

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Bill Stroll [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 1:54 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; [REDACTED]
Cc: Strata 303; Gillian Lawson; Christine Morissette; Chantal Brodeur; Carolina Ashe; Vanessa Dingley; Caspar Davis; Jo Anna Hope; Miranda Worthy; Sandy Jones; Alan Morton; Ken Bailey; megan berman; Bill; Steve Williams; DaveMcWalter@gmail.com; Jessica Sluymer; Jan Klizs; Bob June; Paul Lecavalier; Russ Scruggs
Subject: Proposed development at 1475 Fort Street Follow Up

Dear Mayor and city councillors

I wrote to you February 13 regarding my concerns of the proposed Lantern Properties development at 1475 Fort Street. In that email I noted a lack of information and consultation, and questionable variances the developer had proposed. Although a meeting did take place between Strata 303 owners, the Rockland Neighbourhood Association and Lantern Properties these matters still remain troublesome.

Despite zoning bylaws, the new structure would occupy almost 50% of the site, up from the current 30% and that the setback, with the height addition of another storey would only be a couple of feet from our property line. Furthermore, there will be a loss of affordable housing as all units will be available only at market value. I request council insist on public consultation before this redevelopment moves forward.

Bill Stroll
3 - 949 Pemberton Road

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Sandra Jones [REDACTED] >
Sent: May 20, 2020 7:13 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); bisett@victoria.ca; Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: Strata 303
Subject: Proposed Development at 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a homeowner at 949 Pemberton Road in a complex that runs adjacent to the 1475 Fort Street proposed development by Lantern Properties.

I appreciate the need for and focus on more rental units. However, this should not be at the expense of and disadvantage to homeowners in surrounding properties. In line with that these are the points to be addressed:

- The proposed development, which is considerably larger than the existing building, would result in a significant loss of privacy to units bordering this development due to the increased height and close proximity to the property line. There would only be 12 feet between our border and their four storey building. There has been lack of consultation, lack of transparency, and lack of concern for the impact and consequences of the proposed design affecting the adjacent community.

A more thorough process in examining the facts, and more rigorous public consultation and review for these consequences to homeowners is needed.

- Regard for our neighbourhood with its mature bylaw protected trees and their unquestionable ecological footprint is needed. Some of the trees are over 60 feet in height. The proposed building plan would destroy these trees and only allow for very small trees to be planted as the area allotted is much smaller and would never allow for large tree regrowth.

- The use of the variance process by this developer needs to be questioned. Variances this extreme demand a very different process. It is my understanding that a variance is there to deal with existing acceptable community development without major changes to that. A re-zoning application would have been more appropriate to a building design with such variances.

I want to be reassured that Mayor and Council is committed to upholding the integrity of this neighbourhood. We need you to work with us. We need to work together to maintain the beauty of this neighbourhood and living conditions including privacy of its residents.

I hope the deeply held values for communication, community engagement and consideration, environmental preservation, and working together are upheld and developed when considering this proposal.

Sandra Jones
#6 -949 Pemberton Road

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: May 21, 2020 1:03 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston
Cc: 'Strata 303'; 'Gillian Lawson'; cmorissette@telus.net; 'brodeurc'; 'Carolina Ashe'; 'Vanessa Dingley'; 'Lorena and Caspar'; 'Jo Anna Hope'; 'Miranda Worthy'; 'Sandy Jones'; 'Alan Morton'; 'Ken Bailey'; 'megan bermand'; 'Bill McKechnie'; stevewilliams89@hotmail.com; 'Dave McWalter'; 'Jessica Sluymer'; 'Jan Klizs'; 'Bob June'; 'Paul Lecavalier'; 'Russ Scruggs'; inquiries@lanprop.com; [REDACTED]
Subject: Variance request 1475 Fort St

Dear Mayor and Council

- I live adjacent to the north property line of the proposed development at 1475 Fort St. I only became aware of the proposal recently while talking to my neighboring strata owners.
- The existing 3 story building (which is to be replaced) has a rear yard setback of approximately 50ft. The proposal in question calls for a four story building with a setback of only 12ft. to our property line.
- No amount of hedging or visual barrier will prevent the 3rd or 4th story occupants of the new building from looking directly into our backyard/windows, nor will it reduce the inevitable noise from the apartments particularly during the summer months when windows and balcony doors are open
- In my opinion this project is a huge overreach for the size of the lot and involves clearcutting the whole project site. It makes sense that the development be commensurate with the size of this panhandle lot.

I appeal to Council to take the appropriate steps when reviewing this project to ensuring the project is aligned with current zoning, with perhaps minor changes, instead of the major variances being requested

Thank you,

B. McKechnie

949 Pemberton Rd.
[REDACTED]

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Alan Morton [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 11:18 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: Strata 303; Gillian Lawson; Christine Morissette; Chantal Brodeur; Carolina Ashe; Vanessa Dingley; Caspar Davis; Bill Stroll; Jo Anna Hope; Miranda Worthy; Sandy Jones; Alan Morton; Ken Bailey; megan bermand; Bill; Steve Williams; DaveMcWalter@gmail.com; Jessica Sluymmer; Jan Klizs; Bob June; Paul Lecavalier; Russ Scruggs
Subject: 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council:

As one of the residents of 949 Pemberton Road I have some concerns with the proposed redevelopment at 1475 Fort Street, which is adjacent to my townhome complex.

While the lack of consultation has been frustrating, I find the misrepresentation and lack of transparency regarding ultimate goals to be very concerning. There seems to be a steady shift of goal posts in what is being asked for.

From the time of the BC Land Surveyors site plan and Arborists' report the proposal has gone from:

- 12.9m to 14.39m in height
- 28 market rentals and 4 affordable units to all 32 market rental
- 26 resident parking underground and 3 grade level to all underground in order to ask for a front setback variance of just under 2m as opposed to 10m

The initial letter to council from the developer in June 12, 2019 stated that 1475 Fort is significantly lower than 949 Pemberton and that they are providing a "sensitive transition" between the R1 and R3 zoning. There is a grade difference but it is only 6 feet. Therefore, the proposal for a building face that is 13 feet from and 41 feet above the adjoining property line would seem to be in opposition to the concept of a transition as outlined in the Design Guidelines-Multiuse Residential Commercial Industrial, 1.6.1 and 1.6.2.

I feel that the lack of transparency, unwillingness to work with the community to address concerns, and the desire to push through massive variances despite zoning bylaws and Design Guidelines will cloud future interactions with this developer and architect.

Alan Morton
7-949 Pemberton Road

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Russ Scruggs [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 3:24 PM
To: Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Lisa Helps (Mayor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); cthorton-joe@victoria.ca; Alec Johnston
Cc: inquiries@lanprop.com
Subject: Redevelopment of 1475 Fort Street

To the Mayor and Victoria city Councillors,

We are residents of 1019 Pemberton Road strata.

It was recently brought to our attention by our neighbours to the south; 949 Pemberton Road that Lantern Properties of Vancouver has put forward a proposal to demolish the building; 1475 Fort Street and build a new rental property. As owners of one of the 9 Units of Strata VIS 740 we have concerns with the proposed new development as the proposed new structure will be a significant expansion of both footprint and height of the building.

- R3-AM2 maximum site coverage for the main building is 30%; the proposed building would cover 46.9%.
- R3-AM2 maximum height is 12 meters (39.5 ft); the proposed building would be 14.39 meter (47 ft) high;
- R3-AM2 setback is one half of the building height, i.e. 7.2 meters (23'7"); the proposed building would be 3.6 m (12 ft) from our property line.

As for the process itself; there has been a lack of transparency and sharing of information with the two stratas who will be grossly impacted.

Lantern Properties has claimed that notices were distributed to the two neighbouring stratas but the owners of the units of both stratas have all said this is not the case.

The current structure is indeed in need of replacement but this new building will be in short an overbuild relative to the site, neighbours, blue sky and it will displace the current residents living there; VIHA assisted individuals. The current council is looking for ways to "densify" the city with affordable rental units but this is not the way to achieve that means.

The new building footprint will result in the removal of a green belt of trees needed for reduction in sound and sight for neighbours; quality of daily life in the area.

We trust the city council and city planners will challenge this redevelopment as it currently stands relative to the proposal documents on the city site.

Regards,
Candace and Russ Scruggs

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Norman Spector [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2020 6:27 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor)
Cc: Alec Johnston; Peter Johanknecht; Lantern Properties
Subject: Re: 1475 Fort Street

Dear Madam Mayor and Council:

I am writing in regard to the above development proposal by Lantern Properties.

While walking my dog, I have been observing a similar development in the neighbourhood at 1201 Fort Street by Abstract Development for well-nigh two years.

In this case, there have been regular traffic stoppages as construction vehicles have entered and exited the site; indeed, the lane closest to the sidewalk seems to have been taken over on a semi-permanent basis by the developer.

In the case of the proposed Lantern Properties development, Fort Street is significantly narrower at the driveway where construction vehicles would be entering and exiting the site for an extended period of time. Consequently, stoppages and blockages are a much more problematic issue.

Since Fort Street is a major traffic artery for public transit, cyclists and private cars--including for Camosun and U Vic students--I would hope you'd give serious consideration to the transportation issue in assessing the developer's proposal

Yours faithfully

Norman Spector

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Caspar Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 12:58 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: 'Strata 303'; 'Gillian Lawson'; 'Christine Morissette'; 'Chantal Brodeur'; 'Carolina Ashe'; 'Vanessa Dingley'; 'Caspar Davis'; 'Bill Stroll'; 'Jo Anna Hope'; 'Miranda Worthy'; 'Sandy Jones'; 'Alan Morton'; 'Ken Bailey'; 'megan bermand'; Bill; 'Steve Williams'; DaveMcWalter@gmail.com; 'Jessica Sluymmer'; 'Jan Klizs'; 'Bob June'; 'Paul Lecavalier'; 'Russ Scruggs'
Subject: Proposed Development at 1475 Fort Street
Importance: High

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

I live in a townhouse complex at 949 Pemberton Road, directly south of Lantern Properties' proposed development at 1475 Fort Street. I understand that their application is going to come before the Committee of the Whole on May 28.

This development proposes to replace a run down social housing apartment building with a much larger and taller market rental building. This building would also come within 12 feet of our property line. It would represent a very significant expansion of both the footprint and height of the building, and flouts the zoning bylaw, requiring major variances whose nature would compound their impact:

R3-AM2 maximum site coverage for the main building is 30%; the proposed building would cover 46.9%.
R3-AM2 maximum height is 12 meters (39.5 ft); the proposed building would be 14.39 meter (47 ft) high;
R3-AM2 setback is one half of the building height, i.e. 7.2 meters (23'7"); the proposed building would be 3.6 m (12 ft) from our property line.

The inappropriateness of the requested variances is compounded by the fact that the property line between us and them is a zoning border and the City's Guidelines call for "respect of character of established areas, of design transition and respect of privacy". The proposed building would have a sky-blotting wall with windows looking directly into bedrooms in our complex from as little as 30 feet away.

We would welcome an appropriate redevelopment at 1475 Fort but what is proposed would have a severe impact on our privacy and would severely limit the light for several of our units. It also does away with social housing in favour of more market housing, and it calls for the demolition of several mature trees which significantly enhance our daily enjoyment of life, in addition to providing valuable habitat for the birds and other wildlife of our neighbourhood.

Moreover, the developer, has acted very badly. They claim to have distributed a notice to all of our units as well as to those next door at 1019 Pemberton Road, but none of us ever received such a notice. We learned about the proposed development only when it came up in a conversation between one of our owners and Pam Madoff. After we approached Lantern, they finally deigned to give us a meeting with the architects, who responded to our concerns by saying that many Europeans are used to living much closer together. They didn't mention the fact that most European towns grew organically over centuries, or that for much of that time raw sewage frequently flowed in the gutters.

Lantern's conduct stands in stark contrast to that of our neighbours to the southeast, who are also proposing redevelopment. Those neighbours got in touch with us early in the process, before completing the design, and hosted a Zoom meeting in which they sought our input as they showed us how they had created the plan with consideration to

our sight lines and had reduced the height as their proposed building approaches our border.

Lantern's proposed design egregiously flaunts the zoning requirements, and they have not even pretended to take our very legitimate concerns seriously. Their design should not be approved

Caspar Davis and Lorena Mowers
#16 - 949 Pemberton Road



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Jo Anna Hope <[REDACTED]>
Sent: May 21, 2020 8:01 AM
To: Alec Johnston; Ben Isitt (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); inquiries@lanprop.com; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Lisa Helps (Mayor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor)
Subject: Fwd: 1475 Fort Street Development Permit Application

Dear Mayor and Council,

I reside at #15-[949 Pemberton Road](#), a complex immediately south of the site at [1475 Fort Street](#), where a Development Permit Application has been submitted to the City. I recognize that the existing building on that site needs replacement so do not oppose redevelopment. I appreciate the fact that Lantern Properties quite recently greatly improved the adjacent property at [1471 Fort Street](#) with landscaping, etc., thereby enhancing the neighbourhood.

However, I do have several serious concerns about this proposal:

1. Loss of low-income rental housing:

While recognizing the great need in general for rental housing in Victoria, and for higher densities along transportation corridors, I am concerned that low-income rental is going to be lost. If this cannot be replaced by new low-income rentals, it should at least be focused on the needs of moderate-income tenants – I understand that some of the excessive variances requested (see below) are related to marketing to higher-income renters.

2. Procedural Issues/Lack of Consultation:

- Previous correspondence from residents of 949 Pemberton has addressed the serious problem of the lack of consultation with us so I will not reiterate all of these concerns, but I do find particularly egregious the fact that both the Advisory Design Panel and the Rockland Neighbourhood Association were told that there had been consultation with neighbours when in fact this was only with a very select few neighbours on St. Charles Street, while those of us at 949 Pemberton were completely unaware of the development proposals, and it was pure coincidence that we found out about it through Pam Madoff, a member of the ADP, in January! Since we, and those at 1019 Frewing Lane, are the most directly impacted – this is completely unacceptable and the process needs to be reviewed and improved.

3. Request for Excessive Variances and Need for Buffer Zone Between Properties:

The overall look of the proposed building, quality, use of materials, etc., seems pleasant enough, but it needs to be substantially scaled back with regard to site coverage, building height and setbacks because the variances requested give it too large a footprint for the site and would allow it to seriously impinge on us as neighbours. *The whole point of having established requirements for setbacks is surely to protect neighbours from such impingement, and the reasons for height limits are similarly to protect neighbours.* While a small modification in these requirements to accommodate a particular need might be acceptable (as was the height variance requested and approved for 1016 Pemberton Road a few years ago), the *scale* of the variances requested in this case makes a mockery of the setback regulations! Why have regulations if they are going to be so wantonly over-ridden? If approved, they would be completely over-riding the neighbours' quality of life for the sole benefit of the developer, and this is most unjust. Apparently, the height variance is being requested to accommodate high ceilings for the higher-end market – really not acceptable if it negatively affects the neighbours.

We do not agree with the architects' claim that this building would provide a sensitive transition between the larger buildings on Fort Street and the residential area to the south because the massing of the building is simply too great on the south side, especially if it were to be so close to the boundary—12 feet, I understand. Perhaps stepped-back levels of the proposed building might make it more acceptable to those in the two-storey townhouses so close by? That would provide a much better transition. The current proposal creates serious privacy issues for neighbours in the existing dwellings and would most likely have a negative affect their property values.

The current proposal would also make necessary the removal of several existing mature trees which create a much-needed buffer zone between the two properties and provide habitat for many species of bird and other small beings. I am concerned about the unnecessary loss of existing trees. I also feel very strongly that if there is to be infill which increases density in a historic neighbourhood such as this, there must be compensating buffer zones – this seems to be a fundamental component of good urban design. A properly landscaped buffer zone would benefit the residents of the proposed building as well as the residents of 949 Pemberton and 1019 Frewing Lane.

CONCLUSION:

I request that the Committee of the Whole give this proposal serious and careful scrutiny, bearing in mind:

- The lack of consultation with us at an appropriate time in the planning and design process;
- The truly excessive variances being requested which, if approved, would negatively impact the neighbours at 949 Pemberton Road.

I hope that you will request that the proposal be re-submitted with a revised design at a reduced and more appropriate scale, without excessive variances, and providing landscaping as an effective buffer zone between our properties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jo Anna Hope
15-949 Pemberton Road

--

PLEASE NOTE, my new email address: [REDACTED]



LANTERN
— PROPERTIES LTD —



1176 Burnaby Street, Vancouver BC, V6E1P1

 lanprop.com

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Barbara Bolli <[REDACTED]>
Sent: May 19, 2020 12:16 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: 'Strata 303'; 'Gillian Lawson'; 'Christine Morissette'; 'Chantal Brodeur'; 'Carolina Ashe'; 'Vanessa Dingley'; 'Caspar Davis'; 'Bill Stroll'; 'Jo Anna Hope'; 'Miranda Worthy'; 'Sandy Jones'; 'Alan Morton'; 'Ken Bailey'; 'megan bermand'; Bill; 'Steve Williams'; DaveMcWalter@gmail.com; 'Jessica Sluymmer'; 'Jan Klizs'; 'Bob June'; 'Paul Lecavalier'; 'Russ Scruggs'
Subject: 1475 Fort Street: Proposed Development
Attachments: 1474 Fort Street DPV 00120.pdf; Fwd: Record of March 5 Meeting between Lantern/Cascadia and Strata 303; Fwd: 1475 Update
Importance: High

Dear Mayor and Council,

- In June 2019, Lantern Properties submitted a development application to the City of Victoria to replace an existing apartment building with construction of a 32 unit rental apartment building at 1475 Fort.
- None of the property owners at the 16 unit strata at 949 Pemberton and the adjacent 6 unit strata at 1019 Pemberton whose properties front on to the 1475 Fort St property - and are most directly impacted by this development – were not consulted/made aware of this project. Properties owners only became aware of the development when Pam Madoff contacted one of the strata property owners in February 2020.
- As part of the development process, Lantern Properties consulted with the Rockland Neighbourhood Association (RNA) and the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) in January 2020 about the proposal. Neither at the time expressed concerns or opposition to the project.
- After becoming aware of the project, the strata contacted the RNA regarding its review of the project. The RNA subsequently undertook a more in-depth evaluation of the project including an on site visit. As you can see from the RNA's April 22, 2020 letter to Mayor and Council (attached), this more detailed assessment of the project has shown that this 'simple variance development application' belies a project that has far more impacts to property owners than what was initially understood. [the scope of the variances and related impacts are so substantive that this application should have received the same review process as a rezoning proposal which would have resulted in greater transparency for all involved]
- At the January 22, 2020 APD meeting, the developer informed the panel that adjacent property owners were "positive" about the project (ADP January 22, 2020 minutes) when in fact property owners most affected by the project knew nothing about the project at that time. As the ADP was deliberately misled by the developer and, given the findings of the RNA's reassessment of the proposal, strata property owners believe that the City has a moral obligation to redirect the ADP to go back and reevaluate this proposal.
<https://www.victoria.ca/assets/City~Hall/Committees/Other~Committees/Advisory~Design~Panel/Minutes/2020/ADP%20MINUTES%20-%20January%2022,%202020.pdf>
- The duplicitous behavior of the developer continues and is most concerning. Following the strata's initiation of contact with the developer in February 2020 and the strata's first information meeting on March 5, 2020 with the developer, Pam Madoff wrote in an email to a strata member that Lantern had contacted her to report that " the

meeting went well and that concerns were being addressed". This is patently untrue. Please see the attached email from the strata to Lantern dated April 25, 2020 which clearly lays out the strata's strong concerns with project. To date none of the strata's concerns have been addressed. Emails to the developer inquiring about modifications to the design go answered (see attached).

- Your immediate direction to the ADP to re-evaluate this proposal is requested. This would be the right thing to do.

Sincerely,
Barbara Bolli
9-949 Pemberton Rd

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Christine Morissette [REDACTED]
Sent: May 19, 2020 3:47 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: Strata 303; Gillian Lawson; Christine Morissette; Chantal Brodeur; Carolina Ashe; Vanessa Dingley; Caspar Davis; Bill Stroll; Jo Anna Hope; Miranda Worthy; Sandy Jones; Alan Morton; Ken Bailey; megan bermand; Bill; Steve Williams; [REDACTED]; Jessica Sluymmer; Jan Klizs; Bob June; Paul Lecavalier; Russ Scruggs
Subject: 1475 Fort Street development

Dear Mayor and Council:

We are homeowners who live adjacent to a proposed development at 1475 Fort Street. We are writing to express our concerns regarding three aspects of this development:

1. The request for significant variances on size and height of the new building The existing building on this property takes up 30% of the area, whereas the new building is slated to take up nearly 50%, as well as an additional story in height. This will place the new building within two meters of our strata's boundary fence, and along with one more story, will significantly reduce the privacy of our units that face the fence. The variances requested will also necessitate the removal of eleven mature trees, greatly reducing the urban canopy for which this neighbourhood is known.
2. The lack of consultation with adjacent property owners At no time were any of the 16 homeowners at 949 Pemberton Road ever informed about or consulted on this development by the developer. It is our understanding that this consultation is required by the City of Victoria. To add insult to injury, the developer continues to insist that we all were, in fact, consulted.
3. The loss of affordable housing, particularly for vulnerable citizens When this development was first proposed, it was implied there would be some affordable housing to meet the City's current needs. While we applaud the commitment to rentals, we now understand they will be available only at market value. Furthermore, the current building housed people with mental health conditions overseen by VIHA. So in the stroke of a pen, the new development will prevent low income and other vulnerable citizens from accessing housing at this location.

We trust that going forward, the considerations of adjacent property owners will play a role in the approval process for the development at 1475 Fort Street.

Christine Morissette and Chantal Brodeur
#13 - 949 Pemberton Road
Victoria BC

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Vanessa Dingley [REDACTED]
Sent: May 21, 2020 12:59 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: Strata 303; Gillian Lawson; cmorissette; brodeurc; Carolina Ashe; vdingley; Lorena and Caspar; [REDACTED] Miranda Worthy; Sandy Jones; [REDACTED] Ken Bailey; megan bermand; Bill McKechnie; Steve Williams; Dave McWalter; Jessica Sluymmer; Jan Klizs; Bob June; Paul Lecavalier; [REDACTED] Bill Stroll; Barbara Bolli
Subject: 1475 Fort Street Development Permit Application

We are resident owners of one of the 16 townhouses at 949 Pemberton Road, a complex immediately south of the site at 1475 Fort Street, where a Development Permit Application has been submitted to the City. We recognize that the existing building on that site needs replacement so we do not oppose redevelopment. We appreciate the fact that Lantern Properties quite recently greatly improved the adjacent property at 1471 Fort Street with landscaping, etc., thereby enhancing the neighbourhood.

However, we do have several serious concerns about this proposal:

1. Loss of low-income rental housing:

While recognizing the great need in general for rental housing in Victoria, and for higher densities along transportation corridors, we are concerned that low-income rental is going to be lost. If this cannot be replaced by new low-income rentals, it should at least be focused on the needs of moderate-income tenants – we understand that some of the excessive variances requested (see below) are related to marketing to higher-income renters.

2. Procedural Issues/Lack of Consultation:

- Previous correspondence from residents of 949 Pemberton has addressed the serious problem of the lack of consultation with us so we will not reiterate all of these concerns. But we do find particularly egregious the fact that both the Advisory Design Panel and the Rockland Neighbourhood Association were both told that there had been consultation with neighbours when in fact this was only with a very select few neighbours on St. Charles Street, while those of us at 949 Pemberton were completely unaware of the development proposals, and it was pure coincidence that we found out about it through Pam Madoff, a member of the ADP, in January! Since we, and those at 1019 Frewing Lane, are the most directly impacted – this is completely unacceptable and the process needs to be reviewed and improved.

3

• 3. Request for Excessive Variances and Need for Buffer Zone Between Properties:

The overall look of the proposed building, quality, use of materials, etc., seems pleasant enough, but it needs to be substantially scaled back with regard to site coverage, building height and setbacks because the variances requested give it too large a footprint for the site and would allow it to seriously impinge on us as neighbours. *The whole point of having established requirements for setbacks is surely to protect neighbours from such impingement; and the reasons for height limits are similarly to protect neighbours.* While a small modification in these requirements to accommodate a particular need might be acceptable (as was the height variance requested and approved for 1016 Pemberton Road a few years ago), the *scale* of the variances requested in this case makes a mockery of the setback regulations! Why have regulations if they are going to be so wantonly over-ridden? If approved, they would be completely over-riding the neighbours' quality of life for the sole

benefit the developer, and this is most unjust. Apparently, the height variance is being requested to accommodate high ceilings for the higher-end market – really not acceptable if it negatively affects the neighbours.

We do not agree with the architects' claim that this building would provide a sensitive transition between the larger buildings on Fort Street and the residential area to the south because the massing of the building is simply too great on the south side, especially if it were to be so close to the boundary. Perhaps stepped-back levels of the proposed building might make it more acceptable to those in the two-storey townhouses so close by? That would provide a much better transition. The current proposal creates serious privacy issues for neighbours in the existing dwellings, and could negatively affect their property values.

The current proposal would also make necessary the removal of several existing mature trees which create a much-needed buffer zone between the two properties. We are concerned about the unnecessary loss of existing trees. We also feel very strongly that if there is to be infill which increases density in a historic neighbourhood such as this, there must be compensating buffer zones – this seems to be a fundamental component of good urban design. A properly landscaped buffer zone would benefit the residents of the proposed building as well as the residents of 949 Pemberton and 1019 Frewing Lane.

CONCLUSION:

We request that the Committee of the Whole give this proposal serious and careful scrutiny, bearing in mind:

- The lack of consultation with us at an appropriate time in the planning and design process;
 - The truly excessive variances being requested which, if approved, would negatively impact the neighbours at 949 Pemberton Road.
- We hope that you will request that the proposal be re-submitted with a revised design at a reduced and more appropriate scale, without excessive variances, and providing landscaping as an effective buffer zone between our properties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Vanessa and John Dingley
12-949 Pemberton Road

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Carolina Ashe [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 7:20 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston
Cc: Strata 303; Gillian Lawson; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; Carolina Ashe; Vanessa Dingley; Lorena and Caspar; Jo Anna Hope; Miranda Worthy; Sandy Jones; Alan Morton; Ken Bailey; Megan Bermand; Bill McKechnie; [REDACTED]; Dave McWalter; Jessica Sluymer; Jan Klizs; Bob June; Paul Lecavalier; Russ Scruggs; inquiries@lanprop.com
Subject: 1475 Fort Street building proposal

Dear Mayor and Council,

On February 25, 2020, I sent you a letter expressing initial concerns with a development proposal at 1475 Fort Street, which abuts 949 Pemberton Road, where I live. In my previous letter, I mentioned my concerns about lack of consultation and transparency on the part of the developer. In spite of a meeting with the developer (initiated by a resident of 949 Pemberton Road), along with a follow-up email, the developer continues to show no interest in addressing concerns brought forward by residents.

Following are additional concerns:

Design guidelines: 1981 vs 2019

- It is my understanding that the 1981 *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs, and Awnings* has been referenced in respect to the proposal for 1475 Fort Street.
- These antiquated guidelines are cursory, incomplete, and do not address what can be expected in a new build for 2020.
- The *Design Guidelines for: Residential, Commercial and Industrial, 2012/2019 (2012/2019 Design Guidelines)*, supersede the 1981 guidelines and provide much more comprehensive and current direction for transition between the two zones. Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.5 and 1.6., in particular, are applicable to this proposal.
- It is reasonable to expect that the *2012/2019 Design Guidelines* will be referenced in the review of this application.

Impact of variances on properties bordering 1475 Fort Street

- The current site plans show the view of the building from the perspective of passers-by on Fort Street.
- The view is very different for neighbours living on the other sides.
- Residents at 949 Pemberton Road will no longer see the sky and trees when they step outside their back doors. Instead, they will be confronted with a massive wall, 12 to 13 feet from the property line, and reaching more than 40 feet above them.
- With the removal of mature trees, the residents of both 949 and 1019 Pemberton Road will have no visual or sound buffer from this large block-shaped building that will virtually fill its entire lot.
- It is difficult to put into words the detrimental ecological impact of the removal of mature trees which stand at the border between 1475 Fort Street and other properties, not to mention the loss of visual and sound buffer that these trees provide.

Parking

- The proponent is requesting a variance which will reduce the number of required parking stalls from 45 (for residents and visitors) to 26. While bicycle parking stalls will be available, it cannot be assumed that all occupants of the building, as well as their visitors, will not own cars.
- There is already a dearth of on-street parking in the neighbourhood. One of the nearest possibilities, Pemberton Road, is already congested with parked cars on both sides.

Summary

I understand that there is a shortage of rental apartments in Victoria and am not opposed to a new rental building replacing the old one at 1475 Fort Street. However, this proposal presents a case of extreme overreach in an apparent attempt to squeeze as many profitable, market rental units as possible into a small parcel of land, regardless of cost to surrounding neighbours, and to the environment.

What I am asking for

- I am asking that you apply whole systems thinking in your review of this development. Please consider not only the economic goals of the developer, but also the social, environmental and economic impacts of this development on the entire neighbourhood.
- Please visit the building site. See for yourself what the impact of this proposed building will be if the requested variances and removal of trees are approved.
- Please talk to the residents who have spent many hours researching this situation and reaching out to you.

I am trusting that if you do these things, you will ask the proponent to redraw plans that:

- are in keeping with current zoning bylaws, with only minor variances, if any;
- are aligned with relevant sections of *2012/2019 Design Guidelines*; and
- address and incorporate the concerns of neighbours who have been, and continue to reach out to the City and to the proponent.

Thank you,

Carolina Ashe
Unit 7, 949 Pemberton Road

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Barbara Bolli <[REDACTED]>
Sent: May 21, 2020 2:16 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: 'Strata 303'; 'Gillian Lawson'; 'Christine Morissette'; 'Chantal Brodeur'; 'Carolina Ashe'; 'Vanessa Dingley'; 'Caspar Davis'; 'Bill Stroll'; 'Jo Anna Hope'; 'Miranda Worthy'; 'Sandy Jones'; 'Alan Morton'; 'Ken Bailey'; 'megan bermand'; Bill; 'Steve Williams'; [REDACTED]; 'Jessica Sluymmer'; 'Jan Klizs'; 'Bob June'; 'Paul Lecavalier'; 'Russ Scruggs'
Subject: 1475 Fort St: Proposed Development Application

Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of a strata on 949 Pemberton Rd which borders a proposed development at 1475 Fort St. Much correspondence, including my own letter of February 12, 2020, has been written to Mayor and Council expressing strong concerns with this proposed development, the conduct of the developer and the very inadequate process in which it is being reviewed. As such, I will not repeat these concerns here. I do, however, want to strongly recommend that in order to demonstrate that a fair and reasonable assessment of this proposed project is undertaken, the Committee of the Whole needs to ensure the following:

- That the project is in keeping with current zoning bylaws
- That it is aligned with relevant sections of *2012/2019 Design Guidelines* and NOT the dated *1981 Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs, and Awnings* which has been referenced in respect to the proposal for 1475 Fort Street
- That the Advisory Design Panel is directed to reassess the development plans given that the developer misled the ADP when it advised the panel that neighbours response to the project was “positive” when the strata complexes at 949 and 1019 Pemberton Rd had not been made aware of the project by the developer
- That a thorough analysis of the implications of the project with respect to parking is undertaken as there is limited parking available at the proposed apartment complex and a dearth of parking in the neighbourhood
- That the arborist’s impact assessment report is updated to reflect the scaled-up project design
- That there is clear demonstration of meaningful/tangible consideration of and response to concerns/input of neighbours
- That an onsite visit is conducted to understand the real on-the-ground impacts of this project
- That there is clear demonstration that the costs of this project through loss of privacy, increased noise, decreased property values, significant tree and habitat loss and adverse impacts to the general ambiance of the neighbourhood through the erection of an oversized building on too small a lot is NOT born by adjacent neighbors

Consider this as the committee’s due diligence check list as the proposal application is reviewed. I look forward to reviewing the Committee’s response to the application and its consideration of this check list. If followed, I am

confident that the Committee will support the construction of a building that complements the neighbourhood rather than erodes it.

Sincerely,
Barbara Bolli

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Strata 303 [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2020 12:27 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; Lantern Properties; Peter Johanknecht
Cc: Alan Morton; Barbara Bolli; Bill McKechnie; Bill Stroll; Carolina Ashe; Caspar Davis; Chantal Brodeur; Christine Morissette; Erik Solbakken; Gillian Lawson; Jan Klizs; Jay Nefsky; Jessica Sluymer; Jo Anna Hope; John and Vanessa Dingley; Miranda Worthy; Norman Spector; Sandy Jones; Steve Williams; Strata 303; Paul Lecavalier; [REDACTED]; Megan Bermand; Ken Bailey
Subject: 1475 Fort Street

This letter is a follow up to a letter sent February 10, 2020 by our then Strata Chair, Christine Morissette, expressing concerns about the above-mentioned development.

Our concerns remain the following:

- **LACK OF CONSULTATION**

From the beginning, there has been poorly conceived community consultation on the part of the developer and architects. We realize that a variance request does not oblige the developer to consult with surrounding neighbours, however in this case the developer/architects have repeatedly presented themselves as having sought feedback from the community. That is simply not the case. No one in our strata, or the strata next door at 1019 Pemberton Road received the letter purported to have been distributed for an open house on March 24, 2019. Subsequent requests to see a copy of that letter and a distribution list have been ignored. At the January 22, 2020 meeting of the ADP, in reply to a question from the panel asking about the feedback so far from neighbours, the developer completely misrepresented the situation by stating that the feedback had been very positive. In fact, no feedback had ever been solicited from us. After hearing of the proposed development from a third party, **we requested** a meeting with the developer/architect which was held on March 5, 2020.

- **EXCESSIVE VARIANCE REQUESTS**

The proposed plan asks for substantial variances on all four sides plus a height variance. We see this request as an overreach. Our understanding is that variance requests deal with minor changes but the proposed changes are anything but minor. The site coverage of the current building is 30% and the proposed plan calls for a 46.9% site coverage. The result is a massive rebuild with significant loss of privacy to strata homeowners to the south and an unfortunate loss of mature trees in the area. Although the architects acknowledged these facts during the March 5 meeting, their only response was a seeming willingness to add more shrubbery.

- **NON-COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES**

The current development plan does not comply with Section 1.6 of the City of Victoria Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial, July 2012 (updated December 2019) which require that privacy issues be addressed and that a stepped transition be employed between two zones when one is a multi-unit.

- **LOSS OF TREES**

Visitors to our city always remark on our magnificent trees. The City even has an Urban Forest Master Plan. We know as a society how important it is to maintain our tree canopy. This proposed development would lead to the loss of 11 mature trees with the consequent loss of habitat, visual beauty, and sound barrier. This is not in keeping with our city's image or the best interests of the neighbourhood.

We acknowledge the need for rental housing in Victoria. This development was originally billed as offering some low rental units but, along the way, that feature has been abandoned. The result is that the residents of the 11 current low rental units will be displaced to allow for 32 units to be rented out at market rates.

The developer in question did a fine job of renovating an adjacent building on the property and the plans for this building appear to include attractive materials. The existing building on this site is in poor shape and we have no objection to a new building being erected in its place. However, we feel that any new building should be one where only minor variances are required, not the major ones being sought in this project, and where the transitions between this building and its neighbours are as outlined in the current city guidelines.

We wish to extend an invitation to the Mayor and Councillors to visit our strata to see the proposed development from our vantage point.

Gillian Lawson
Chair, Strata 303
949 Pemberton Road

Pierre-Paul Angelblazer

From: Alec Johnston
Sent: May 26, 2020 8:53 AM
To: Pierre-Paul Angelblazer
Subject: FW: Proposed Development at 1475 Fort Street

Additional correspondence for 1475 Fort.

Thanks,
Alec

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

From: Sandra Jones <[REDACTED]>
Sent: May 20, 2020 7:13 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; bisett@victoria.ca; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthorne-ton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; inquiries@lanprop.com
Cc: Strata 303 <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Proposed Development at 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a homeowner at 949 Pemberton Road in a complex that runs adjacent to the 1475 Fort Street proposed development by Lantern Properties.

I appreciate the need for and focus on more rental units. However, this should not be at the expense of and disadvantage to homeowners in surrounding properties. In line with that these are the points to be addressed:

- The proposed development, which is considerably larger than the existing building, would result in a significant loss of privacy to units bordering this development due to the increased height and close proximity to the property line. There would only be 12 feet between our border and their four storey building. There has been lack of consultation, lack of transparency, and lack of concern for the impact and consequences of the proposed design affecting the adjacent community.

A more thorough process in examining the facts, and more rigorous public consultation and review for these consequences to homeowners is needed.

- Regard for our neighbourhood with its mature bylaw protected trees and their unquestionable ecological footprint is needed. Some of the trees are over 60 feet in height. The proposed building plan would destroy these trees and only allow for very small trees to be planted as the area allotted is much smaller and would never allow for large tree regrowth.

- The use of the variance process by this developer needs to be questioned. Variances this extreme demand a very different process. It is my understanding that a variance is there to deal with existing acceptable community development without major changes to that. A re-zoning application would have been more appropriate to a building design with such variances.

I want to be reassured that Mayor and Council is committed to upholding the integrity of this neighbourhood. We need you to work with us. We need to work together to maintain the beauty of this neighbourhood and living conditions including privacy of its residents.

I hope the deeply held values for communication, community engagement and consideration, environmental preservation, and working together are upheld and developed when considering this proposal.

Sandra Jones
#6 -949 Pemberton Road

Katie Lauriston

From: Alec Johnston
Sent: May 25, 2020 8:42 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Katie Lauriston
Subject: FW: Redevelopment of 1475 Fort Street

From: Russ Scruggs [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 3:24 PM
To: Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; cthorton-joe@victoria.ca; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>
Cc: inquiries@lanprop.com
Subject: Redevelopment of 1475 Fort Street

To the Mayor and Victoria city Councillors,

We are residents of 1019 Pemberton Road strata.

It was recently brought to our attention by our neighbours to the south; 949 Pemberton Road that Lantern Properties of Vancouver has put forward a proposal to demolish the building; 1475 Fort Street and build a new rental property.

As owners of one of the 9 Units of Strata VIS 740 we have concerns with the proposed new development as the proposed new structure will be a significant expansion of both footprint and height of the building.

- R3-AM2 maximum site coverage for the main building is 30%; the proposed building would cover 46.9%.
- R3-AM2 maximum height is 12 meters (39.5 ft); the proposed building would be 14.39 meter (47 ft) high;
- R3-AM2 setback is one half of the building height, i.e. 7.2 meters (23'7"); the proposed building would be 3.6 m (12 ft) from our property line.

As for the process itself; there has been a lack of transparency and sharing of information with the two stratas who will be grossly impacted.

Lantern Properties has claimed that notices were distributed to the two neighbouring stratas but the owners of the units of both stratas have all said this is not the case.

The current structure is indeed in need of replacement but this new building will be in short an overbuild relative to the site, neighbours, blue sky and it will displace the current residents living there; VIHA assisted individuals.

The current council is looking for ways to "densify" the city with affordable rental units but this is not the way to achieve that means.

The new building footprint will result in the removal of a green belt of trees needed for reduction in sound and sight for neighbours; quality of daily life in the area.

We trust the city council and city planners will challenge this redevelopment as it currently stands relative to the proposal documents on the city site.

Regards,
Candace and Russ Scruggs

Katie Lauriston

From: Alec Johnston
Sent: February 11, 2020 8:55 AM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: FW: proposed development at 1475 Fort Street

For the file. DPV No. 00120.

Thanks,
Alec

From: Strata 303 [REDACTED]
Sent: February 10, 2020 2:48 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED]
Cc: Strata 303 [REDACTED]; Paul Lecavalier [REDACTED]
Subject: proposed development at 1475 Fort Street

Dear City of Victoria Council members,

I'm writing to you as Chair of Strata 303, located at 949 Pemberton Road. I'm writing on behalf of our 16 homeowners regarding the development of a 33 unit apartment building proposed for 1475 Fort Street. Our strata complex is located immediately behind the proposed development site. We understand that the developer submitted a Development Permit Application in June 2019. However, we were unaware of the proposed development until this month, February 2020, when a member of the City's Advisory Design Committee advised one of our homeowners about the project.

I'm writing to express the concern of all our homeowners regarding the lack of consultation for this development, the variance of setback for the building, and the difficulty of obtaining a meeting with the developer to look at the architectural plans and drawings.

When we contacted the project manager of Lantern Properties for a consultation, they insisted we had already been consulted, even though not one of our 16 homeowners has been approached. We have since learned that a neighbouring strata that also borders the development site was not consulted. The proposed development will have as much impact on that strata as it will on ours. Is that why we were never consulted, but residents of St. Charles, who do not border the development, were?

A Strata 303 representative has contacted the project manager on several occasions, only to receive delay tactics, today finally culminating in the offer to meet during the last week of this month. Representatives from both stratas have a desire to attend this meeting, though coming so late in the process, it is neither transparent nor timely.

One of our greatest concerns about the proposed development is the request for a variance of setback from 20 feet to ten feet to the property line of our homeowners. This will have a significant impact on strata owners whose units open to the development site. Construction noise and debris will find its way to the front yards of homeowners, and the variance of setback will permanently affect the privacy of these same units. The variance, if approved by

Council, will be entirely to the advantage of the developer, and entirely to the disadvantage of the homeowners whose units have been in place for 45 years.

We are asking Council to advise us at what stage in the process the Development Permit Application sits, and how we, as the homeowners most affected by the development, can best provide our feedback. We await your response.

Christine Morissette, Chair
Strata 303

From: Sandra Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 7:12 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); bisett@victoria.ca; Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; [REDACTED]
Cc: Strata 303
Subject: Proposed Development at 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a homeowner at 949 Pemberton Road in a complex that runs adjacent to the 1475 Fort Street proposed development by Lantern Properties.

I appreciate the need for and focus on more rental units. However, this should not be at the expense of and disadvantage to homeowners in surrounding properties. In line with that these are the points to be addressed:

- The proposed development, which is considerably larger than the existing building, would result in a significant loss of privacy to units bordering this development due to the increased height and close proximity to

- the property line. There would only be 12 feet between our border and their four storey building. There has been lack of consultation, lack of transparency, and lack of concern for the impact and consequences of the

- proposed design affecting the adjacent community.

- A more thorough process in examining the facts, and more rigorous public consultation and review for these consequences to homeowners is needed.

- Regard for our neighbourhood with its mature bylaw protected trees and their unquestionable ecological footprint is needed. Some of the trees are over 60 feet in height. The proposed building plan would destroy these trees

- and only allow for very small trees to be planted as the area allotted is much smaller and would never allow for large tree regrowth.

- The use of the variance process by this developer needs to be questioned. Variances this extreme demand a very different process. It is my understanding that a variance is there to deal with existing acceptable

- community development without major changes to that. A re-zoning application would have been more appropriate to a building design with such variances.

I want to be reassured that Mayor and Council is committed to upholding the integrity of this neighbourhood. We need you to work with us. We need to work together to maintain the beauty of this neighbourhood and living conditions including privacy of its residents.

I hope the deeply held values for communication, community engagement and consideration, environmental preservation, and working together are upheld and developed when considering this proposal.

Sandra Jones
[REDACTED]

From: Carolina Ashe [REDACTED]

Sent: May 25, 2020 4:06 PM

To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <Blisitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED] Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>

Cc: Strata 303 [REDACTED] Gillian Lawson [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] brodeurc [REDACTED] Carolina Ashe [REDACTED]
Vanessa Dingley [REDACTED] Lorena and Caspar [REDACTED] Bill Stroll
[REDACTED] Jo Anna Hope [REDACTED] Miranda Worthy [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Sandy Jones [REDACTED] Alan Morton
[REDACTED] 'Ken Bailey' [REDACTED] 'megan bermand'
[REDACTED] Bill McKechnie [REDACTED]
Dave McWalter [REDACTED] 'Jessica Sluymmer' [REDACTED] Jan Kliz
[REDACTED] Bob June [REDACTED] Paul Lecavalier [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: 1475 Fort Street Proposal - tree loss

Dear Mayor and Council,

Attached please find a letter for your consideration at the Committee of the Whole meeting on May 28, 2020, regarding the proposed development at 1475 Fort Street.

Thank you,

Carolina Ashe and Alan Morton

Dear Mayor and Council,

We have each written previous letters expressing concerns about the development at 1475 Fort Street. This letter specifically addresses the irreversible damage that will result from the removal of 11 trees to accommodate the extreme variances requested for this proposed development.



To the left is a photograph of three Big Leaf Maples, standing approximately 50 feet tall. These magnificent trees are among those slated for removal, should the building permit be granted. They are a vital part of an urban ecosystem supporting a surprising number of birds, which we have identified year after year:

American Robin	House Finch
Anna's Hummingbird	Hutton's Vireo
Bewick's Wren	Merlin
Brown Creeper	Northern Flicker
Bushtit	Purple Finch
Chestnut-backed Chickadee	Rose-breasted Nuthatch
Cooper's Hawk	Spotted Towhee
Dark-eyed Junco	Song Sparrow
Downey Woodpecker	Stellar's Jay
Fox Sparrow	Varied Thrush
Golden-crowned Sparrow	White-crowned Sparrow

Where will the birds go if these trees are removed? There is a disturbing pattern of sacrificing trees for densification, as one urban ecosystem after another is felled for townhouse and apartment developments, pushing the birds that depend upon the trees to compete for ever-shrinking habitat. In addition to habitat loss, the carbon sequestration, water-filtering, and benefit to people that these large trees provide cannot be replicated by patio shrubs or tiny saplings.

We understand the need to create homes for all. We do not understand why it is taking place at the expense of the environment. It *is* possible to find a balance. Victoria is at risk of losing the natural surroundings that have contributed to its reputation as a uniquely beautiful and livable city.

We ask that your decision reflect not only the viewpoints of the developer, but also those who love Victoria and call it "home" .

Sincerely,

Carolina Ashe and Alan Morton

From: Grace Golightly [REDACTED]
Sent: May 22, 2020 12:00 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and councillors,

From what I understand, creating underground parking, which is bigger than the building envelope, is expected to "necessitate" removing a number of these mature trees during development of this site.

I greatly appreciate the City's focus on planting more trees, and encouraging homeowners to do so as well. However, with climate change breathing down our necks, retaining the mature trees we already have would actually do us more good right now.

This area is very walkable and bikeable, with easy access to transit. There is really no good reason to sacrifice mature trees, merely to allow cars to sit underground at this site. It is simply what has become normal. But it is well past time to come up with a new normal.

These trees provide incredible eco-services (oxygen, carbon sequestration, air purifying, reducing floodwater, etc.) as well as beauty that raises people's spirits and reduces their stress levels. Saplings cannot come anywhere close to providing the same things -- and won't, for decades.

Car shares could be made available instead of some of the parking. There are many tenants or buyers who would be interested in the proposed units, even without the parking.

I understand there is also concern about some of the remaining tenants, and that they may not be protected by normal rental protections. I believe you are all caring people who would not want to see vulnerable people destabilized or made homeless in this situation. I hope they are given time and support to find equally supportive and affordable housing.

Sincerely,
Grace Golightly

From: Vanessa Dingley [REDACTED]
Sent: May 21, 2020 12:58 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <iloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <Bisitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED]

Cc: Strata 303 [REDACTED] Gillian Lawson [REDACTED] cmorrisette [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] brodeur [REDACTED] Carolina Ashe [REDACTED]
vdingley [REDACTED] Lorena and Caspar [REDACTED] johope66 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Miranda Worthy [REDACTED] Sandy Jones [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] alanmorton61 [REDACTED] Ken Bailey [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] megan bermand [REDACTED] Bill McKechnie [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Steve Williams [REDACTED] McWalter [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Jessica Sluymer [REDACTED] Jan Klizs [REDACTED]
Bob June [REDACTED] Paul Lecavalier [REDACTED] >; rscruggs56 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Bill Stroll [REDACTED] Barbara Bolli [REDACTED]

Subject: 1475 Fort Street Development Permit Application

We are resident owners of one of the 16 townhouses at 949 Pemberton Road, a complex immediately south of the site at 1475 Fort Street, where a Development Permit Application has been submitted to the City. We recognize that the existing building on that site needs replacement so we do not oppose redevelopment. We appreciate the fact that Lantern Properties quite recently greatly improved the adjacent property at 1471 Fort Street with landscaping, etc., thereby enhancing the neighbourhood.

However, we do have several serious concerns about this proposal:

1. Loss of low-income rental housing:

While recognizing the great need in general for rental housing in Victoria, and for higher densities along transportation corridors, we are concerned that low-income rental is going to be lost. If this cannot be replaced by new low-income rentals, it should at least be focused on the needs of moderate-income tenants – we understand that some of the excessive variances requested (see below) are related to marketing to higher-income renters.

2. Procedural Issues/Lack of Consultation:

- Previous correspondence from residents of 949 Pemberton has addressed the serious problem of the lack of consultation with us so we will not reiterate all of these concerns. But we do find particularly egregious the fact that both the Advisory Design Panel and the Rockland Neighbourhood Association were both told that there had been consultation with neighbours when in fact this was only with a very select few neighbours on St. Charles Street, while those of us at 949 Pemberton were completely unaware of the development proposals, and it was pure coincidence that we found out about it through Pam Madoff, a member of the ADP, in January! Since we, and those at 1019 Frewing Lane, are the most directly impacted – this is completely unacceptable and the process needs to be reviewed and improved.

- **3. Request for Excessive Variances and Need for Buffer Zone Between Properties:**

The overall look of the proposed building, quality, use of materials, etc., seems pleasant enough, but it needs to be substantially scaled back with regard to site coverage, building height and

setbacks because the variances requested give it too large a footprint for the site and would allow it to seriously impinge on us as neighbours. *The whole point of having established requirements for setbacks is surely to protect neighbours from such impingement; and the reasons for height limits are similarly to protect neighbours.* While a small modification in these requirements to accommodate a particular need might be acceptable (as was the height variance requested and approved for 1016 Pemberton Road a few years ago), the *scale* of the variances requested in this case makes a mockery of the setback regulations! Why have regulations if they are going to be so wantonly over-ridden? If approved, they would be completely over-riding the neighbours' quality of life for the sole benefit the developer, and this is most unjust. Apparently, the height variance is being requested to accommodate high ceilings for the higher-end market – really not acceptable if it negatively affects the neighbours.

We do not agree with the architects' claim that this building would provide a sensitive transition between the larger buildings on Fort Street and the residential area to the south because the massing of the building is simply too great on the south side, especially if it were to be so close to the boundary. Perhaps stepped-back levels of the proposed building might make it more acceptable to those in the two-storey townhouses so close by? That would provide a much better transition. The current proposal creates serious privacy issues for neighbours in the existing dwellings, and could negatively affect their property values.

The current proposal would also make necessary the removal of several existing mature trees which create a much-needed buffer zone between the two properties. We are concerned about the unnecessary loss of existing trees. We also feel very strongly that if there is to be infill which increases density in a historic neighbourhood such as this, there must be compensating buffer zones – this seems to be a fundamental component of good urban design. A properly landscaped buffer zone would benefit the residents of the proposed building as well as the residents of 949 Pemberton and 1019 Frewing Lane.

CONCLUSION:

We request that the Committee of the Whole give this proposal serious and careful scrutiny, bearing in mind:

- The lack of consultation with us at an appropriate time in the planning and design process;
 - The truly excessive variances being requested which, if approved, would negatively impact the neighbours at 949 Pemberton Road.
- We hope that you will request that the proposal be re-submitted with a revised design at a reduced and more appropriate scale, without excessive variances, and providing landscaping as an effective buffer zone between our properties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Vanessa and John Dingley

[REDACTED]

From: Nancy Macgregor [REDACTED]
Sent: May 21, 2020 4:42 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Development application 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

I began my concern about this development with the need to protect trees in Victoria. On this site are ten mature trees that will be removed. Only two of these trees qualified as protected when this application first came to the city, but since that time seven trees would fit that category. Most of the trees being removed are along the western boundary of the property, shared by the neighbour. Large big leaf maples, red cedar and European Ash grace the edges, and on the east Hawthorn and Maple. These trees will be removed in order to allow for underground parking which extends outside the building envelope.

While parking spaces have been decreased due to a walking distance to the city centre and a great bus service on Fort and Yates St, and bike spaces with a heated bike room for repairs incorporated on site, more could be done.

Diminishing the tree canopy here is a sad loss not just to tenants of this apartment but to neighbours and to the tree canopy of the city. Fort St. lost a significant number of mature, diverse and exceptional trees in 2019 at 1201 Fort St.

With each development we are chipping away at the urban forest that makes this city unique and prepares us for climate change days ahead. Hearing the birds again is a lesson from Covid 19, not to be forgotten.

By offering shares in a car share company or investing in the eco pass bus pass program, less parking would be needed, saving more trees. The city could also improve the regulations around how many cars we need per unit of housing.

My greater concern is about the human family, the tenants of 1475 Fort St. housed by VIHA, some waiting for alternate housing to be found, since this lease to VIHA has expired. There is also a current lease by VIHA at 1471 Fort St, a building owned by the same developer.

This is an issue that needs Provincial work, to house the vulnerable in our society. But at present, we have a situation that adds stress to people who deserve to have a place of healing, a home, that does not require them to move on until they can do so with confidence. For that reason, I request that the Mayor and Council delay this development until VIHA is able to find appropriate housing for these citizens, and that they may know that their tenancy is secure. In this time of Covid 19, Bonnie Henry asks us to "be calm, be kind, and be safe". Let us heed her words and take our time to recover. We may expect a 2nd wave of this pandemic. Let us not impose more stress on our health care workers, and those seeking stability and a safe home.

Thank you for your consideration, Nancy Macgregor

From: Jo Anna Hope [REDACTED]
Sent: May 21, 2020 8:00 AM
To: Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED] Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>
Subject: Fwd: 1475 Fort Street Development Permit Application

Dear Mayor and Council,

I reside at #15-[949 Pemberton Road](#), a complex immediately south of the site at [1475 Fort Street](#), where a Development Permit Application has been submitted to the City. I recognize that the existing building on that site needs replacement so do not oppose redevelopment. I appreciate the fact that Lantern Properties quite recently greatly improved the adjacent property at [1471 Fort Street](#) with landscaping, etc., thereby enhancing the neighbourhood.

However, I do have several serious concerns about this proposal:

1. Loss of low-income rental housing:

While recognizing the great need in general for rental housing in Victoria, and for higher densities along transportation corridors, I am concerned that low-income rental is going to be lost. If this cannot be replaced by new low-income rentals, it should at least be focused on the needs of moderate-income tenants – I understand that some of the excessive variances requested (see below) are related to marketing to higher-income renters.

2. Procedural Issues/Lack of Consultation:

- Previous correspondence from residents of 949 Pemberton has addressed the serious problem of the lack of consultation with us so I will not reiterate all of these concerns, but I do find particularly egregious the fact that both the Advisory Design Panel and the Rockland Neighbourhood Association were told that there had been consultation with neighbours when in fact this was only with a very select few neighbours on St. Charles Street, while those of us at 949 Pemberton were completely unaware of the development proposals, and it was pure coincidence that we found out about it through Pam Madoff, a member of the ADP, in January! Since we, and those at 1019 Frewing Lane, are the most directly impacted – this is completely unacceptable and the process needs to be reviewed and improved.

3. Request for Excessive Variances and Need for Buffer Zone Between Properties:

The overall look of the proposed building, quality, use of materials, etc., seems pleasant enough, but it needs to be substantially scaled back with regard to site coverage, building height and setbacks because the variances requested give it too large a footprint for the site and would allow it to seriously impinge on us as neighbours. *The whole point of having established requirements for setbacks is surely to protect neighbours from such impingement, and the reasons for height limits are similarly to protect neighbours.* While a small modification in these requirements to accommodate a particular need might be acceptable (as was the height variance requested and approved for 1016 Pemberton Road a few years ago), the *scale* of the variances requested in this case makes a mockery of the setback regulations! Why have regulations if they are going to be so wantonly over-ridden? If approved, they would be completely over-riding the neighbours' quality of life for the sole benefit of the developer, and this is most unjust. Apparently, the height

variance is being requested to accommodate high ceilings for the higher-end market – really not acceptable if it negatively affects the neighbours.

We do not agree with the architects' claim that this building would provide a sensitive transition between the larger buildings on Fort Street and the residential area to the south because the massing of the building is simply too great on the south side, especially if it were to be so close to the boundary—12 feet, I understand. Perhaps stepped-back levels of the proposed building might make it more acceptable to those in the two-storey townhouses so close by? That would provide a much better transition. The current proposal creates serious privacy issues for neighbours in the existing dwellings and would most likely have a negative affect their property values.

The current proposal would also make necessary the removal of several existing mature trees which create a much-needed buffer zone between the two properties and provide habitat for many species of bird and other small beings. I am concerned about the unnecessary loss of existing trees. I also feel very strongly that if there is to be infill which increases density in a historic neighbourhood such as this, there must be compensating buffer zones – this seems to be a fundamental component of good urban design. A properly landscaped buffer zone would benefit the residents of the proposed building as well as the residents of 949 Pemberton and 1019 Frewing Lane.

CONCLUSION:

I request that the Committee of the Whole give this proposal serious and careful scrutiny, bearing in mind:

- The lack of consultation with us at an appropriate time in the planning and design process;
- The truly excessive variances being requested which, if approved, would negatively impact the neighbours at 949 Pemberton Road.

I hope that you will request that the proposal be re-submitted with a revised design at a reduced and more appropriate scale, without excessive variances, and providing landscaping as an effective buffer zone between our properties.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jo Anna Hope

[REDACTED]

--

PLEASE NOTE, my new email address:

[REDACTED]

From: bmckechnie41@gmail.com <bmckechnie41@gmail.com>

Sent: May 21, 2020 1:03 PM

To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <Bisitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>

Cc: 'Strata 303' [REDACTED] 'Gillian Lawson' [REDACTED] 'brodeurc' [REDACTED] 'Carolina Ashe' [REDACTED] 'Vanessa Dingley' [REDACTED] 'Lorena and Caspar' [REDACTED] 'Jo Anna Hope' [REDACTED] 'Miranda Worthy' [REDACTED] 'Sandy Jones' [REDACTED] 'Alan Morton' [REDACTED] 'Ken Bailey' [REDACTED] 'megan bermand' [REDACTED] 'Bill McKechnie' [REDACTED] 'Dave McWalter' [REDACTED] 'Jessica Sluymer' [REDACTED] 'Jan Klizs' [REDACTED] 'Bob June' [REDACTED] 'Paul Lecavalier' [REDACTED]

Subject: Variance request 1475 Fort St

Dear Mayor and Council

- I live adjacent to the north property line of the proposed development at 1475 Fort St. I only became aware of the proposal recently while talking to my neighboring strata owners.
- The existing 3 story building (which is to be replaced) has a rear yard setback of approximately 50ft. The proposal in question calls for a four story building with a setback of only 12ft. to our property line.
- No amount of hedging or visual barrier will prevent the 3rd or 4th story occupants of the new building from looking directly into our backyard/windows, nor will it reduce the inevitable noise from the apartments particularly during the summer months when windows and balcony doors are open
- In my opinion this project is a huge overreach for the size of the lot and involves clearcutting the whole project site. It makes sense that the development be commensurate with the size of this panhandle lot.

I appeal to Council to take the appropriate steps when reviewing this project to ensuring the project is aligned with current zoning, with perhaps minor changes, instead of the major variances being requested

Thank you,

B. McKechnie

[REDACTED]

From: Barbara Bolli [REDACTED]

Sent: May 21, 2020 2:15 PM

To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <iloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca> [REDACTED]

Cc: 'Strata 303' [REDACTED] 'Gillian Lawson' [REDACTED] 'Christine Morissette' [REDACTED] 'Chantal Brodeur' [REDACTED] 'Carolina Ashe' [REDACTED] 'Vanessa Dingley' [REDACTED] 'Caspar Davis' [REDACTED] 'Bill Stroll' [REDACTED] 'Jo Anna Hope' [REDACTED] 'Sandy Jones' [REDACTED] 'Alan Morton' [REDACTED] 'Ken Bailey' [REDACTED] 'megan bermand' [REDACTED] 'Bill' [REDACTED] 'Steve Williams' [REDACTED] 'Jessica Sluymer' [REDACTED] 'Jan Klizs' [REDACTED] 'Bob June' [REDACTED] 'Paul Lecavalier' [REDACTED] 'Russ Scruggs' [REDACTED]

Subject: 1475 Fort St: Proposed Development Application

Mayor and Council:

I am a resident of a strata on 949 Pemberton Rd which borders a proposed development at 1475 Fort St. Much correspondence, including my own letter of February 12, 2020, has been written to Mayor and Council expressing strong concerns with this proposed development, the conduct of the developer and the very inadequate process in which it is being reviewed. As such, I will not repeat these concerns here. I do, however, want to strongly recommend that in order to demonstrate that a fair and reasonable assessment of this proposed project is undertaken, the Committee of the Whole needs to ensure the following:

- That the project is in keeping with current zoning bylaws
- That it is aligned with relevant sections of *2012/2019 Design Guidelines* and **NOT** the dated *1981 Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs, and Awnings* which has been referenced in respect to the proposal for 1475 Fort Street
- That the Advisory Design Panel is directed to reassess the development plans given that the developer misled the ADP when it advised the panel that neighbours response to the project was “positive” when the strata complexes at 949 and 1019 Pemberton Rd had not been made aware of the project by the developer
- That a thorough analysis of the implications of the project with respect to parking is undertaken as there is limited parking available at the proposed apartment complex and a dearth of parking in the neighbourhood
- That the arborist’s impact assessment report is updated to reflect the scaled-up project design
- That there is clear demonstration of meaningful/tangible consideration of and response to concerns/input of neighbours

- That an onsite visit is conducted to understand the real on-the-ground impacts of this project
- That there is clear demonstration that the costs of this project through loss of privacy, increased noise, decreased property values, significant tree and habitat loss and adverse impacts to the general ambiance of the neighbourhood through the erection of an oversized building on too small a lot is **NOT** born by adjacent neighbors

Consider this as the committee's due diligence check list as the proposal application is reviewed. I look forward to reviewing the Committee's response to the application and its consideration of this check list. If followed, I am confident that the Committee will support the construction of a building that complements the neighbourhood rather than erodes it.

Sincerely,
Barbara Bolli

From: Paul Lecavalier [REDACTED]

Sent: May 19, 2020 10:47 AM

To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; cthorton-joe@victoria.ca <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; ajohnston@victoria.ca <ajohnston@victoria.ca>

Subject: Major concerns regarding proposed development at 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor Phelps

I am the president of the Strata 740 at 1019 Pemberton Road. I am writing you to express my concern with the proposed apartment building development at 1475 Fort Street.

This proposed development, which is immediately to the North-East of our Strata lot, calls for the removal of a number of mature trees along the western and southern boundaries of the development lot. The removal of these trees will have a considerable negative impact on our Strata in that it removes a very effective visual and noise barrier between the two properties.

I would like to submit the following points for your and your council's consideration:

- I agree that new rental development at relatively high density is needed in Victoria and Fort Street is a good location for such development.
- The new building being proposed will be of good quality and will improve the overall character of the area.
- BUT this higher density development needs to be separated by a BUFFER AREA from the lower density areas behind Fort Street so as not to impact these areas negatively (views, noise etc.) and ultimately lower their property values.
- The existing trees that line the side and back of the proposed development lot do provide the much-needed buffer area and every effort should be made to preserve them.
- If it is not possible to save these trees given the proximity of the new construction, then the developer and /or the City MUST PROVIDE a buffer area with the appropriate attenuation measures to compensate for the lost tree cover.
- This buffer area will benefit the medium density townhouse developments immediately adjacent (south and south-west) to the proposed development site and will benefit the eventual tenants of the new apartment building by providing much needed greenery.
- IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT that the City always insist that such buffer areas be included in any redevelopment plans calling for the insertion of higher density developments into existing built-up areas. This will be crucial in getting neighbouring property owners to accept these new projects.

I trust that the above points will help you and your Council Members make the appropriate adjustments to the development plans for 1475 Fort Street.

Yours truly

Paul Lecavalier [REDACTED]

From: Janet Simpson [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 10:33 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: re 1475 Fort Street (COW May 28th)

Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to express my grave concerns over the proposed development on this site.

There is currently an apartment building here that could accommodate many renters. Demolishing it and hauling all the materials off to the landfill should be the last resort. The site is large enough for an addition to provide more accommodation.

But the current proposal is to tear everything down and build something which unreasonably exceeds what is permitted by the zoning. In fact, the excess and the impact on neighbours warrants a rezoning.

The ask for a 17% increase in site coverage (especially in what is a panhandle situation), and a reduction of 100% of the setbacks is basically a request to take down every significant tree on the property. Many of these trees are Big leaf maples and Wester red cedars. They are all at least 60-70 feet high. Eleven of these trees would be removed.

This would be an unconscionable violation of the City's expressed intent to protect and enhance our tree canopy. These trees are on the perimeter of the property and, with the appropriate and necessary adherence to the site coverage and setback regulations, would not interfere with the development of the site.

Sincerely,
Janet Simpson

[REDACTED]





From: Carolina Ashe [REDACTED]

Sent: May 20, 2020 7:20 PM

To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] brodeurc [REDACTED] Carolina Ashe
[REDACTED] Vanessa Dingley [REDACTED] Lorena and Caspar
[REDACTED] Jo Anna Hope [REDACTED] Miranda Worthy
[REDACTED] Sandy Jones [REDACTED] Alan Morton
[REDACTED] Ken Bailey [REDACTED] megan bermand
[REDACTED] McKechnie [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Dave McWalter [REDACTED] Jessica Sluymer
[REDACTED] Jan Kliz [REDACTED] Bob June [REDACTED] Paul
[REDACTED] Lecavalier [REDACTED] Russ Scruggs [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: 1475 Fort Street building proposal

Dear Mayor and Council,

On February 25, 2020, I sent you a letter expressing initial concerns with a development proposal at 1475 Fort Street, which abuts 949 Pemberton Road, where I live. In my previous letter, I mentioned my concerns about lack of consultation and transparency on the part of the developer. In spite of a meeting with the developer (initiated by a resident of 949 Pemberton Road), along with a follow-up email, the developer continues to show no interest in addressing concerns brought forward by residents.

Following are additional concerns:

Design guidelines: 1981 vs 2019

- It is my understanding that the 1981 *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs, and Awnings* has been referenced in respect to the proposal for 1475 Fort Street.
- These antiquated guidelines are cursory, incomplete, and do not address what can be expected in a new build for 2020.
- The *Design Guidelines for: Residential, Commercial and Industrial, 2012/2019 (2012/2019 Design Guidelines)*, supersede the 1981 guidelines and provide much more comprehensive and current direction for transition between the two zones. Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.5 and 1.6., in particular, are applicable to this proposal.
- It is reasonable to expect that the 2012/2019 *Design Guidelines* will be referenced in the review of this application.

Impact of variances on properties bordering 1475 Fort Street

- The current site plans show the view of the building from the perspective of passers-by on Fort Street.
- The view is very different for neighbours living on the other sides.
- Residents at 949 Pemberton Road will no longer see the sky and trees when they step outside their back doors. Instead, they will be confronted with a massive wall, 12 to 13 feet from the property line, and reaching more than 40 feet above them.

- With the removal of mature trees, the residents of both 949 and 1019 Pemberton Road will have no visual or sound buffer from this large block-shaped building that will virtually fill its entire lot.
- It is difficult to put into words the detrimental ecological impact of the removal of mature trees which stand at the border between 1475 Fort Street and other properties, not to mention the loss of visual and sound buffer that these trees provide.

Parking

- The proponent is requesting a variance which will reduce the number of required parking stalls from 45 (for residents and visitors) to 26. While bicycle parking stalls will be available, it cannot be assumed that all occupants of the building, as well as their visitors, will not own cars.
- There is already a dearth of on-street parking in the neighbourhood. One of the nearest possibilities, Pemberton Road, is already congested with parked cars on both sides.

Summary

I understand that there is a shortage of rental apartments in Victoria and am not opposed to a new rental building replacing the old one at 1475 Fort Street. However, this proposal presents a case of extreme overreach in an apparent attempt to squeeze as many profitable, market rental units as possible into a small parcel of land, regardless of cost to surrounding neighbours, and to the environment.

What I am asking for

- I am asking that you apply whole systems thinking in your review of this development. Please consider not only the economic goals of the developer, but also the social, environmental and economic impacts of this development on the entire neighbourhood.
- Please visit the building site. See for yourself what the impact of this proposed building will be if the requested variances and removal of trees are approved.
- Please talk to the residents who have spent many hours researching this situation and reaching out to you.

I am trusting that if you do these things, you will ask the proponent to redraw plans that:

- are in keeping with current zoning bylaws, with only minor variances, if any;
- are aligned with relevant sections of *2012/2019 Design Guidelines*; and
- address and incorporate the concerns of neighbours who have been, and continue to reach out to the City and to the proponent.

Thank you,

Carolina Ashe



From: Bill Stroll [REDACTED]

Sent: May 20, 2020 1:54 PM

To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <iloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED]

Cc: Strata 303 [REDACTED]

Gillian Lawson [REDACTED]

Christine Morissette [REDACTED]

Chantal Brodeur [REDACTED]

Ashe [REDACTED]

Dingley [REDACTED]

Caspar Davis [REDACTED]

Jo Anna Hope [REDACTED]

Miranda Worthy [REDACTED]

Sandy [REDACTED]

Jones [REDACTED]

Alan Morton [REDACTED]

Ken Bailey [REDACTED]

megan bermand [REDACTED]

Bill [REDACTED]

Steve Williams [REDACTED]

Jessica Sluymer [REDACTED]

Jan Klizs [REDACTED]

Bob June [REDACTED]

Paul Lecavalier [REDACTED]

Russ Scruggs [REDACTED]

Subject: Proposed development at 1475 Fort Street Follow Up

Dear Mayor and city councillors

I wrote to you February 13 regarding my concerns of the proposed Lantern Properties development at 1475 Fort Street. In that email I noted a lack of information and consultation, and questionable variances the developer had proposed. Although a meeting did take place between Strata 303 owners, the Rockland Neighbourhood Association and Lantern Properties these matters still remain troublesome.

Despite zoning bylaws, the new structure would occupy almost 50% of the site, up from the current 30% and that the setback, with the height addition of another storey would only be a couple of feet from our property line. Furthermore, there will be a loss of affordable housing as all units will be available only at market value. I request council insist on public consultation before this redevelopment moves forward.

Bill Stroll
[REDACTED]

From: Alan Morton [REDACTED]
Sent: May 20, 2020 11:18 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <iloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED]
Cc: Strata 303 [REDACTED] Gillian Lawson [REDACTED] Christine Morissette [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Chantal Brodeur [REDACTED] Carolina Ashe [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Vanessa Dingley [REDACTED] Caspar Davis [REDACTED]
Bill Stroll [REDACTED] Jo Anna Hope [REDACTED] Miranda Worthy [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Sandy Jones [REDACTED] Alan Morton [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Ken Bailey [REDACTED] megan bermand [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Bill [REDACTED] Steve Williams [REDACTED] Jessica [REDACTED]
Sluymmer [REDACTED] Jan Klizs [REDACTED] Bob June [REDACTED]
Paul Lecavalier [REDACTED] Russ Scruggs [REDACTED]
Subject: 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council:

As one of the residents of 949 Pemberton Road I have some concerns with the proposed redevelopment at 1475 Fort Street, which is adjacent to my townhome complex.

While the lack of consultation has been frustrating, I find the misrepresentation and lack of transparency regarding ultimate goals to be very concerning. There seems to be a steady shift of goal posts in what is being asked for.

From the time of the BC Land Surveyors site plan and Arborists' report the proposal has gone from:

- 12.9m to 14.39m in height
- 28 market rentals and 4 affordable units to all 32 market rental
- 26 resident parking underground and 3 grade level to all underground in order to ask for a front setback variance of just under 2m as opposed to 10m

The initial letter to council from the developer in June 12, 2019 stated that 1475 Fort is significantly lower than 949 Pemberton and that they are providing a "sensitive transition" between the R1 and R3 zoning. There is a grade difference but it is only 6 feet. Therefore, the proposal for a building face that is 13 feet from and 41 feet above the adjoining property line would seem to be in opposition to the concept of a transition as outlined in the Design Guidelines-Multiuse Residential Commercial Industrial, 1.6.1 and 1.6.2.

I feel that the lack of transparency, unwillingness to work with the community to address concerns, and the desire to push through massive variances despite zoning bylaws and Design Guidelines will cloud future interactions with this developer and architect.

Alan Morton
[REDACTED]

From: Christine Morissette [REDACTED]
Sent: May 19, 2020 3:46 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Alec Johnston; [REDACTED]
Cc: Strata 303; Gillian Lawson; Christine Morissette; Chantal Brodeur; Carolina Ashe; Vanessa Dingley; Caspar Davis; Bill Stroll; Jo Anna Hope; Miranda Worthy; Sandy Jones; Alan Morton; Ken Bailey; Megan Bermand; Bill; Steve Williams; [REDACTED] Jessica Sluymer; Jan Klizs; Bob June; Paul Lecavalier; Russ Scruggs
Subject: 1475 Fort Street development

Dear Mayor and Council:

We are homeowners who live adjacent to a proposed development at 1475 Fort Street. We are writing to express our concerns regarding three aspects of this development:

1. The request for significant variances on size and height of the new building

The existing building on this property takes up 30% of the area, whereas the new building is slated to take up nearly 50%, as well as an additional story in height. This will place the new building within two meters of our strata's boundary fence, and along with one more story, will significantly reduce the privacy of our units that face the fence. The variances requested will also necessitate the removal of eleven mature trees, greatly reducing the urban canopy for which this neighbourhood is known.

2. The lack of consultation with adjacent property owners

At no time were any of the 16 homeowners at 949 Pemberton Road ever informed about or consulted on this development by the developer. It is our understanding that this consultation is required by the City of Victoria. To add insult to injury, the developer continues to insist that we all were, in fact, consulted.

3. The loss of affordable housing, particularly for vulnerable citizens

When this development was first proposed, it was implied there would be some affordable housing to meet the City's current needs. While we applaud the commitment to rentals, we now understand they will be available only at market value. Furthermore, the current building housed people with mental health conditions overseen by VIHA. So in the stroke of a pen, the new development will prevent low income and other vulnerable citizens from accessing housing at this location.

We trust that going forward, the considerations of adjacent property owners will play a role in the approval process for the development at 1475 Fort Street.

Christine Morissette and Chantal Brodeur
[REDACTED]

From: Miranda Worthy [REDACTED]
Sent: May 19, 2020 12:18 PM
To: Barbara Bolli [REDACTED] Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAalto@victoria.ca>; Alec Johnston <ajohnston@victoria.ca>; [REDACTED]

Cc: 'Strata 303' [REDACTED] 'Gillian Lawson' [REDACTED] 'Christine Morissette' [REDACTED] 'Chantal Brodeur' [REDACTED] 'Carolina Ashe' [REDACTED] 'Vanessa Dingley' [REDACTED] 'Caspar Davis' [REDACTED] 'Bill Stroll' [REDACTED] 'Jo Anna Hope' [REDACTED] 'Sandy Jones' [REDACTED] 'Alan Morton' [REDACTED] 'Ken Bailey' [REDACTED] 'megan bermand' [REDACTED] 'Bill' [REDACTED] 'Steve Williams' [REDACTED] 'Sluymer' [REDACTED] 'Jan Klizs' [REDACTED] 'Bob June' [REDACTED] 'Paul Lecavalier' [REDACTED] 'Russ Scruggs' [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 1475 Fort Street: Proposed Development

Good afternoon,

The below email thread has been forwarded for the Property Owner's review and action.

If I can be of further assistance or you have questions, please let me know.

COVID -19 Announcement Updated April 29,2020:

Please be advised, our **office is open** for business at regular hours (9-5 M-F) with measures in place as per the recommendations of government and health authorities. Our staff continues to self-isolate as much as possible, on a rotating schedule for office hours. Many of us are still working remotely, but checking our emails regularly and available. **Emergency** calls (250-478-9141) will continue to be answered after hours.

Any **maintenance** requests which are non-emergent will be deferred until further notice, pending availability of contractors.

We remain deeply grateful for the positive, understanding and cooperative spirit we have encountered to date.

~ Stay safe, stay health and if you can stay home ~

Sincerely,

Miranda A. Worthy

[REDACTED]

IMPORTANT NOTICE!

This email is confidential, may be legally privileged and is for the intended recipient only. Access, disclosure, copying and distribution or reliance on any of, by anyone else is prohibited and may be a criminal offence. Please delete if obtained in error and e-mail confirmation to the sender.

From: Barbara Bolli [REDACTED]

Sent: May 19, 2020 12:16 PM

To: mayor@victoria.ca; jloveday@victoria.ca; sdubow@victoria.ca; bisitt@victoria.ca; spotts@victoria.ca; gyoung@victoria.ca; cthorne-ton-joe@victoria.ca; malto@victoria.ca; ajohnston@victoria.ca; [REDACTED]

Cc: 'Strata 303' [REDACTED] 'Gillian Lawson' [REDACTED] 'Christine Morissette' [REDACTED] 'Chantal Brodeur' [REDACTED] 'Carolina Ashe' [REDACTED] 'Vanessa Dingley' [REDACTED] 'Caspar Davis' [REDACTED] 'Bill Stroll' [REDACTED] 'Jo Anna Hope' [REDACTED] 'Sandy Jones' [REDACTED] 'Alan Morton' [REDACTED] 'Ken Bailey' [REDACTED] 'megan bermand' [REDACTED] 'Bill' [REDACTED] 'Steve Williams' [REDACTED] 'Jessica Sluymmer' [REDACTED] 'Jan Klizs' [REDACTED] 'Bob June' [REDACTED] 'Paul Lecavalier' [REDACTED] 'Russ Scruggs' [REDACTED]

Subject: 1475 Fort Street: Proposed Development

Importance: High

Dear Mayor and Council,

- In June 2019, Lantern Properties submitted a development application to the City of Victoria to replace an existing apartment building with construction of a 32 unit rental apartment building at 1475 Fort.
- None of the property owners at the 16 unit strata at 949 Pemberton and the adjacent 6 unit strata at 1019 Pemberton whose properties front on to the 1475 Fort St property - and are most directly impacted by this development – were not consulted/made aware of this project. Properties owners only became aware of the development when Pam Madoff contacted one of the strata property owners in February 2020.
- As part of the development process, Lantern Properties consulted with the Rockland Neighbourhood Association (RNA) and the Advisory Design Panel (ADP) in January 2020 about the proposal. Neither at the time expressed concerns or opposition to the project.
- After becoming aware of the project, the strata contacted the RNA regarding its review of the project. The RNA subsequently undertook a more in-depth evaluation of the project including an on site visit. As you can see from the RNA's April 22, 2020 letter to Mayor and Council (attached), this more detailed assessment of the project has shown that this 'simple variance development application' belies a project that has far more impacts to property owners than what was initially understood. [the scope of the variances and related impacts are so substantive that this application should have received the same review process as a rezoning proposal which would have resulted in greater transparency for all involved]

- At the January 22, 2020 APD meeting, the developer informed the panel that adjacent property owners were “positive” about the project (ADP January 22, 2020 minutes) when in fact property owners most affected by the project knew nothing about the project at that time. As the ADP was deliberately misled by the developer and, given the findings of the RNA’s reassessment of the proposal, strata property owners believe that the City has a moral obligation to redirect the ADP to go back and reevaluate this proposal.
<https://www.victoria.ca/assets/City~Hall/Committees/Other~Committees/Advisory~Design~Panel/Minutes/2020/ADP%20MINUTES%20-%20January%2022,%202020.pdf>
- The duplicitous behavior of the developer continues and is most concerning. Following the strata’s initiation of contact with the developer in February 2020 and the strata’s first information meeting on March 5, 2020 with the developer, Pam Madoff wrote in an email to a strata member that Lantern had contacted her to report that “ the meeting went well and that concerns were being addressed”. This is patently untrue. Please see the attached email from the strata to Lantern dated April 25, 2020 which clearly lays out the strata’s strong concerns with project. To date none of the strata’s concerns have been addressed. Emails to the developer inquiring about modifications to the design go answered (see attached).
- Your immediate direction to the ADP to re-evaluate this proposal is requested. This would be the right thing to do.

Sincerely,
Barbara Bolli



From: Norman Spector [REDACTED]
Sent: May 18, 2020 6:27 AM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor)
Cc: Alec Johnston; Peter Johanknecht; Lantern Properties
Subject: Re: 1475 Fort Street

Dear Madam Mayor and Council:

I am writing in regard to the above development proposal by Lantern Properties.

While walking my dog, I have been observing a similar development in the neighbourhood at 1201 Fort Street by Abstract Development for well-nigh two years.

In this case, there have been regular traffic stoppages as construction vehicles have entered and exited the site; indeed, the lane closest to the sidewalk seems to have been taken over on a semi-permanent basis by the developer.

In the case of the proposed Lantern Properties development, Fort Street is significantly narrower at the driveway where construction vehicles would be entering and exiting the site for an extended period of time. Consequently, stoppages and blockages are a much more problematic issue.

Since Fort Street is a major traffic artery for public transit, cyclists and private cars--including for Camosun and U Vic students--I would hope you'd give serious consideration to the transportation issue in assessing the developer's proposal

Yours faithfully

Norman Spector

- **EXCESSIVE VARIANCE REQUESTS**

The proposed plan asks for substantial variances on all four sides plus a height variance. We see this request as an overreach. Our understanding is that variance requests deal with minor changes but the proposed changes are anything but minor. The site coverage of the current building is 30% and the proposed plan calls for a 46.9% site coverage. The result is a massive rebuild with significant loss of privacy to strata homeowners to the south and an unfortunate loss of mature trees in the area. Although the architects acknowledged these facts during the March 5 meeting, their only response was a seeming willingness to add more shrubbery.

- **NON-COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES**

The current development plan does not comply with Section 1.6 of the **City of Victoria Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial, July 2012 (updated December 2019)** which require that privacy issues be addressed and that a stepped transition be employed between two zones when one is a multi-unit.

- **LOSS OF TREES**

Visitors to our city always remark on our magnificent trees. The City even has an Urban Forest Master Plan. We know as a society how important it is to maintain our tree canopy. This proposed development would lead to the loss of 11 mature trees with the consequent loss of habitat, visual beauty, and sound barrier. This is not in keeping with our city's image or the best interests of the neighbourhood.

We acknowledge the need for rental housing in Victoria. This development was originally billed as offering some low rental units but, along the way, that feature has been abandoned. The result is that the residents of the 11 current low rental units will be displaced to allow for 32 units to be rented out at market rates.

The developer in question did a fine job of renovating an adjacent building on the property and the plans for this building appear to include attractive materials. The existing building on this site is in poor shape and we have no objection to a new building being erected in its place. However, we feel that any new building should be one where only minor variances are required, not the major ones being sought in this project, and where the transitions between this building and its neighbours are as outlined in the current city guidelines.

We wish to extend an invitation to the Mayor and Councillors to visit our strata to see the proposed development from our vantage point.

Gillian Lawson

