

Madison Heiser

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 11:01 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: Subject: Development Permit Development with Variances Application No 00126 for 956 Heywood Avenue

From: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Sent: January 27, 2021 8:53 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Fw: Subject: Development Permit Development with Variances Application No 00126 for 956 Heywood Avenue

From: Lottie Ericson [REDACTED]
Sent: January 26, 2021 2:49 PM
To: Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Stephen Andrew (Councillor) <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>; cthortonjoe@victoria.ca <cthortonjoe@victoria.ca>; Geoff Young (Councillor) <gyoung@victoria.ca>; Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>
Subject: Subject: Development Permit Development with Variances Application No 00126 for 956 Heywood Avenue

Subject: Development Permit Development with Variances Application No 00126 for 956 Heywood Avenue

First of all, I would like to thank Councillor Thornton-Joe and councillor Young for having voted no to the proposed development on 956 Heywood Avenue and I do hope that you will continue to do so and also positively influence other city councillors to follow your lead.

By-laws are created for the common good. The City hires planners and planning departments are given instructions after consultation, referendums, open houses and much consideration.

Densification development on the above-mentioned single city lot will have far reaching negative impacts. Much damage will be done to community by buildings that do not have the understanding of the common good.

Because of this development the quality of life of the residents of 32 apartments, (north facing ones on 964 Heywood and south facing ones on 909 Pendergast) will be dramatically affected. By having the proposed building only a few meters away they will lose privacy and light. The residents being mostly single seniors are living in affordable one or two-bedroom leasehold apartments. Yes, these apartments are affordable, now let us keep them livable.

That a developer desires to maximize profits is understandable. But whether the developer is being greedy or just being an astute business person doesn't seem to be an issue in this development. One can only hope that no developer, even if they are working with the City on housing for the homeless, would be above the law.

I am surprised that Aryze believes that they can ask for and possibly receive six variances on a very small 15-metre-wide city lot between two large apartment blocks. They expect the City to give them twice the legal site coverage. They want to do away with the rear and side setbacks, from a legal 7.71 to 1.52, 1.37 and 0.93 meters. Fortunately, the two neighbouring apartment blocks were built following the law so some distance is given. Variances should only be allowed when the City wishes to increase the common good. Such cases could include i.e. saving trees, making improvements to support people with disabilities or if the developer benefits the common good for example by building a group home.

Aryze has made only minor changes over the last two years but those changes are not enough. Have they considered less grand one-bedroom apartments, which would fit with and be less damaging to the neighbourhood?

Aryze also wants a height variance so the owners of the two top suites can have access to the roof and hence look down onto both sides of the neighbouring apartments and sundecks. What about privacy? Cramming in a six-unit apartment block on a small city lot is certainly not considered compatible with the adjacent development. Would we even be having this discussion if the 32 effected properties were high end condos?

The planning department is very subjective in its descriptions. They talk of extensive perimeter landscaping not mentioning that the perimeter is only 1.37 meters wide and that the shade from the building will have minor impact on the liveability of some of the neighbouring units. Surely nobody in the planning department, or city councillor, would be happy to see a four-storey apartment plunked down immediately beside their own apartment or home. Privacy is going to be protected by some rushes and screens! What about conversations, music and where there are no plants or screen? The staff at the planning department is defending this development saying that it is going to look nice. We ask, "Nice for whom!"

The city has shown an interest in providing more affordable rental units. This development is far from being classed as affordable housing. For citizens in 32 units to lose quality of life and lose financially does not seem to justify building 6 high-end apartments. The 32 properties are affordable. Let us keep them liveable.

Densification is happening just a block away from this proposal at the corner of Quadra Street and Southgate. A large development of 90 units is replacing three small homes and an older 34-unit apartment block. This project is well thought out and is not obstructing the main view of any property.

If a bylaw can be easily negated by asking for and receiving variances, then all of the work to create a fair and just community is being overridden!

The citizens of Victoria need to believe that our elected representatives are not only upholding the laws and bylaws of the city, but also being sensitive to the rights and needs of all its citizens.

I ask that you please vote no to the illegal development proposal on 956 Heywood Avenue.

Yours sincerely,

Charlotte Ericson
Resident of 964 Heywood Avenue

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Brian Grison
Suite 123, 964 Heywood Avenue
Victoria, British Columbia, V8V2Y5

Mayor and Council of Victoria (publichearings@victoria.ca)
Fairfield Neighbourhood Lianon Councilor Ben Isitt (bisitt@victoria.ca)
James Bay Neighbourhood Councilor Stephen Andrew (stephen.andrew@victoria.ca)

Wednesday, January 27, 2021

Dear Sir or Madam,

Regarding the Proposed Development for 956 Heywood Avenue

I am the resident and owner of Suite 123, 964 Heywood. I have lived at this address for four years. I moved to Victoria from Toronto in 1977.

I am opposed to the proposed development of a condominium building at 956 Heywood Avenue. The proposal does not fit into the residential landscape, community atmosphere, architectural or pleasant mix of built and natural aesthetic that is central to life in Fairfield, James Bay or the other districts of Victoria and surrounding communities. Except for one architectural mistake at 986, Heywood Avenue is a residential street with a mixture of individual houses and low-rise apartment buildings. It should remain so. There are lots of large trees, lawns and gardens. The proposed building should be built downtown; it should not turn Heywood Avenue or Fairfield into a downtown.

The proposed building would occupy every square foot of the property with no regard for trees, gardens and lawns; flowerpots are no substitute. Such condominiums are more appropriate on Yates Avenue west of Cook Street, where lawns, trees and gardens are not expected or appropriate. The building would tower over its neighbours, restricting light and views for its north, east, west and south facing neighbouring apartments.

The lot itself, which currently contains one residential home, set well back from the street with lots of trees and gardens and a driveway to the street, is too small to accommodate such a large development. This lot would be more suitable for an infill duplex or multi-family four-unit strata development in a more traditional design than an ugly and impersonal six- unit condominium.

Cordially,
Brian Grison

To:
Subject:

Development permit No 00126-- 956 Heywood

Dear Victoria City Council:

I am a full time resident of 964 Heywood. My unit and quality of life will be greatly affected by the proposed development at 956 Heywood. My unit will be staring right into the windows of the proposed building (or staring right at a cement wall)

Please reject the developers proposed variances for 956 Heywood

- 1) They are requesting to supply few parking spaces on the property. This will result in further parking congestion in the area.
- 2) They are requesting an increase in height. This will reduce light to the apartments on the north and south side of the development. This will result in people needing to have lights on all day due to the darkness and the lack of natural light has negative impact on peoples mental well being.
- 3) They are requesting to reduce the front setback to only 6.63 meters – This will reduce any green space at the front of the building
- 4) They are requesting to reduce the back setback to only 1.5 meters – This will block the north side residences sunlight. (of 964 Heywood)
- 5) They are requesting to reduce the side setback to only 1.37 - This will mean the all units on the north side of 964 Heywood will either be looking at a cement wall or watching their neighbours activities. Impacting the privacy of those living on the north and south side of the project. Having the proposed building this close is a fire hazard and serious safety concern for all.
- 6) They are requesting to have 64% site coverage. They are asking to DOUBLE the site coverage. This is completely unreasonable. This increases the quantity of cement and reduces any greenspace and does not fit with the neighbourhood\community plan

What is the point of having zoning regulations if a developer does not have to abide by them.

This project does not meet any existing bylaws or community plans and should be on hold until the developer can meet the current building codes.

If you approve this development as is you will be setting a precedent for all other developments.

Thank you for your consideration

Brad Brownell
North facing resident of 964 Heywood

Madison Heiser

From: Ms. B [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 1:54 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Variance application 00126- (956 Heywood Ave)

Dear Council,

Reference Application number: 00126,
956 Heywood Ave, permit area 16.

I write in connection with the above planning application. I live at 909 Pendergast street, directly beside this lot. I wish to object strongly to the development in this location for the following reasons:

-reduced parking spaces will put a strain on already tight parking in the area

-the rear and side setback variances and site coverage seem excessive. The lot does not seem large enough to accommodate such a large building without affecting neighbouring buildings (r/e sunlight/privacy/view)

I know that council is charged with managing the continued growth and prosperity of the neighbourhood, however the variances in this application seem excessive and not in line with the area. If approved I feel they will greatly affect existing residents, many of whom have owned units in adjacent buildings for years.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ms. Brown

Madison Heiser

From: Roy Fletcher [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 12:32 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Public Hearing for 956 Heywood Ave. Development Permit No. 00126

Public Hearing for 956 Heywood Ave. Development Permit No. 00126

Submitted by Roy Fletcher #101-1041 Richardson St. in the City of Victoria

I recommend that Victoria City Council REJECT this proposal for 956 Heywood Ave.

I lived on this block of Heywood Ave. from 1946 to 1968.
My family home was demolished during the building boom of late-60s and early-70s.
This single property was the only house which remained after that series of developments.

It now presents a very difficult and complex challenge.
This proposal falls far short of answering that challenge.
It contains too many suites for the site restrictions listed below.
When I looked at it for the first time I thought it was a first design attempt.

Beacon Hill Park

The map does not show it, but the BHP eastern boundary is right at the property line of the proposed development. The paved area of Heywood Ave. has never been severed from the Trust property.

building massing

The two adjacent buildings have a 10-metre setback. This one is proposing six-metres.
It will present a very dominant front when viewed from Beacon Hill Park.
This building design makes no attempt to blend to the existing buildings on either side.
The proposed side set-backs are very small and add to the dominance of this building when viewed from the park side.

parking

6 parking stalls is too few.
These will not be low-price units in a building close to town. These will be high-priced units for the wealthy.
In fact, they may be Airbnb units
Most of the people in these units will have two cars.

A quick scan of the parking design for this building should give Council an indication that some residents of the building will choose to park on the street because it is too inconvenient to exit from the semi-underground parking as designed.

The two buildings on either side have waiting lists for parking so residents of this building will have no ability to rent spaces close by.

Parking on Heywood Ave. is zoned residential only. As a frequent visitor to the other buildings, I can assure Council that parking on this block is frequently not available.

The road behind, Vancouver St., is slated for a cycle path.
It is already choked with cars from the two adjacent buildings. Half the parking spots on Vancouver St. will be eliminated.
All the rest of the roads in that neighbourhood are already choked with cars.
The City has no need to install 30Km/h signs in that neighbourhood. It's usually not possible to go more than 20 Km/h.

It is inevitable that meal delivery services (Skip-the-Dishes, DoorDash etc) and other deliveries will illegally park on the grassy area on the west side of Heywood Ave. in the Heywood Meadow of Beacon Hill Park.

garbage

The only access to this building is on Heywood Ave.

It is a narrow road with many cars parked on the street.

This building has 6 suites, so it will not have small blue bins left on the boulevard.

It will have the large wheeled garbage and recycling bins.

Large garbage trucks will have a difficult time finding a stopping spot to upload the garbage etc.

They will inevitably use the Heywood Meadow as a loading zone.

Regards. RAF