancing Victoria's green space should always be a priority, and I would hope that this has been taken into consideration in this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns. I am hopeful that development can proceed on this site at a scale that will add to Victoria's housing supply while preserving Fairfield and Rockland's quiet, leafy atmosphere.

Sincerely,

Patricia Manly, Ph.D.  
608 Harbinger Avenue  
Victoria, BC V8V 4J1

## Heather McIntyre

---

**From:** Raphael Beck [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 17, 2019 4:25 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: Development at 1224 Richardson

As we are unable to attend the June 19 meeting, we would like to voice our concerns regarding the proposed development on Richardson:

1. The size of the development is out of proportion to the surrounding neighborhood. It will turn a quiet residential area into a busy urban environment.
2. Privacy of residents west of the lane could be compromised as tenants from the development seek to shortcut through to Linden avenue.
3. Parking: it is unrealistic to assume that 24 “families” will own 10 cars. More likely, most of them will. That means that they will seek parking in adjacent streets, resulting in residents of these streets having trouble finding a parking place.
4. Lane traffic: our big concern is that the narrow private lane will be transformed into a high-traffic area. This will compromise the safety of young children living along the lane, as well as pedestrians and bikers who often use the lane now.
5. Is paying \$850 per square foot considered “affordable housing”?

The development should be scaled down to fit the neighbourhood.

Raphael and Dahlia Beck  
3-727 Linden Ave

630 Linden Ave.,  
Victoria, B.C.  
V8V 4G5.

June 20, 2019.

Mayor and Council  
Victoria, B.C.

re: Proposed Development  
1224 Richardson (Jim Stemp)

I am not opposed to development. I have a place to live and only feel that it is right if other people also have a place.

The issue is Parking. There is no parking on the north side of Richardson. Ten spots on the property is severely inadequate for 24 units, even if there was only 1 occupant per unit. If they all ride bicycles, they'll need groceries delivered and there needs to be space for taxis and visitors.

The number of service people that are on our street daily is amazing. Neighbours have groceries and water delivered. There are couriers several days a week. Plenty of lawn-care people. Neighbours are vigilant in maintaining their homes and yard as a result, there are painters, electricians, plumbers, carpenters, bricklayers, arborists. Myself, I had the help of a caregiver for  $4\frac{1}{2}$  years. Also, I have family who visit from out of town. I always request them as much as possible to park in front of our lot. I know they grandfathered some of the older homes that have been converted into suites not requiring as much on-site parking as was necessary but with new construction, I think the problem of parking should be addressed before it is built.

Thank you,

Sandra Greenwood



## Lucas De Amaral

---

**From:** Melanie and Morgan Finley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 5, 2019 5:41 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Proposed Development 1224 Richardson Street

Hi,

We are opposed to the proposed development at 1224 Richardson Street changing from single family to 24 strata units.

We live within close proximity to 1224 Richardson Street and have received a notice about the proposed development to change the zoning from R1-B (single family house) to 24 strata units. This does not align with other neighbourhood developments to date. It changes the family residential feel of our neighbourhood. It does not meet proposed or active community development plans. We also have grave concerns about lack of parking that will be provided and the increased traffic on a laneway that is on an elementary school walking route.

While we appreciate the desire to densify our residential neighbourhoods this proposal is not suitable for our area. Please consider changing this high density proposal to one that suits the neighbourhood. Other lots close by have been subdivided into single family houses or large 2 story houses on large lots have been strata converted into 3 or 4 units.

Thank you,

## Heather McIntyre

---

**From:** Development Services email inquiries  
**Sent:** September 6, 2019 11:03 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** FW: 1224/1226 Richardson St- Proposed redevelopment

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

Subject: 1224/1226 Richardson St- Proposed redevelopment  
Date: 2019-09-05 19:32  
From: ANGELE MUNRO [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

To Whom it may concern,

I live at 3-602 Trutch St and am in favour of the proposed site specific development of this property with the following suggestions.

I drive along Richardson St 6 days a week past that location on my way to Oak Bay Recreation. It is a very busy street even early in the morning ( usually 6:45 am). It is a bicycle route and there are lots of vehicles parked along the street as well as vehicular traffic.

To address these concern, I would suggest that the Developer provide enough on-site parking for residents and visitors also bicycle storage.

This location would be great for residents who wish to cycle or walk to work Downtown which would benefit the traffic and parking in the city.

Also, it should be considered that this building has no Heritage value.

A new building would provide a safe and healthy environment for its residents and be an asset to Fairfield. Some older buildings in the area have been a safety issue. There have been fires in the neighbourhood in the last couple of years as well as lead and asbestos issues.

I appreciate having the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Thank you

--  
ANGELE MUNRO,BA  
Realtor  
Pemberton Holmes Ltd  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

...Tell ANGELE

## Heather McIntyre

---

**From:** Loretta Blasco [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 18, 2019 10:07 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Proposed development of 1224 Richardson

Good morning,

I wasn't able to attend last night's meeting, but I thought it was important to share with you what I see as going in the wrong direction with development. What I mean by that is, for example, 1201 Fort Street and the Black and White developments that are currently being constructed.

What Victoria DOES NOT NEED are more condo developments in our neighbourhoods.

What Victoria DOES NEED is affordable rental/co-op housing stock. And by affordable, I don't mean subsidized units, nor do I mean, 300 sq. ft. units for \$1400 per month. We need housing where people can get on with their lives and build community. I do understand that all levels of government need to be involved, but it's time to say no to over development in our neighbourhoods. It's time to think differently about housing, other than condo units, and the time is now to make it happen.

Please pay attention to the set backs on these developments that are coming to you for approval. There is no need, except greed, to have buildings encroaching on sidewalks, and neighbours. As well, greed drives the need to increase the height of these buildings. A two story building on Richardson fits in better with the neighbourhood, not 3 stories. And for goodness sake, if you going to allow this development, please make sure the city receives some amenities for the privilege of building in a neighbourhood, for example, money for better roads, or maybe green space. Stop giving our valuable land away for nothing, for free.

I hope you, the Mayor, and city council will carefully consider the legacy you are trying to leave for Victorians living and working here. I'm sure, you would rather have a legacy with a different headline, Instead of the headline saying that Victoria is one of the worst places in Canada to be a renter now. Wouldn't it be exciting to change that statement around to something more community based, affordable and inclusive?

Please think carefully as you consider the proposed development of 1224 Richardson.

Thank you.

Loretta Blasco  
301-1025 Linden Avenue  
Victoria BC

Sent from my iPad



## CALUC COMMUNITY MEETING FEEDBACK FORM

This form was developed by the RNA Land Use Committee to help consolidate neighbor's feedback to Rezoning Proposals. It is not meant to be a complete compilation of all issues. When a development proposal requires rezoning the applicant is advised to have consulted with the immediate neighbors at a community meeting so that their concerns can be considered. Please read this form carefully, checking the statements with which you are in agreement and signing to indicate you have been informed about this development proposal. You are encouraged to provide comments: however, your ultimate position need not be declared until the Public Hearing before City Council.

I have had an opportunity to review the required plans and proposal for 1224/26 Richardson.

Both the existing zoning and the requested proposed rezoning criteria have been explained.

I have been informed of the proposed number of dwellings.

The plans I have seen include the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans, elevations with clearly indicated heights, setbacks and site coverage, photos or illustrations (to scale) of buildings in relation to flanking buildings.

Proposals for blasting or tree removal have been explained.  
OR

I have been informed there will be no blasting or tree removal.

*planting new trees, great news.*

The proposed landscaping for our common property line is acceptable to me.

The proponent's explanation adequately addressed my questions and concerns about the proposal.

I understand that the plans I have seen may change considerably and that it would be in my best interest to follow the process going forward.

*not the "ASH"*

*Component which is a distraction*

Please check one of the following to indicate your support of, further consideration, or objection to this development as it has been proposed.

I support the concept as proposed.

I do not have an opinion at this time.

I am opposed to this development as it has been proposed.

Signature(s):

*Annette Ruitenbeek* Date: *Sept 18, 2019*

Address:

*# 3, 1200, Richardson Street "ASH"*

Comment:

*The "affordable sustainable housing" concept is a red herring. The developers explained their plan in more detail at this second meeting. I now understand that ASH is not*

*(over)*

Thank you for this. It is your neighborhood. Please do not hesitate to contact the proponent, the Rockland Planner, the Rockland Council Liaison or [landuse@rockland.bc.ca](mailto:landuse@rockland.bc.ca) if you have questions or concerns.



an official program but ~~not~~ rather, Gene Miller's invention. Once the original buyers sell, there will be no further "affordable" elements that are enforceable.

Yet the neighbourhood will still have a significantly over-populated, under-served lot.

- 24 units is ~~too~~ too many
- inadequate parking by any measure
- bus service in the area is minimal & projected to remain low tho somewhat improved

- densely populated houses in rear of property → how will they be served by service vehicles, movers, emergency vehicles etc? via the alley? It's a private alley. Via the parking lot? It will probably be full because it is too small for the number of units proposed.

My new understanding from this <sup>meeting</sup> second is that ASH ("affordable sustainable housing") is a red herring.

This is simply a development proposal, with too many units for the level of services available. Parking is a real issue. It is unfair to expect the culture to change from car-culture to other, simply because there isn't parking available.



## Heather McIntyre

---

**From:** PW [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** October 14, 2019 10:40 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** Development Services email inquiries  
**Subject:** 1224 Richardson development.

Hello

Hope you all had a wonderful weekend.

Concerns over the 24 unit proposed development at 1224 Richardson. Developer is using affordable housing to propose rezoning reduced set backs over height and to many units on a lot that in the past had one house with access only and required off Richardson.

We have had two resident meetings the residents concerns are not a development, just the kind of development. We would appreciate your attention to our concerns. The lane adjacent to the development (Richardson to Rockland) is owned by the residents on Linden we allow the public to use the back lane..it's nice to share a quiet walk on the lane. We have a problem regarding the lane. The development is proposing they use the lane (small portion off Richardson owned by city) to access the development off the lane. This is nothing but trouble. It is a lane not a road, it is narrow and does not meet code and will create unsafe traffic problems, all traffic from the development will use the private lane. There is a proposal for a curb to direct vehicle traffic into the development. The lane needs to be left alone. The driveway clearly needs to be separate and off Richardson. The lane should not be used as an allowance for variance to the proposed development. The owners of the lane pay taxes every year on the lane and at this point would like to keep the lane open for the public. The owners of the lane have not been offered compensation from the developer or the city might consider the purchase or reducing the property tax bill. The planning department needs to keep this in mind. Time and money should not be spent on re-engineering the lane.

The Development for that site is wrong it is our opinion the site zoning must be attached to the building plans. Plans of 6-8 family units. Reasons ..the condo market is flooding and prices reasonable we need the next step up for family homes. This area is suitable.

Parking is a big issue with this development.

The developer seems to have heart please encourage them to build family units, less density with no use or allowances with the "Lane"

Regards,  
Peter Willis  
Victoria

Sent from cell

## Heather McIntyre

---

**From:** ron [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** February 14, 2020 12:58 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** 1224 Richardson development

Good day,

As we live at 1232 Richardson, next door to this proposed development, we would like to raise our concerns.

This has already been turned down by the Advisory Design Group. This proposal will now be presented to you without addressing any of the concerns. That is, over height, over dense, minimal parking.

We would have no problem with half that many units in smaller buildings but as it stands now we will be subject to a wall of three story windows the full length of our property. There is no solution presented for the protected tree on the 1232 lot which over stands the proposed building "C". Both 1224 and 1232 lots are only 55 feet wide so this development on 1224 would totally devalue any resale options for 1232 as the present code calls for a 60 foot lot for a panhandle development.

Regards,

Maureen and Ron Pugh

1232 Richardson Street

## Lucas De Amaral

---

**From:** Tamsin McIntosh [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** March 5, 2020 12:17 PM  
**To:** Lisa Helps (Mayor)  
**Subject:** 1224 Richardson

>  
> To Mayor Lisa Helps and Council  
>  
> I have several concerns about the proposed development at 1224 Richardson Avenue.

> The developers are not working with the neighbors, and are going ahead after being turned down by your Advisory Design Group. It seems that by calling the development "affordable", they believe this development will pass council, even though this is a huge jump in density for profit. I am totally supportive of affordable housing, but this proposed development does not meet the community's needs. We are just a few blocks from an elementary school and a Community Centre. We have more affordable small units already on the market. We really need some family housing.

>  
>  
> This is essentially a panhandle development, with the two back buildings having no street access. I am told by City planners that it is not a panhandle because it is not wide enough to qualify. With a lane way house, or panhandle lot there are extra restrictions, designed to protect neighbors from a big building looking into and shading our back yards. This development dwarfs my neighbors properties to the East. The developers drawings are shown from an angle that makes them appear to fit in. Please hold them to the set backs and height restrictions in R1A, as other properties that actually have street access are held to this zoning.

> The back two buildings have no street access and the building at the back has no vehicle access for fire, ambulance or deliveries.

> The lane at the back is a PRIVATE DRIVE owned by the houses to the south. I own 721 Linden, and I own the lane at the back of my property.

> 1224 Richardson has always had it's own driveway, but that is not in the new plans. My neighbours have never minded the foot and bicycle traffic,

> but are tired of getting blocked, and have voted to put up PRIVATE LANE and NO PARKING signs. The lane is not wide enough for cars to pass, and this development creates a number of dangerous situations such as having to back out onto Richardson, driving onto a pedestrian sidewalk and limited visibility at both ends. It will be even more dangerous for the proposed bike lane. Closing the lane to through traffic would solve some of the problems, but would also create some.

> I invite you to come out, and will happily walk the lane and show you our concerns. Please give me a call or email with the time you would like to come, and I will do my best to meet you or have a neighbor meet you.

>  
> Tamsin McIntosh  
> 721 Linden Ave  
> Victoria B.C. V8V4G8  
> [REDACTED]