1475 Fort Street (Rockland)

All feedback received from August 10 to September 18, 2020

Submitter's Name
Matt Pope

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
1036 St Charles St

Timestamp of Submission
2020-08-25 17:30

Additional Comments
Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,
We are the owners of 1036 St Charles Street and we are writing today to express concern about the proposed development at 1475 Fort St. Our house sits approximately 50 m away from 1475 Fort Street.

We would like to state for the record that as of Aug 25 2020 we have received absolutely no notifications from Lantern Properties regarding the proposed development to date, and we are only aware of the proposal after hearing about it from several neighbours. We have also heard that the developers have reported "positive feedback from neighbours", and we would like to state unequivocally that we have not been consulted in any way by the developer or any associated parties, and thus we have not shared any feedback.

We share many of the concerns articulated by the Rockland Neighbourhood Association in their letter to you dated April 22, 2020, and also the concerns raised from many of our neighbours. Most unsettling is the proposed building height of 14.39 m: 20% higher than allowed under the R3-AM2 zoning. This alone would have a tremendous impact on all neighbours in the area, and I would be surprised if our neighbours at 1046 St Charles, whose house would end up being completely dwarfed by the 14.39 m proposed building only a few feet away, didn't see their property value decrease significantly. In addition, the proposed east side yard setback is less than half of what the zoning requires (14.39 m / 2 = 7.2 m; here they are proposing 3 m!). The proposed site coverage is 17% greater than allowed. What is the point of having zoning regulations if developers feel that they can just get excessive variances for all restrictions: height (20% over), setbacks (42% of what's required!), lot coverage (17% over)?

We fully agree with our neighbours that this has been a flawed process, and that the proposal represents too big a building on too small a lot. We urge Mayor and Council to request LP to go back and propose something in keeping with the site, its location and the neighbourhood.

Please keep up the great work that you are doing!

Thanks,

Matt & Jessica Pope
1036 St Charles St.

Submitter's Name
gretchen karlebach

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
#9 1019 Pemberton Road, Victoria

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-03 17:41

Additional Comments
Lack of transparency from the beginning of the project
*** many changes since the original application, with 'variances' increasing dramatically, important issues like arborist reports not updated, .. all with little or no notification

Lack of consultation
*** major misrepresentation of neighbours involvement, '100% happy,' when in actuality the invitation to the CALUC meeting is the first notification I have had from the developer, architect, or city, by email, by Canadian postal service, or hand delivered. I have learned everything via 'the grapevine' of neighbours. Thus, claims by developer that, "notices were sent out" is extremely misleading or .... I am just one of many, many neighbours that also have not received anything information on this proposed project. I am aware that one household received an invitation to an informational meeting, and they were the only people there -- hard to believe that others were invited and did not show up.....

Submitter's Name
Gretchen Karlebach

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
#9 1019 Pemberton Rd

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-03 17:49

Additional Comments
Loss of living, older, established trees, bushes
*** plan to replace with younger, smaller growth, which will take years to achieve comparable height & coverage, decreasing privacy of current neighbours & incoming renters of proposed building

*** decreasing the bird population
*** decreasing of some the natural sound barrier between neighbours
*** decreased square footage of ground for planting

Submitter's Name
Gretchen Karlebach

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
#9 1019 Pemberton Road

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-03 17:55

Additional Comments
Loss of affordable rental suites
*** how does this project address the need for AFFORDABLE family housing units in Victoria?
*** original plans included 4 'affordable'/subsidized suites, but they have disappeared
*** have plans been made to find suitable housing for those vulnerable tenants currently living the building now?

Submitter's Name
Caspar Davis & Lorena Mowers

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
16 - 949 Pemberton Road, Victoria, BC V8S 3R5

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-15 18:05

Additional Comments
Lantern Properties, a professional developer/landlord, bought the property at 1475 Fort Street - presumably after a thorough evaluation of the site, the building, and the relevant zoning bylaws. Now they say they need egregious zoning variances - variances that would ordinarily require rezoning - and removal of several senior members of the urban forest - in order to use the property.

We and other neighbours would welcome the new building if it respected the zoning and did not call for removal of large mature trees, but the proposed zoning violations seriously reduce both the privacy of several neighbours and their ability to enjoy their property. It will also lower their property values.

Lantern Properties knew what they were buying and they have no right to flout the zoning bylaws. Bylaws exist to preserve the character of neighbourhoods and protect the right of property owners to enjoy their property. Minor variances are appropriate where they do not vitiate the purpose of the bylaws, but City Council must do their duty and reject this flagrant disrespect of the bylaws.

Submitter's Name
Dee Hoyano

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
1046 St. Charles Street, Victoria BC V8S3P6

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-15 18:50

Additional Comments
I am writing to voice my concerns and objections to the proposed variances requested by the developer of the property at 1475 Fort Street. I have a number of concerns about the process of neighbourhood engagement as well as the proposed building itself.

Poor Engagement with neighbours

Contrary to the claims of the developer as has been noted in the council meeting notes, notification about this proposal to adjacent neighbours has been poor and incomplete. Our home (1046 St. Charles Street) is directly adjacent to the property on the east side, and is in fact the closest residential home to the current apartment building and the site of the proposed new building. We did not receive any invitation to a community meeting with the developer in the spring of 2020, nor have we received any information about the development proposal from the developer since that time. We learned about this proposal from our neighbours by word of mouth this summer- if they had not informed us, we would have only known about this from the notice recently sent to us by the city.

Variances in building footprint

The granting of the variances will primarily benefit the profitability of the developer with little to no benefit to the neighbourhood or the city as whole in terms of improved housing affordability, or availability for lower income or vulnerable residents.

The developer has removed the proposed units that would be available for below market rent.

It is implausible to believe that BC Housing or Island Health will be able to subsidize units in the new building for the vulnerable people currently living there, or other people in similar situations, given that all of the units will be at market rental rates.
The result of this will be displacement of the vulnerable people living in the units currently, who will not be rehoused in this new development.

Impact on neighbours: the negative impacts of the variances that enlarge the building size and height will result in loss of very large trees, increased shading to neighbours' homes (including ourselves), and loss of privacy due to the increased height and proximity to the property lines.

I ask Council to consider the balance of community benefits and harms in this proposal. A new building can be built on this site without requiring variances, and still provide rental housing.

Impacts of Construction

In addition, the underground parking lot and enlarged foundation will likely damage the root system of the privacy laurel hedge on our property, which is the only means of privacy from both the 1475 Fort property as well as the apartment buildings directly north of our property. This was documented in the arborist report.

Again, please consider the balance of community benefits and harms in this proposal. A new building can be built on this site without requiring variances, and with less negative impact on the neighbourhood.

Submitter's Name
Alan Morton

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
7-949 Pemberton Road

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-16 20:14

Additional Comments
Mayor Helps and Council members,
I am writing to you regarding the proposed development at 1475 Fort Street. As a neighbour living on the adjoining property at 949 Pemberton my concern is the change in density that is projected.
The BC Local Government Act in Part 14 Division 9.498 states
(2) As restrictions on subsection (1), a development variance permit must not vary the following:
(a)the use or density of land from that specified in the bylaw;
also
P14 D7 states:
490(3) A development permit must not
(a)vary the use or density of the land from that permitted in the bylaw except as authorized by section 491 (3) [variation in relation to health, safety or protection of property],
491(3) Conditions and requirements under subsection (2) may vary the use or density of land, but only as they relate to health, safety or protection of property from damage.

Current density zoning is 1.2:1. The developer's plans call for density of 1.42:1, claiming that this density comes in under the allowable 1.6:1 maximum with bonus.
This "bonus" in density is only granted if all parking is underground. The granting of two significant variances is necessary to support the developer's assumed "bonus".
1. Underground parking reduction
• A request of almost 50% reduction in parking, from 47 to 26 spaces.
• Excavation for this insufficient amount of parking will extend to property lines on 3 sides of the property.
2. Site coverage increase from 40% to 47%
• The claim of forty-seven percent site coverage is deceptive, as it includes the square footage of a long driveway used by both 1471 and 1475 Fort Street.
• The fact is, the building footprint will fill nearly the entire lot.
This "house of cards" approach is an attempt to shoehorn, with compounding variances, a large building on a lot that is far too small to support it.
The lot is suitable for rentals and I would support a development that is of a scale and massing appropriate to the site. I would, therefore, ask that Mayor and Council reject this proposal and send it back to the developer.

Alan Morton

Submitter's Name
Christine Morissette

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
13 - 949 Pemberton Road

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-16 23:22

Additional Comments
Dear Mayor and Council:

We are writing as homeowner residents at 949 Pemberton Road, and as adjacent neighbours to the proposed development at 1475 Fort Street. We have signed two previous letters to Council on behalf of our strata, and this is our second letter as individual homeowners. It is with increasing frustration that we write to you again and ask that you deny the development permit for 1475 Fort in its existing form, and send it back for redesign. Lantern Properties continues with the deceit that it has consulted with neighbours most affected by the development, and that we are in support of the plan. This is simply not true: we have never been consulted, and we are alarmed by the scope of the proposed development.

While there are several concerns regarding the development, we clarify here our response to just two of them:
the variances required to develop the property
the removal of a part of the urban forest in our neighbourhood.

The variances requested by the developer are so numerous and extreme that they reflect the need for a rezoning of the property, not a simple development variance permit. Zoning bylaws are meant to ensure safety, preserve privacy of residents, and preserve the character of the neighbourhood. The developer requests a setback reduction to within four feet of the perimeter of our adjacent strata units, which flies in the face of the purpose of zoning bylaws.

There are 11 mature and protected trees that will be removed as part of the proposed development. The urban canopy of the Fort Street neighbourhood is not just an aesthetic extra in a multi use area of single family, apartment and house conversion homes. These trees provide a natural environment near downtown, and a sound and visual barrier close to a major traffic artery. The trees contribute to the character of the neighbourhood, provide an urban wildlife habitat, and contribute to the overall health of the neighbours.

We ask that Mayor and Council start this development process over again, and that it include an honest and transparent consultation with affected neighbours, and a rezoning application where required. Please let us know how you plan to proceed. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Christine Morissette and Chantal Brodeur
#13 - 949 Pemberton Road

Submitter's Name
Bill McKechnie

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
9-949 Pemberton Rd

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-17 4:20

Additional Comments
Dear Mayor and Council.
I am an experienced developer and contractor. I live at 949 Pemberton Rd adjacent to the proposed development at 1475 Fort St.
Upon looking at this proposal, my reaction is to advise the developer to take a long hard look at the economics of refurbishing the existing apartment (circa 1950) instead of tearing it down. The fashion

of the fifties was to build larger living units, and these can now be re-jigged to create a number of smaller apartments brought up to modern standards and code.
I would not be surprised if the return on their investment was similar to demolishing and building new units with the variances as requested.
By approving these rather excessive variances, the community and neighbors pay a huge price in the form of environmental and wildlife impacts, loss of social housing, loss of privacy, impacts to neighborhood character and so on. Clearly this is a building proposal which is an enormous and inappropriate overreach for the lot size and the neighborhood.

Yours truly,
Bill McKechnie [redacted]

Submitter's Name
Barry Willimott

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
1030 St. Charles Street, Victoria, B.C.

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-17 21:48

Additional Comments
Mayor and Council
When we purchased our home at 1030 St. Charles Street 2 and a half years ago, we looked into and checked with the City as to what the bylaws were for 1475 Fort Street, our backyard borders about 80 feet of the subject property. We did this because we were aware that a new building would eventually replace the existing building. We are more than happy to see appropriate new rental stock. We purchased our home based on the information from the City and trusted that the City would adhere to the responsibility of maintaining and upholding these bylaws thereby protecting the trees, respecting all neighbours privacy, and enjoyment of their property. This does not appear to be the case. There are several neighbours that will be negatively impacted and affected by the proposed new building. The developer intends to clear-cut the entire property of all trees which will destroy a number of protected trees which form part of the tree canopy that Victoria neighbourhoods are known for. The developer plans to excavate the entire site to the property lines to facilitate underground parking.
In April 2019 we received an invitation to a meeting on Aril 24, 2019. I still have a copy of this "invitation" and it clearly states in the heading "Information for Immediate Neighbours". We were the only neighbours in attendance and when I asked Peter the Architect why there were not more people present, he did not respond. The plans that we were shown at that time were of a much smaller building and Peter assured us that it was well within "current by-laws" but did need some tweaking in regards to some very minor variances. Peter did visit us and took some pictures from outside of our house, this visit took around 10 to maybe 15 minutes. I questioned him again about variances and he

again stated that the building required some minor variances but “was within current by-laws” provided that they relocate some fencing and garbage bins. This was even further from the truth as even the smaller building still required a number of variances.
We were never advised or notified or advised of any changes to the plan that was shown to us in April, 2019. We did not become aware of these changes until a neighbour spoke with us in July of this year.
I have read the minutes from the Design Review Panel in which Peter states that we have “positive attitude” towards the building. That is not true and how is it possible that he could say that after the plans had changed? This alone should be reason enough for this development to be turned back to the Design Review Panel. No one else in the neighbourhood had been notified of this development until earlier this year and that was by way of word of mouth between neighbours. For the record we feel that we have been misled and have been misquoted by the Architect and Developer in saying that we had a “positive response” to this project. That could not be further from the truth!
We were unable to view Lanterns’ recent September 9th “CALUC” meeting on line as the connection kept failing and the video was delayed along with the sound being garbled. We were unable to ask any questions and we were unable to see any of the questions being asked. We have now had a chance to review this so called “CALUC” meeting and we are shocked at what we saw. In particular Peter stating that everything that has happened thus far is “moot” and Josh Hayes saying that it is necessary for a building needed to be that size in order to make it profitable. Wouldn't a building that is within bylaws would be profitable?
If the developer did their homework when they purchased this property they must have been happy with the bylaws in place at that time or they would not have proceeded with the purchase.
I am hopeful that the Mayor and Council will do “the right thing” by maintaining and respecting the bylaws that are in place. Please send this proposal back to the developer to design a building that fits the size of the property

Submitter's Name
Vanessa Dingley

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter’s Email
[redacted]

Submitter’s Address
#12 -949 Pemberton Road, Victoria, V8S 3R5

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-18 2:47

Additional Comments
Despite many letters from neighbours having been submitted, I remain extremely concerned about the scale of the proposed development at 1475 Fort, adjacent to our townhouse complex. While understanding the urgent need for rental housing in Victoria, I do not think that this should enable developers to disregard existing setback and height requirements; they exist for a reason and should be respected. I appreciate the information given at the recent CALUC webinar, but this does not

reassure me that sufficient changes will be made to make the proposed development acceptable in the neighbourhood. I also remain concerned about the loss of mature trees.

Submitter's Name
Ken and Tamara Bailey

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
10-949 Pemberton Rd

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-18 18:35

Additional Comments
Dear Mayor and Council,
We live at 10-949 Pemberton Rd which is adjacent to the proposed apartment building proposed by Lantern Properties at 1475 Fort St.

As you know, the existing apartment building provides supportive housing for a vulnerable population. Where do these people go if Council approves this project? VIHA will certainly not be able to afford the rents associated with this high end building. Support for this proposal would be a big trade-off in favour of the developer with the losers being those that need much needed supportive housing (as well as surrounding neighbours and the environment.) Where are the City's priorities on this very important issue? What are the social and economic implications of not providing proper housing for vulnerable people in our City? We can see right now in Victoria that these are huge.

Lantern Properties' original design proposal included four affordable housing units. These have been removed from the current design proposal. The developer says that these were excluded as they are not economic for the project. We suggest that the City discuss its interest in supporting affordable and, or, supportive housing with the developer. Maybe the developer has to downsize his profit. Perhaps a renovation of the existing building may be a way of being economic for the developer at the same time as meeting the City's interest in supporting housing for the less prosperous members of our community. (By the way, many developers have upgraded existing buildings for rental purposes in Victoria and have done so successfully).

We are opposed to Lantern's design as proposed. Please send this design back to the developer to come up with a building which is better suited to the lot size, the environment and the community. It is on the record that Lantern Properties is a landholding company and only interested in developing and managing rental properties. Because of this, we can expect that this company will not bring a strata development proposal back to Council, a concern that was brought up by a couple of Councillors at the May 28 CotW meeting. And, in any event, Council can also decline any strata proposal that includes requests for excessive variances such as that proposed by Lantern.

Sincerely Yours,

Ken and Tamara Bailey

Submitter's Name
Carolina Ashe

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
7-949 Pemberton Road

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-18 18:47

Additional Comments
Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors:

For several months, people living adjacent to the proposed development at 1475 Fort Street have worked together, poring over site plans, studying related legislation and guidelines, and reaching out to City staff as well as elected officials.

Throughout this research, I have been struck by two discoveries about this development process:
1. Some who are in a position to influence decision-making have spoken about the impact of this development on neighbours, without consulting with us and often without us even knowing; and
2. The process presents systemic roadblocks to meaningful input from the impacted neighbours.

There are several examples of what I`ve referenced above. For brevity, below are three:
• The developer stated at the January 22, 2020 ADP meeting, that neighbours' feedback on the proposal was "very positive," when, in fact, it has now been established by those neighbours that the opposite was true.
• "…the proposed development would have minimal impacts on adjacent properties in terms of privacy impacts and shading..." (Committee of the Whole Report for May 28: Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00120 for 1475 Fort Street, page 2)
• City staff at the May 28th meeting stated that there would be limited opportunities for windows on the south side of the proposed development to look into neighbouring windows, contradicting a letter from an immediate neighbour that a Councillor was referencing.

This leads to the question: Who gets to determine how neighbours are impacted?

In this context, "impact" is personal, and as such, it cannot be determined by another party, especially by those who stand to gain by projecting the idea that impact will be minimal.

We have inserted ourselves in the process, sending you numerous letters, telling our own story about what the impact of this development will be for us. Thank you for listening, and for your decision at the May 28th CotW meeting, directing the developer to consult with us and respond to our concerns.

This was a good starting point. However, based on past experience, I am still very concerned about how our feedback will be framed, and the weight it will have on decision-making.

I hope that our willingness to be involved citizens is being received in a positive way. I believe that in a democracy, citizens should have a real voice and be able to make a difference in matters that will have an impact on our lives.

My neighbours and I are all busy people, and we could be doing other things with our discretionary time. But this matter is important to us, and we have made it a priority, because:
• We are committed to maintaining the character and livability of this neighbourhood
• We are concerned about preserving the environment which is being threatened through the proposed removal of mature trees
• We love this city and are committed to participating in its overall well-being

I am not opposed to a rental apartment being built on this site, as long as it is built within current zoning bylaws, and respects the neighbours' concerns.

Please believe us when we say that this building proposal, with its multiple and compounded variance requests, poses a threat to our privacy, the character of the neighbourhood, and the environment. We are the ones being most impacted.

Therefore, I am asking you to please reject this application and send it back to the developer for redesign.

Yours truly,
Carolina Ashe

Submitter's Name
Jo Anna Hope

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
15-949 Pemberton Road, Victoria BC

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-18 19:53

Additional Comments
Mayor Helps and Councillors,
I am writing about the application for a 4 story apartment block at 1475 Fort Street. My townhouse complex borders this property. The proposed building cannot fit on this site without clear-cutting all the mature trees that all sand at the perimeter of the lot. I do not see how this can be considered a

good idea when the effects of climate change are literally hitting us in the face. As I write this letter, smoke from wildfires is covering the entire continent.
We know that the elimination of trees has been a major contribution to the climate crisis we are now facing. This has been happening over a long period of time. It may seem that the 1475 Fort Street development is small in comparison to other situations where many more trees have been lost. But humanity has created our climate crisis, one decision at a time – one tree here, a dozen trees there. It all adds up.
The only way we can hope to mitigate the effects of past actions is to start making decisions that will help the planet to heal.
I am asking you to send this application back to the developer with the message to redesign an apartment building that observes the zoning bylaws.
This will save 11 mature trees. It is the right thing to do.
Jo Anna Hope
15-949 Pemberton Road, Victoria

Submitter's Name
Cynthia Pacheco

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
11-949 Pemberton Road Victoria

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-18 21:06

Additional Comments
Mayor and Council,
I am a resident of 11-949 Pemberton Rd writing to you share with you my concerns about the proposed development at 1475 Fort Street. They include:

This proposed building will sit like a colossus on the landscape – 12 feet away from our property line – four stories high towering over our homes – with 18 windows directed our way. Please see the attached pictures. It is far too big for the size of the lot and is not in keeping with the location of the property which is hidden behind and well away from 1471 Fort St on a pan handle lot and surrounded by a number of homes and townhouses.

The mature trees which immeasurably add to the quality of life in the neighbourhood and the City, will all be removed as part of the construction of this development. All these trees are located on the periphery of the property. If the proposed building was more appropriately designed to fit the lot size – there would be no need to impact these beautiful specimens.

The developer says that it is not economic to upgrade the existing building. But there are many, many examples of older buildings/homes in Victoria that have been successfully upgraded and contribute to the apartment stock. Pemberton Rd has many such examples. There is a greed factor here on the part of the developer.

We appeal to Mayor and Council not to support the egregious variances asked for by the developer. Please send this proposal back to the developer to come up with a design that better fits with size of the property and is compatible with the City's environmental, social and economic values. We know that the City can not direct the developer to build a certain type or size of building but does have the power to say no. And by saying no – and sending the developer back to the drawing board - a better outcome for all is likely to be the result.

Thank you.

Cynthia Pacheco

Submitter's Name
Barbara Bolli

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
9-949 Pemberton Rd

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-18 22:39

Additional Comments
Mayor and Council,
I am writing to you with respect to my concerns about Council's ability to give meaningful attention to the review of the proposed development at 1475 Fort St. Please understand that this comment is not intended to be in any way a slight on Councilors' abilities or commitment to their roles. I well understand the myriad pressing matters in front of Council as this time and how these, unquestionably, must be a challenge and a burden in trying to give meaningful and effective consideration to each issue.

As a neighbour directly impacted by a development which requires Councils' approval of egregious variances in order to support the construction of a building which is far too large relative to the property on which it will be erected, your decision is critical to me and to my neighbours. It is critical because of the irreparable harm it will cause to the environmental values of the area and the livability and the character of the neighbourhood. This impact, this erosion of neighbourhood, is not short term, it is permanent.

Right from the start, our collective confidence in the development process associated with this proposal and its ability to support a fair and rational outcome has been severely tested. The project is being proposed by a company which has failed in everyway possible to provide opportunities for meaningful engagement with neighbours, and which has acted with duplicity every step of the way. We have endured a development process turned upside down by Covid 19 causing confusion,

inconsistency and uncertainty for the Rockland Neighbourhood Association (RNA) and neighbours and further undermining our confidence in the review and decision making process for this proposal.

We observed at the May 28 CotW meeting that a number of Councilors had not fully turned their mind to understanding the concerns posed by neighbours about this proposal and to fully appreciate all elements of the project. We heard a number of Councilors say they were concerned about the scope of the variances, but there was, with one exception, no elaboration on what exactly their concerns were. The variances are the core of the issue with this proposal. We observed too the CotW approve the implementation of an on-line process for CALUC meetings during Covid on the morning of June 11 and in the afternoon, endorse the motion - in direct contradiction to the morning motion – to require Lantern Properties to undertake consultation with neighbours in regards to 1475 Fort St! This contradictory decision making left the CALUC process in a fray resulting in City staff providing confusing and contradictory messaging to the RNA and neighbours about the CALUC process.

Given these challenges, what is the key to ensuring that a fair, reasonable and informed decision is made in respect to this proposal? While appreciating Councilors' demanding workloads and pressing community priorities, we believe the only solution is for Council to engage in a dialogue directly with neighbours rather than relying on City staff to answer your questions. Go observe the site from all vantage points to really understand what this proposed structure would look like on this site and to better appreciate our concerns about the many impacts associated with constructing a building of this size on this property. Letter writing and technology-based communication is only going to go so far to help Council understand all the issues and concerns related to this proposal.

It is possible to build a viable and appropriately scaled apartment building here. We are convinced that if Council takes a little time to personally understand all aspects of this proposal it will send it back to the developer to make the changes necessary to support this outcome.

Respectfully,
Barbara Bolli

Submitter's Name
Sandra Jones

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
6-949 Pemberton Road

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-18 23:52

Additional Comments
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a homeowner at 949 Pemberton Road. I am expressing my concern about the proposed development at 1475 Fort Street by Lantern Properties because it will harm the natural environment in the neighbourhood.

I am so concerned that I have taken the time to paint the numerous birds that have been observed to inhabit the mature trees on this lot, in particular the Big Leaf maples. These birds and their ecosystem, of which we as neighbours and the city are a part, is what is at stake. These mature trees provide a substantial canopy and support a sensitive ecosystem from which we all benefit. As we all know, they remove carbon dioxide, reduce storm water, modify temperature and noise, and improve air quality. Research clearly indicates that an urban forest contributes to human health and well-being which is crucial in our era of pandemic and climate change.

We have experienced climate change effects this week with the toxic air from the fires in California, Oregon, and Washington. The mature trees are judiciously sequestering carbon and reducing air pollution by capturing particulate matter.

I hope you will consider:

- Lantern's current design with excessive variances and removal of all mature periphery trees destroys the beauty of our neighbourhood, the privacy of our homes and the habitat of the birds.

- Replacement trees will not make up for what is lost as they will not grow to anything of the size of these mature trees. 1-1 replacement is over an underground parking lot.

- The proposed development plan does not reflect meaningful consideration and input of the people most impacted by their plans. Lantern has not been required to consider ecosystems, or meet standards that reflect the integrity and environmental concerns of the people they affect.

Mayor and Council, I ask that this proposal be denied and sent back for redesign to a building that protects our urban forest and in doing so assists Victoria in climate recovery.

Sincerely,

Sandra Jones
#6-949 Pemberton Road
Victoria, BC
[redacted]

Submitter's Name
Gillian Lawson

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Address
1-949 Pemberton Road, Victoria, BC V8S 3R5

Timestamp of Submission
2020-09-19 1:14

Additional Comments

I'm writing to express my frustration with the process employed to consider this development proposal. You will already be aware of the misgivings our neighbourhood has concerning this development. We have tried every way we can think of to alert city council and city staff to our concerns. We felt encouraged when, in the May 28 CotW meeting, the developer was directed to engage in a CALUC with the neighbourhood. Even with the unusual circumstances of the pandemic, we heard in the June 11 CotW than an in-person CALUC should still be possible and that the developer would be ill-advised to ignore the option of an in-person meeting.
We offered two venues for an in-person CALUC but the developer turned us down and opted for an online version. This venue was a webinar hosted by an urban planner of their choice. So, instead of a properly constituted CALUC meeting moderated by the neighbourhood association, we had an event, hosted by an apologist for the developer, which severely limited our participation. Not only was the developer allowed to dictate the terms of the meeting, they were also permitted to describe it as a "project upgrade meeting" ie, one they were initiating voluntarily. Not so. They wouldn't have done this if City Council had not directed them to do so.
In addition to a developer unwilling to engage, we also appear to be dealing with city staff who are disinterested in our concerns. At the ADP meeting of January 22 2020, a senior planner was in attendance yet, according to the minutes, the meeting failed to address in any way the significant variances asked for by the developer even though that was specifically what the panel was asked to address. At the CotW meeting on May 28, city staff described the impact of the proposed development on adjacent properties as minimal and suggested that the new trees would contribute to the urban canopy, conveniently ignoring the 11 mature trees that would be removed. I'm disappointed that city employees would fail so abysmally at looking out for the concerns of the citizens who pay their salaries.
Where does this leave the average citizen? How can we make our position clear in a process that seems stacked against us? I certainly hope that, when this project returns for further consideration by City Council, we can count on the support of our elected councillors.
Gillian Lawson
Unit 1 – 949 Pemberton Road

Submitter's Name
Russ Scruggs

Submitter's Position
Oppose

Submitter's Email
[redacted]

Submitter's Address
#2 1019 Pemberton Road

Timestamp of Submission

2020-09-19 1:17

Additional Comments
Dear Mayor and Council,

We are writing you as residents at 1019 Pemberton Road; a small townhouse complex adjacent to the proposed redevelopment of the Lantern Properties 1475 Fort Street property.
My wife and I have been signatories to neighbourhood group letters written and sent on to council over the past two months raising concerns and objections to this proposal as it sits with the city; development permit application with variances.
Our concerns are with:
1. the project:
• inclusion of extraordinary variances in order to accommodate the new building; building height, set back reduction.
• a request for almost 50% reduction in parking spaces with the new building – excavation required will extend footprint on 3 sides of the property
• removal of old growth trees both on the developer's property and risk to the root system of trees on neighbouring properties
• displacement of bird populations with the removal of the tree canopy
• privacy of neighbouring properties reduced with the tree removal

2. the process:
• the developer, architect and city planning representatives have stated that the adjacent neighbours have been consulted over the course of the development permit application process and support the project – this is not true.
• while we understand the challenge to host the requested CALUC meeting during this time of COVID protocol, but the on-line meeting held September 9th was poorly moderated and not a truly representative platform whereby neighbouring residents could properly voice and debate this project.
§ we were told that the meeting was recorded, and we encourage council members to listen to the proceeding to better grasp the cumbersome proceedings of the meeting and the concerns the neighbours of the proposed redeveloped property at 1475 Fort Street have.

We ask that Mayor, Council and the Victoria City Planning Department reject the development application (city folder DVP00120) applied for by Lantern Properties; June 12, 2019 and for the company to resubmit an application for redevelopment of the property with a building that maintains the green scape of the neighbourhood and meets the design criteria of the zoning bylaws.

Regards,
Russ and Candace Scruggs

[redacted]

From: Darion Jones [redacted]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 2:39 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Support of 1475 Fort Street

Date: February 12, 2021

I'm a resident of Victoria, and I'm writing to express my support of the project located at **1475 Fort Street, Victoria, B.C.**

I'm supportive of the project as I feel there is a lack of quality rental housing in this city, especially close to downtown and close to transit, shops and restaurants. We must be more pro-active with climate change in all our communities, so a project that is forward thinking by enabling more people to affordably live close to where they work, providing a walkability factor close to the amenities and services they need. Downtown Victoria needs accommodation that supports diversity, and a livable healthy sense of community for workers, residents, and visitors. A strong downtown core is important to the health and sustainable growth of a modern city.

I encourage you to vote in favor of this project.

Thank you,

Darion Jones
3817 Beachview Place
Victoria, BC V8P5N8

February 14, 2021

I'm a resident of Victoria, Fernwood specifically. I'm writing to express my support of the project located at **1475 Fort Street, Victoria, B.C.**

I'm supportive of the project because there is a lack of quality rental housing in Victoria and the current building has come to the end of its life. It would be great to have 28 new market units and 4 new affordable units in this neighbourhood. All neighbourhoods should be accommodating growth and improvement. Diversity leads to vibrant communities and Rockland has limited housing options that do not adequately meet the City's initiative for diverse neighborhoods and sustainable housing. When possible, future growth should be around transit (vehicle and non-vehicle) (existing and proposed) and this project does just that. It seems that the developers of this project have been listening to their neighbours and keeping the historical context of the neighbourhood in mind with their plans and revisions.

I encourage you to vote in favor of this project.

Thank you,

Cathy Hunt
1234 Pembroke Street
Victoria, B.C.
V8T1J8
[redacted]

LANDLORDBC

Vancouver
1210 - 1095 West Pender
Vancouver BC V6E 2M6
[redacted]

Victoria
830B Pembroke Street
Victoria BC V8T 1H9
[redacted]

June 4th, 2021

Mayor and Council
City of Victoria
Sent via email: publichearings@victoria.ca

Subject: 1475 Fort Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing today on behalf of all LandlordBC members, rental housing owners and managers, in support of the application to develop a new purpose-built rental housing building at 1475 Fort Street which would provide long-term rental housing to families of all sizes and ages. This project is the first step to addressing the rental crisis in Victoria by ensuring that families of all sizes are able to obtain adequate housing in a fast-growing community. With the amount of economic uncertainty facing many families in British Columbia due to the COVID-19 pandemic, rental housing will continue to be the only option for many of our residents. Ensuring therefore that we continue to enable new rental housing to be built to meet demand is critical for diverse and robust communities.

As the CEO of Landlord BC, I have been in constant contact with all levels of government, asking them to create an environment that ensures the success of the rental housing sector.

The 1475 Fort Street application will increase the total number of available rental housing units in this neighbourhood from 11 to 32, creating an additional 22 rental units that can be occupied by local families. Housing is an issue that affects all members of the community, so it is important that housing options in a community reflect the make-up of our neighbourhoods.

LandlordBC enthusiastically supports the approval of this rental housing application and encourages Mayor and Council to consider these factors in your decision. Purpose-built market rental housing is one of the most secure forms of long-term rental housing, especially for families looking for affordable places to live. Given the region's overall housing market, LandlordBC anticipates the demand for market rental to increase even more than it has over the last decade. This is an urgent concern that needs to be addressed in a timely manner by all levels of government and I urge City councils to do their part.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

D. Hutniak

David Hutniak
CEO, Landlord BC

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Garry Muir and I am located at 590 Cottyn Way in the beautiful city of Victoria. I have resided in Victoria for well over forty years and have had the privilege of watching the city change and grow throughout these years.

However, the issues of housing affordability and housing availability are ones that I am keenly aware of. I am the owner of three rental buildings in Victoria, one of which is located at, 1913 Duchess Street, less then five minutes away from the location for this application. In addition to owning these rental buildings, I also manage a lot of onsite plumbing work for many major landlords in Victoria.

Between my own buildings and my plumbing portfolio, it is obvious how little vacancy there is across the city. My buildings have long waitlists and the moment there is a vacancy posted there is a line-up of potential tenants at the door. When I am onsite for plumbing work, it is very rare that I am working in a vacant suite.

I'm personally glad to see that the aging rental building on this property is being replaced with a new building that will provide almost three times as many units in this neighbourhood. I hope that council recognizes the importance of these types of investments to build new rental and I hope that council approves this application.

I appreciate your time,

Garry Muir

Hi Lisa – in your deliberations of this project at the CotW meeting tomorrow – " **Appropriately scaled multi-tenanted development**" should be the primary criteria for Council's review of this project. We support redevelopment - but only with a design that is commensurate with the property size and surrounding environs.

Thank you!
Barbara

From: Barbara Bolli
Sent: January 19, 2021 11:27 AM
To: 'mayor@victoria.ca' <mayor@victoria.ca>; 'Lisa Helps (Mayor)' <LHelps@victoria.ca>; 'gyoung@victoria.ca' <gyoung@victoria.ca>; 'stephen.andrew@victoria.ca' <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>; 'bisitt@victoria.ca' <bisitt@victoria.ca>; 'jloveday@victoria.ca' <jloveday@victoria.ca>; 'malto@victoria.ca' <malto@victoria.ca>; 'cthornton-joe@victoria.ca' <cthornton-joe@victoria.ca>; 'sdubow@victoria.ca' <sdubow@victoria.ca>; 'spotts@victoria.ca' <spotts@victoria.ca>
Cc: 'Bob June'
Subject: 1475 Fort Street Development Proposal: Lantern Properties

Mayor and Council

Re: 1475 Fort St

As an owner of a strata home adjacent to the proposed development at 1475 Fort St., I am writing to express my strong concerns about the scale of this development and the egregious variances that are before Council for decision. The proposed structure takes up almost the entire area of the small lot on which it is to be built. What is not built above ground is to be built below ground – that is – the underground parking lot reaches almost corner to corner of the property such that almost all the vegetation on the property must be removed. This includes mature tree species that can never grow again at this site because there will not be adequate soil depth to support the growth of large vegetation.

My questions for Council are these:

1. Is Council's vision for Victoria a landscape of oversized buildings that consume almost every square inch of property available, no different from that found in the downtown core? Is the vision to ensure original landscapes are irreparably changed through the permanent removal of original trees and other vegetation to make way for over-sized development projects? What about all the other values that are lost when this happens – the wildlife who use the vegetation, the character and the charm of a neighbourhood, the sense of place and neighbourhood, the semblance of uniqueness, of privacy? All these are key elements of quality of life – and are irreplaceable.

2. In a Globe and Mail article dated May 30, 2020 Mayor Lisa Helps is quoted as saying she supports allowing "more households to access existing neighbourhoods by permitting

and encouraging appropriately scaled multi-tenanted housing". The question for Mayor and Council is - do these pictures attached here depict "appropriately scaled multi-tenanted housing"? We think not. https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-it-will-take-courage-to-enact-the-post-pandemic-change-we-need-in/

We appeal to Council to take a balanced approach in its deliberation of this proposal. Neighbours support redevelopment of the site but only if the development is commensurate with the lot size and surrounding environs, ensuring that as many of the values that we all hold as a community, are preserved. Please send this proposal back to the developer to propose a development that meets these reasonable criteria.

Thank you.

Barbara Bolli

Mayor and Council,

I would like to thank you for taking the time to discuss this proposal at council. While there are various things that I would like to comment on, I will address only one at this point.

When Councilor Thornton-Joe referred to a picture of the current and proposed view from 1030 St. Charles which was provided by residents and asked staff if it was accurate she was told no. Staff said that they did not have that anything showing that view and that the one shown by Councilor Thornton-Joe was out of scale. That statement is misleading as an almost identical view is provided by the developer in their revised plans posted on the Tracker.

This lends credence to the statement in my previous letter that there is a bias in the planning department and the information given to council is not neutral.

Alan Morton

Dear Mayor and Council,

I live on the east side of 1475 Fort Street, and am writing in regards to the proposed development of a four-story apartment building.

As one of the neighbours living closest to this property, I am very concerned about the impact this development will have on my privacy and enjoyment of my home. The proposal is requesting extreme variances on all four sides. The variance request of 3.05 metres on the east side is less than half of the 6.46 metres that is required in bylaws.

If this variance is approved, the hedge inside my yard will be impacted, according to the April 5, 2019 report from the arborist, Talbot Mackenzie and Associates. I found this out from neighbours, who informed me of the development proposal. Until that time, I had no idea that a development was even under consideration. Lantern Properties did not grant me the courtesy of notifying me about the development or the risk to my privacy hedge.

As you might imagine, in addition to damaging my hedge, a 45 foot tall building with windows and balconies overlooking my home and yard just 10 feet away from the property line will have an impact on my family's quality of life.

City bylaws governing building setbacks exist for a reason. I believe that it is reasonable for my neighbours and I to ask that you direct the developer to design a building that respects those bylaws, thereby respecting the rights of the community to enjoy their homes.

Yours truly,

Dee Hoyano