

Lacey Maxwell

From: Susan Kerschbaumer [REDACTED]
Sent: May 28, 2017 11:27 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Lisa Helps (Mayor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Chris Coleman (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor); Pam Madoff (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); landuse@oaklandsca.com; Geoff Young (Councillor)
Subject: Strong opposition to rezoning application: 2700 Avebury

Re: **Opposition** to the rezoning of 2700 Avebury Ave., Victoria

Applicant: Richard A. Kiers

As the owners (since 2006) of 2718 Avebury, we are **firmly against** the rezoning of 2700 Avebury.

The owner of 2700 Avebury, Earl Large, has been an absentee landlord who has shown **absolute disrespect for the neighbourhood**. He has no commitment to the community – only a monetary investment in making as much money from his property as possible.

This disregard for the neighbours shows up in many ways:

- ignoring the complaints of nearby homeowners
- leaving recycling, huge piles of leaves, trash and even vehicles in the middle of the intersection
- allowing the house and the property to fall into complete disrepair, resulting in safety and environmental issues such as a leaking oil tank
- renting to ill-suited people who unashamedly disrupt the neighbourhood (a group of 7, for instance, in the 2-bedroom house)

In a clear demonstration of his greed and disrespect for the community, the owner is strongly suspected of recently setting fire to and **purposely destroying a Victoria heritage property**: <http://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/owner-of-victoria-heritage-home-gutted-by-fire-faces-arson-fraud-charges>

Given this lack of concern for the community, we do not believe that he should be given any additional ability to affect it.

Thank you,

Susan Kerschbaumer & Adem Tepedelen

Owners, 2718 Avebury Ave., Victoria

Lacey Maxwell

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: May 31, 2017 10:13 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: proposal for rezoning 2700 Avebury Avenue, Victoria

Dear Mayor and Council,

This email serves as a formal acknowledgement of opposition to the proposed rezoning of 2700 Avebury Avenue.

The proponent, Richard Kiers, set a community meeting for yesterday evening at the Oaklands Community Association and failed to attend, while more than a dozen residents living within proximity (100m) of the proposed development were present, all seeking to oppose the project. This failure to demonstrate respect for the concerns of the surrounding community who will be impacted by such a rezoning, demonstrates the proponent's lack of interest in mitigating such impacts, should the project move forward. This presents a risk to the City, should you approve his proposal.

The following were impacts discussed by community members at the meeting, which have resulted in our collective opposition to the proposal. We urge you to consider these impacts, should the proponent move to a formal application:

- environmental:
 - The street is home to 150+ year old Gary oak trees which are under the protection of the City. This property has several Gary oaks which would require removal
 - The proponent has not provided any information on environmental mitigation measures to ensure a "green" project (supply chain, building materials, waste and water management, health and safety, etc.)
- health and safety:
 - Avebury Avenue is a prized location by all of its residents. The street is home to many children, most of whom are under the age of 10 and play daily outside, riding their bicycles and scooters up and down the street. A construction site on a corner lot, at the intersection of two streets is a major risk for children at play, and could result in injury or death of a child should construction personnel not be adequately trained and aware of their surroundings. Projects like this generally take a minimum of a year, and many, longer. This increases the health and safety risks of both children and residents, particularly given residential construction undergoes less stringent health and safety procedures and regulations than commercial.
 - Avebury Avenue is home to several 100+ year old houses, including our own residence from 1914, with original single pane windows. The proponent is proposing significant blasting given at least half of the property is covered in bedrock. This blasting poses serious risk to historic homes on the street, in addition to people.
 - Noise and dust from construction can pose serious health impacts on the elderly and children on the street (which make up the majority of the street's residents)

- social/community
 - living in a construction zone, particularly on a corner lot at an important intersection for the street, changes the dynamic and culture of a community for the duration of the construction period. Children will not be able to play outside without supervision, people will not be able to walk their normal exercise routes, those located most closely will not be able to enjoy time in their yards given the noise of construction, blasting, and dust.
 - An increase in density, while important for community vibrancy, does not “fit” with this street or neighbourhood of single family homes. From a city planning perspective, Avebury Avenue, with its older homes, does not have the same parking options as other streets (most houses do not have garages), with residents mainly utilizing street parking. By placing two homes, likely with several suites each, on this one lot, residents are looking at a potential of 4 to 6 additional residents with potentially 2 vehicles each (12 additional vehicles) parking in a 100m area. There is simply not room on the street for this level of density.

The impacts listed above are mere highlights of our community’s concern. The risks they pose to us and to the City far outweigh any minimal benefits that could be derived from such a proposal. Mr. Keir’s has demonstrated a lack of respect for and interest in community concerns or lives. His interest, as a developer, is profit. We implore the City to reject this proposal.

Warm regards,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the sender.

Monica Dhawan

From: Susan Kerschbaumer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2019 7:17 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Land Use
Subject: Opposition to proposed rezoning - 2700 Avebury Ave.

Re: **Opposition** to the rezoning of 2700 Avebury Ave., Victoria

Applicant: Kim Colpman

As the owners (since 2006) of 2718 Avebury, we are **firmly against** the rezoning of 2700 Avebury.

The owners of 2700 Avebury have been absentee landlords who have shown **absolute disrespect for the neighbourhood**. They have no commitment to the community – only a monetary investment in making as much money from their property as possible.

This disregard for the neighbours shows up in many ways:

- ignoring the complaints of nearby homeowners
- leaving recycling, huge piles of leaves, trash and even vehicles in the middle of the intersection
- allowing the house and the property to fall into complete disrepair, resulting in safety and environmental issues such as a leaking oil tank
- renting to ill-suited people who unashamedly disrupt the neighbourhood (a group of 7, for instance, in the 2-bedroom house)

Rather than commitment, they demonstrate greed and total disrespect for the neighbourhood.

Given this lack of concern for the community, we do not believe that they should be given any additional ability to affect it.

Thank you,

Susan Kerschbaumer & Adem Tepedelen

Owners, 2718 Avebury Ave., Victoria

Monica Dhawan

From: Bill Moffatt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 10:12 AM
To: Land Use
Cc: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Re: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Attention: David Angus

David,

We received the recent notice of meeting on April 29th. As you are aware, there have been several attempts and iterations by the (numbered company owner's various "representatives") to achieve small lot rezoning of the property. Adjacent neighbours have repeatedly voiced opposition to this and such opposition is well documented and on record with the Oaklands Land Use Committee and the City of Victoria.

For additional perspective, please consider that fact that this stretch of Kings Road is approximately 95 meters in length. Originally, there were four households with street frontage. Subsequently, two additional (full size lots) were subdivided and built upon, yielding two additional households. Subsequent and/or concurrently, two of the households also created rental suites. Thus, density on this 95 meter corridor has increased from the original four households, to the present eight. (in other words the density has doubled/increased by 100%). There are approximately twelve vehicles associated with these households.

In spite of the vigorous and consistent neighbourhood opposition, these attempts continue - with new representative "personnel" apparently recruited to attempt to yield a different result.

Rest assured that the adjacent neighbours remain adamant that our collective 95 meters of roadway has done it's share of "densification" and yet another residence is neither warranted nor desired.

We appreciate the Land Use Committee's past and present service and assistance and we will see you (again) on April 29th.

Regards, Bill and Joanne Moffatt 1336 Kings Rd.

Ed and Jen Rebner

From: "Bill Moffatt" [REDACTED]
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 1:05 PM
To: "Ed and Jennifer Rebner" [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: 2700 Avebury Proposal

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Alan Reyno [REDACTED]
Date: Apr 24, 2019 1:01 PM
Subject: Fwd: 2700 Avebury Proposal
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Alan

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alan Reyno [REDACTED]
Date: April 15, 2019 at 11:12:21 PM PDT
To: Kimberley Colpman [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 2700 Avebury Proposal

Hi Kim,

Thanks for the info. Unfortunately, I must rescind my support for this development. After talking to my neighbours, I remembered that when we last met with Richard, he said if the proposal was not approved, the owner would tear down the existing house and build one larger house. Why is this not happening? Why is this being proposed again when, clearly, the neighbours are not in support?

Alan

On Apr 13, 2019, at 4:41 PM, Kimberley Colpman [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Alan,

Thanks for taking the time to review the proposed development plans for 2700 Avebury. You had asked me to send you these electronically so your wife could have a look also - sorry for the delay in getting these to you. I had made some minor changes to the exterior finishes to make the house 'prettier' :) These drawings show those changes. There is nothing new with respect to siting, density, height and so on, as we reviewed.

I appreciate you signing in support of the application, thank

you! If you have any questions or further comments, just give me a shout.

Enjoy the weekend :)

Kim

Kim Colpman!

c:

<2019 04 11 - 2700 AVEBURY Site Plan - for Rezoning HARTMANN.pdf>

<2019 04 11 - 2700 AVEBURY Floors Plans - for Rezoning HARTMANN.pdf>

<2019 04 11 - 2700 AVEBURY Elevations - for Rezoning HARTMANN.pdf>

Monica Dhawan

From: Stephanie Garrett <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2019 7:31 PM
To: Ben Isitt (Councillor); Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Email to Mayor and Council RE: proposal for rezoning 2700 Avebury Avenue, Victoria

Dear Mayor and Council,

Further to the history of correspondence found below, we would like to express our ongoing and grave concerns regarding the proposed subdivision and development at 2700 Avebury Avenue.

We attended an Oaklands Community meeting last week which felt more like a real estate session for prospective home buyers. The developer who spoke on behalf of the owner shared the design and interior of the home, however none of the social, health, environmental or rights impacts and associated mitigation measures were addressed. I kindly request the Mayor and Council to refer to our concerns which are outlined in the correspondence below.

For clarification, we are a family who were forced to leave Vancouver because we could no longer afford to live there. We bought a 1914 home on Avebury Avenue, on a street full of families with young children, because we wanted our kids to grow up riding their bikes on the street like we did. We could only afford to purchase our home because of the legal tenanted suite in the basement. We provide affordable rent to young people just starting out and students because we want to be a part of the housing solution in the city. We encourage growth, affordable housing and a vibrant city. However, we are for sustainable and thoughtful city planning that starts by increasing density in the downtown core, followed by the main corridors of the city and outward from there. The argument that by somehow subdividing this lot and putting a new, 1 million dollar home on the piece of land will somehow create more benefit than negative impact, is inaccurate. That is not affordable house or responsible city planning.

While city bylaws allow for some degree of protection, we must also take into account the motivations of those seeking permits to subdivide and build. The proponent did not attend three previous community meetings, while all residents did. We only know that the proponent silently attended this meeting because some residents pointed him out, arms crossed and disinterested in the conversation, refusing to speak or look anyone in the eye. His silence spoke volumes. He did not field questions, respond to concerns or demonstrate any interest in the community he is benefiting from financially. This is due to the fact that he does not live on the lot he proposes to expand upon, and because his sole interest is economic gain. This is neither in the interest of the residents surrounding this property, or the city that seeks a sustainable, responsible and affordable solution to the housing issues and growth in the city.

Until the City has a strong planning process in place to address parking, traffic, protection provisions for heritage homes from bedrock blasting, and a larger strategic plan for building up neighbourhoods that are comprised of exclusively single family dwellings (many that are already contributing with additional suites) we urge you to examine this proposal carefully and consider other options for achieving your mandate. This project should not be approved, it has not demonstrated any mitigation planning for the numerous high-probability, high risk impacts.

Regards,

Stephanie Garrett and Ryan Kappmeier

On Jun 1, 2017, at 7:14 AM, Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca> wrote:

Thank you for writing and sharing your concerns, Stephanie and Ryan.

Ben

Ben Isitt
Victoria City Councillor and CRD Director
Email. bisitt@victoria.ca / Tel. 250.882.9302
Web. www.BenIsitt.ca

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: May 31, 2017 11:45 AM
To: Stephanie Garrett
Cc: Ryan Kappmeier
Subject: Email to Mayor and Council RE: proposal for rezoning 2700 Avebury Avenue, Victoria

Dear Stephanie and Ryan,

Thank you for your email and regarding a proposed development at 2700 Avebury Avenue. Your email has been shared with Council and also attached to the correspondence file for this address.

At this time, an application for this address has not yet been received by the City of Victoria but we are aware that this proposal is currently in the Community Association Land Use Committee consultation phase, which is considered the early stages of public consultation. The applicant will still need to provide feedback to the City on how their application responds and what revisions were made to address community concerns prior to the application going to Council at a Committee of the Whole meeting. Council will then be able to assess the various comments and determine how well or if the application has addressed them. Staff will also provide information for Council's consideration in regards to how the application aligns with existing City of Victoria policies that guide development. Mayor and Council will also receive at that time any correspondence from the public specific to the application, and your email will be shared with them again at that time.

Once an application is received by the City of Victoria more information on the application will also be available on the City of Victoria's Development Tracker App<<http://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/residents/planning-development/development-tracker.html>>. A Planner from the City of Victoria will be assigned to the file once an application is submitted and will be involved with the review process, including alignment with existing City of Victoria policies.

Thank you very much for taking the time to share your thoughts with Mayor and Council and the City of Victoria. I hope that you will continue to stay engaged on City of Victoria matters. If you are interested in staying up-to-date on City of Victoria news, events, and opportunities for public input subscribe to the City's bi-weekly newsletter<<http://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/community/e-newsletter.html>>, visit the City of

Victoria's website<<http://www.victoria.ca/EN/index.html>>, or download the City's ConnectVictoria App<<http://www.victoria.ca/EN/meta/news/news-archives/2016-archive/connectvictoria-app-available-for-download-now.html>>. Mayor Helps also holds regular Community Drop In sessions<<http://www.victoria.ca/EN/main/city/mayor-council-committees/mayor-lisa-helps/mayors-community-drop-in.html>> which are open to all members of the public.

Sincerely,

Lacey Maxwell
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor / City Manager's Office
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

[Description: Description: [cid:image001.gif@01CF3C88.FC1AFE40](#)]<<http://www.victoria.ca/>>

[Description: Description: [cid:image003.gif@01CF3C88.FC1AFE40](#)]<<https://www.facebook.com/CityofVictoriaPage>>

[Description: Description: [cid:image004.gif@01CF3C88.FC1AFE40](#)]<<https://twitter.com/cityofvictoria>>

[Description: Description: [cid:image005.gif@01CF3C88.FC1AFE40](#)]<<http://www.linkedin.com/company/city-of-victoria-bc?trk=biz-companies-cym>>

From: Stephanie Garrett [REDACTED]
Sent: May 31, 2017 10:13 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: Ryan Kappmeier [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: proposal for rezoning 2700 Avebury Avenue, Victoria

Dear Mayor and Council,

This email serves as a formal acknowledgement of opposition to the proposed rezoning of 2700 Avebury Avenue.

The proponent, Richard Kiers, set a community meeting for yesterday evening at the Oaklands Community Association and failed to attend, while more than a dozen residents living within proximity (100m) of the proposed development were present, all seeking to oppose the project. This failure to demonstrate respect for the concerns of the surrounding community who will be impacted by such a rezoning, demonstrates the proponent's lack of interest in mitigating such

impacts, should the project move forward. This presents a risk to the City, should you approve his proposal.

The following were impacts discussed by community members at the meeting, which have resulted in our collective opposition to the proposal. We urge you to consider these impacts, should the proponent move to a formal application:

- * environmental:

- * The street is home to 150+ year old Gary oak trees which are under the protection of the City. This property has several Gary oaks which would require removal

- * The proponent has not provided any information on environmental mitigation measures to ensure a “green” project (supply chain, building materials, waste and water management, health and safety, etc.)

- * health and safety:

- * Avebury Avenue is a prized location by all of its residents. The street is home to many children, most of whom are under the age of 10 and play daily outside, riding their bicycles and scooters up and down the street. A construction site on a corner lot, at the intersection of two streets is a major risk for children at play, and could result in injury or death of a child should construction personnel not be adequately trained and aware of their surroundings. Projects like this generally take a minimum of a year, and many, longer. This increases the health and safety risks of both children and residents, particularly given residential construction undergoes less stringent health and safety procedures and regulations than commercial.

- * Avebury Avenue is home to several 100+ year old houses, including our own residence from 1914, with original single pane windows. The proponent is proposing significant blasting given at least half of the property is covered in bedrock. This blasting poses serious risk to historic homes on the street, in addition to people.

- * Noise and dust from construction can pose serious health impacts on the elderly and children on the street (which make up the majority of the street’s residents)

- * social/community

- * living in a construction zone, particularly on a corner lot at an important intersection for the street, changes the dynamic and culture of a community for the duration of the construction period. Children will not be able to play outside without supervision, people will not be able to walk their normal exercise routes, those located most closely will not be able to enjoy time in their yards given the noise of construction, blasting, and dust.

- * An increase in density, while important for community vibrancy, does not “fit” with this street or neighbourhood of single family homes. From a city planning perspective, Avebury Avenue, with its older homes, does not have the same parking options as other streets (most houses do not have garages), with residents mainly utilizing street parking. By placing two homes, likely with several suites each, on this one lot, residents are looking at a potential of 4 to 6 additional residents with potentially 2 vehicles each (12 additional vehicles) parking in a 100m area. There is simply not room on the street for this level of density.

The impacts listed above are mere highlights of our community’s concern. The risks they pose to

us and to the City far outweigh any minimal benefits that could be derived from such a proposal. Mr. Keir's has demonstrated a lack of respect for and interest in community concerns or lives. His interest, as a developer, is profit. We implore the City to reject this proposal.

Warm regards,

Stephanie Garrett and Ryan Kappmeier



image002.png><image003.gif><image004.gif><image005.gif>

Lucas De Amaral

From: Jean Anne Wightman [REDACTED]
Sent: May 16, 2019 10:55 AM
To: Councillors
Subject: Small Lot at 2700 Avebury and Housing Affordability and Affordability

Mayor and Council, City of Victoria

Below is an in-depth article from May 7th 2019 Globe and Mail about housing availability and affordability. It points out how our community approach to these problems can be improved.

I am writing to you about yet another approach to the Oaklands Community for a small lot subdivision at 2700 Avebury presented to the Community Association on April 29th.

Problems I see:

1. My neighbours, the property immediately north of 2700, lose liveability and enjoyment of their property from blocked south sun exposure and immediate adjacency to that residence's outdoor living area. **They are entitled to the same enjoyment and privacy of their property as all lots not adjacent to corner lots.** This right has first priority. It is not fair to impose any additional density on them.

2. Zoning currently in place for Oaklands has ample provision for increasing housing in Oaklands through allowing secondary suites, garden suites, and the construction of vastly larger principal buildings than now exist, that accommodate more people. The proposed small lot is irrelevant in improving Oakland's contribution to increased housing availability and affordability in the City. The proposed small lot simply supplies ONE additional "single family dwelling" in the cause of commodity/investment real estate. As David Suzuki says, it's not real estate, it's my home!

3. I am concerned that the April 29th Community Meeting meeting results be construed as neighbourhood support. These points did not come across clearly at the meeting, lost in a slew of red herrings. The Community Association is not a democratic forum. The discussion was shaped by responses of neighbours not immediately affected by the proposal. Serious impacts on the immediate neighbour were scarcely mentioned. One person at the meeting actually had the impression they could apply to 'small lot' their own non-corner lot!

I don't believe this project has sufficient merit and support that would warrant it being advanced to a formal application. The developer has repeatedly imposed on our time with presentations to community meetings presenting the proposal in different guises.

Jean Anne Wightman
2713 Avebury Avenue
Victoria BC

Canada's housing market – built on faulty assumptions – is falling down on affordability

Jennifer Keesmaat

Contributed to The Globe and Mail

Published May 7, 2019 Updated 2 hours ago

[62 Comments](#)

Jennifer Keesmaat is the chief executive officer of the Keesmaat Group, working with corporate and political leaders to advance change in cities around the world. She is the former chief planner of Toronto.

Over the past 20 years, Toronto and Vancouver – two of Canada's three most populous cities – have built 400,000 homes between them. That's an enviable number for any city in North America seeking to increase supply, a reliable tactic for relieving a housing crisis.

But for its efforts, Toronto and Vancouver continue to top international rankings of unaffordable cities. That highlights a cold reality: We cannot build our way out of this affordability crisis.

We're not alone. In cities such as [Cairo](#), Sydney and New York, real estate has become hyper-commodified. Housing is now seen as a matter of selling, not dwelling, as made plain by [Wall Street's growing interest](#) in the business of housing. And as a result, people cannot afford shelter – even though a significant number of housing units in those very same cities remain wholly unoccupied.

The fundamentals of Canada's housing system are broken. And while there is a way forward that's within reach, it will require us to reject many tightly held 21st-century assumptions about the housing economy. One is that housing affordability can be addressed by increasing supply alone. Where city planners once used population-growth forecasts to assess the need for new housing supply, assuming that each home would become a place for those people to build a life and contribute to a neighbourhood, new supply is being gobbled up by investors seeking a place to park capital. As a result, escalating prices have been delinked from how much people make, creating obstacles for the kinds of people who are essential to communities, such as teachers and tradespeople, to own a home. Just look at the gap in Toronto: 14,771 new dwellings came onto the market last year which, by traditional planning measures, is just shy of the needs for anticipated population growth of 41,000 annually – but according to the most recent census, the average family made \$82,859, while the Canadian Real Estate Association found the average price of a home in Toronto as of February was \$767,800.

[Character homes still coming down in Vancouver despite new incentives program, report shows](#)

[Toronto home sales surge in April, climb near 17 per cent from last year's sluggish level](#)

[Hopes for a 'soft landing, not crash landing' for housing prices](#)

Another question worth asking is why governments remain the primary proponents of private home ownership, as has been the case since the Second World War. Governments control the market's levers, through interventions like infrastructure spending, financial mechanisms like adjusting interest rates and lending rules, and through organizations that facilitate home financing such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in the United States, and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation here.

But, not all interventions are good. In its recent budget, the federal government announced it would assist with down payments for first-time homebuyers – thereby subsidizing an already hot market, and arguably further driving up the cost of housing – which only plays into the commodification problem. After tightening lending rules to mitigate the risk of a market collapse from borrowers being unable to repay loans, the government is just providing more access and more reasons for Canadians to take on debt.

And then there's the assumption that home ownership is inherently more stable than rental. Yes, baby boomers lived that experience, enjoying stability and an uplift in value that turned homes into nest eggs later in life. But it's unlikely that these circumstances will materialize now, given the high cost of housing today in relation to wages. Rental housing, meanwhile, is only unstable because we have not focused on delivering

rental as a real, long-term housing choice. In cities such as Vancouver and Toronto, high-quality, purpose-built rental housing has been a low priority over the past several decades and left to the market to figure out. Real-estate investors, meanwhile, buy units because of low vacancy and high demand, and then rent them out according to what the market can deliver, thus stoking this commodification cycle.

These hoary assumptions distract from the real goal: responsive public policy that delivers access to good, stable housing for all. Political leaders must focus on solutions that include high-quality, purpose-built, affordable rental units, rather than forcing the square peg of postwar mentalities around housing into the round hole of today's housing climate. For an example, we can look to western European countries such as Vienna and Amsterdam, which require all new development to have a three-way split of social, affordable and rent-controlled, and market or ownership housing. With that simple switch in policy, these cities are genuinely making housing more accessible.

Monica Dhawan

From: Eddie Piotrowicz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2019 5:02 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Letter re: Lot subdivision and housing development at 2700 Avebury

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

I am writing in support of the small lot development at 2700 Avebury. I am very conscious of the need for housing in Victoria.

At the same time, I support the developer's request for a variance to frontage requirements of the Subdivision Servicing Bylaw in support of the Oaklands Rise Woonerf adaptation on the Kings Road People Priority Greenway (PPG); research supports that this model can increase safety, reduce non-local (cut-through) traffic and is, therefore, a response to concerns expressed by some neighbours of this development who want to retain a child and family friendly environment.

Sincerely,
Eddie Piotrowicz
1277 Kings Rd
Victoria BC

Monica Dhawan

From: Pat Piotrowicz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2019 5:00 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Letter re: Lot subdivision and housing development at 2700 Avebury

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

I am writing in support of the small lot development at 2700 Avebury. I am very conscious of the need for housing in Victoria.

At the same time, I support the developer's request for a variance to frontage requirements of the Subdivision Servicing Bylaw in support of the Oaklands Rise Woonerf adaptation on the Kings Road People Priority Greenway (PPG); research supports that this model can increase safety, reduce non-local (cut-through) traffic and is, therefore, a response to concerns expressed by some neighbours of this development who want to retain a child and family friendly environment.

Sincerely,
Pat Piotrowicz
1277 Kings Rd
Victoria BC

Monica Dhawan

From: Bill Moffatt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 11:41 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Chelsea Medd; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Dear Mayor and Council,

Further to my email of April 18th (please see below), it is noted that a rezoning application has, indeed, come forward from the numbered company owner's latest representative. Having reviewed the accompanying submission and documentation, (not surprisingly) there are several representations made that are erroneous:

West neighbour: "There are no privacy issues for this neighbour". A patently false statement. In fact, the wall of the proposed dwelling (1.5 meters from the property line) would obscure light, privacy, and quiet enjoyment of the property in it's current state. It would be an extremely aggressive intervention and greatly undermine quality of life for the neighbouring western household.

Northern neighbour: proposed mitigations really do little to offset the detrimentally impacted northern household. These long term residents deserve the right to preserve sunlight, quiet, and privacy in order for them to continue to enjoy their respective quality of neighbourhood life.

The landscape proposal is also contentious, as it is likely several of the mature Garry Oaks would not survive construction or displacement/relocation.

Perhaps the most contentious and erroneous statement contained in the document, concerns the comments regarding the 8 neighbours in closest proximity. The approach to neighbours by the developer's representative involved subterfuge and misdirection. Once the neighbours were able to collectively and objectively assess the proposal, it was deemed by all, (as stated below) that this portion of Kings Rd. has "densified" more than sufficiently.

Of more concern, is the statement "I have continued to to talk to others throughout the neighbourhood and the community meeting: many are supportive of the application". This is nonsense. The only people "supportive" of the application at the Community Meeting were from well outside of the neighbourhood (as far away as Mount Douglas in fact) and/or likely affiliated with the developer/owner in some capacity. One wonders how these "outsiders" were even aware off the meeting? (The Oaklands Land Use minutes are also being amended to better reflect the vociferous opposition from the "neighbours that matter").

While not related to this proposal, in terms of social commentary this is a classic case of a developer (yes, the numbered company owner is a developer) purchasing a property (albeit a number of years ago) by directly approaching a long term senior citizen resident in need of the cash, purchasing for below market value, earning an annuity of rental income while the property appreciates, then attempting to maximize profit through the proposed rezoning and subdivision. There is no corporate social responsibility or philanthropic aspect to this proposal. It is pure, unbridled profit.

We in the neighbourhood certainly expect that Mayor and Council respond accordingly.

Thank you all for your attention and service.

Bill and Joanne Moffatt
1336 Kings Rd.

Regards, Bill

From: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Sent: April 18, 2019 8:00 PM
To: 'Bill Moffatt'
Subject: Mayor and Council email RE: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Dear Bill and Joanne,

Thank you for your email regarding a development application at 2700 Avebury Avenue, it has been shared with Mayor and Council.

I have filed your email to be shared with Mayor and Council again, should an application be received and proceed to a Committee of the Whole Meeting for their consideration.

Thank you for sharing your thoughts with Mayor, Council and the City of Victoria.

Sincerely,

Monica Dhawan
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor / City Manager's Office
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6



From: Bill Moffatt [mailto:]
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 10:12 AM
To: Land Use <Landuse@Oaklandsca.com>
Cc: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Attention: David Angus

David,

We received the recent notice of meeting on April 29th. As you are aware, there have been several attempts and iterations by the (numbered company owner's various "representatives") to achieve small lot rezoning of the property. Adjacent neighbours have repeatedly voiced opposition to this and such opposition is well documented and on record with the Oaklands Land Use Committee and the City of Victoria.

For additional perspective, please consider that fact that this stretch of Kings Road is approximately 95 meters in length. Originally, there were four households with street frontage. Subsequently, two additional (full size lots) were subdivided and built upon, yielding two additional households. Subsequent and/or concurrently, two of the households also created rental suites. Thus, density on this 95 meter corridor has increased from the original four households, to the present eight. (in other words the density has doubled/increased by 100%). There are approximately twelve vehicles associated with these households.

In spite of the vigorous and consistent neighbourhood opposition, these attempts continue - with new representative "personnel" apparently recruited to attempt to yield a different result.

Rest assured that the adjacent neighbours remain adamant that our collective 95 meters of roadway has done it's share of "densification" and yet another residence is neither warranted nor desired.

We appreciate the Land Use Committee's past and present service and assistance and we will see you (again) on April 29th.

Regards, Bill and Joanne Moffatt 1336 Kings Rd.

Heather McIntyre

From: John James O'Brien [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2019 10:15 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Rise Oaklands
Subject: Project at 2700 Avebury

Dear Mayor Helps and Members of Victoria City Council:

I am writing in support of the small lot development at 2700 Avebury, a corner lot in which the rear portion can provide in-fill housing along the Kings Road frontage, similar to the development of an adjacent property some years ago.

The proposed development illustrates how density can be accommodated while the almost rural character of the neighbourhood is preserved through a variance from the Subdivision Servicing Bylaw requirement to install 30 feet of sidewalk to nowhere.

The project is located on the Council supported Oaklands Rise Woonerf and the designated People Priority Greenway (PPG) of Kings Road. Research reveals that the woonerf sub-set of the Shared Space model can increase safety, de-incentivize non-local (cut-through) traffic and in this case, serve as a means to alleviate concerns expressed by some neighbours of this development who want to retain a child and family friendly environment.

So do we all—and the woonerf adaptation is a great way to do it.

On behalf of the 67 neighbourhood petitioners in 2017, and the nearly 150 now on our information list, I thank Council for the unanimous approval granted in 2017, again in 2018, pre and post election.

We ask that you continue support by approving the developer's request including a variance to the sidewalk installation typically required by the Subdivision Servicing Bylaw, as Council has already done in relation to the in-fill housing created at 2695 Capital Heights.

We need housing and places for community. This is a chance to bring both needs together.

Respectfully,

John O'Brien
Co-lead, Oaklands Rise Woonerf Planning Group
Member, Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee
Owner, 1262 Kings Road

Heather McIntyre

From: Robin Drader [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 2:17 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Re Lot Subdivision and Housing Development at 2700 Avebury

Dear Victoria Mayor and council,

I am writing in support of the small lot development at 2700 Avebury. I am very conscious of the need for housing in Victoria and the proposed new home supports this objective in a fitting and thoughtful design. It will fit seamlessly into our community.

At the same time, I fully support the developer's request for a variance to frontage requirements in support of the Oaklands Rise Woonerf adaptation on the Kings Road People Priority Greenway (PPG), which I believe supports a child and family friendly environment.

Sincerely,
Robin Drader
1285 Kings Road
Victoria, V8T 1X8

Heather McIntyre

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2019 11:55 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: mall lot development 2700 Averbury

Dear Mayor Helps and Council,

I am writing in support of the small lot development at 2700 Avebury Avenue; Victoria is much in need of housing and this development aids in addressing this need.

Also, I will support the developer's request for a frontage variance to the Subdivision Servicing Bylaw. Such a variance supports the Oaklands Rise Woonerf concept for the Kings Rd. People Priority Greenway which, I am sure you are now aware, creates a safe, people friendly neighbourhood environment.

Sincerely,
Russ Smith
1285 Kings Rd.

Heather McIntyre

From: EDWARD REBNER [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 22, 2019 2:27 PM
To: Ben Isitt (Councillor); Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1 - S2

Dear Ben Isitt and Mayor and Council:

Our friends and neighbours Bill and Joanne Moffat have already emailed you about this proposed development on both of our borders. We (Ed and Jennifer Rebner - 2710 Avebury) are the northern neighbour and the total length of our lot borders 2700 Avebury. As you are already aware this has been an ongoing process where the developer hires a different project manager every few years to try to get this lot rezoned. Their main goal is to build a new home in the back yard of the present home and then tear down the existing dwelling and build another large home in that area.

We bought our home 2710 Avebury Avenue in 1978 and chose it specifically because it was in an established area. If this proposal was approved, it would be life changing for our family: We would lose nearly all our sunlight, privacy and use of our back yard. We don't feel we should be penalized because we bought next door to a corner lot with an established home on it. Our lot is the exact same size as 2700 and it is ideal for a single family dwelling. To squeeze two homes in this area would be catastrophic for our way of life, neighbourhood and infrastructure surrounding this area. There is already sizeable expansion/density on this smaller than normal block of Kings Road.

We have been very diligent and have poled all the adjacent neighbours and most importantly the 8 immediate neighbours and we have a 100% majority of "No" to this proposed development. All these signed papers are registered at City Hall and were delivered in person by Ed Rebner to Chelsea Medd on April 30, 2019. There is no support in our area at all for this development. We have been to the neighbourhood meetings about 4 times in large numbers to state our opposition. The developer has no interest in affordable housing or our neighbourhood at all - he just wants to make the most money possible on a lot by building first one new home and then removing the existing home and building another new house. He has not been upfront about this at all in this application, but we all heard the project manager from 2 years ago, Richard Kiers, state that fact and we have numerous witnesses.

Please take all of these facts into account - we are counting on you to preserve our neighbourhood and honor the wishes of all the immediate neighbours who oppose this development. Please note that not only have the 8 letters been submitted but also other letters from concerned neighbours surrounding the 8 who vehemently oppose this development as well.

Thank you for your serious consideration to this matter, Sincerely, Ed and Jennifer Rebner 2710 Avebury
Avenue [REDACTED]

Heather McIntyre

From: Robert Tornack [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 7:51 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: 2700 Avebury Proposal

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors:

The small lot development at 2700 Avebury offers opportunity to add to housing stock while demonstrating Council's commitment to citizen led initiatives such as the Oaklands Rise Woonerf, the sidewalk-free people priority greenway of Kings Road from Oaklands Park to Capital Heights (and beyond) on which the proposed in-fill project is located.

It is important that development be seen holistically and in context beyond the immediate location. In this case, the project mirrors and, it is important that Council stand behind its commitment to give neighbourhoods greater say in their evolution. Housing is needed. And in-fill housing such as is proposed in this case can fit sensitively into surroundings.

In this case, in addition to the design of the building, frontage improvements can enhance and extend the concept first presented to Council with a petition to halt a sidewalk to be imposed where not wanted and a presentation requesting Council approval of a moratorium on sidewalk installation along the set of sidewalk-free streets locally known as the Oaklands Rise Woonerf.

In granting approval for this in-fill housing project, I ask that you approve a variance to the Subdivision Servicing Bylaw requirement for a sidewalk in favour of frontage improvements in line with the concept approved by Council in the Fall of 2017 and most recently in December of 2018.

Sincerely,

Robert Tornack
Chair, Oaklands Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee
Co-Lead, Oaklands Rise Woonerf
Owner, 2708 Mt. Stephen Ave

Lucas De Amaral

From: Adem Tepedelen [REDACTED]
Sent: July 31, 2019 9:53 PM
To: Chelsea Medd
Cc: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: REZ00700 - 2700 Avebury Ave

Dear Ms. Medd-

I live at 2718 Avebury Ave, two houses away from this proposed rezoning project. I saw that this will go before council sometime in the near future. I intend to attend that council meeting and oppose it when it does. In the meantime, I wanted to contact you and, for the record, voice my objection to this proposed rezoning.

My wife and son and I have lived in our house (which we own) for going on 14 years and are actively involved in our neighbourhood. We know most people on our block by first name. The house on the lot that is up for rezoning has been occupied by a succession of renters, most of whom did little or no maintenance regarding the yard or general upkeep. To my knowledge, I have never met the owners. It's my understanding that they are absentee landlords, and their property reflects it. At one point two years ago they had a family of *eight* (six children under 11!) living in the house. Needless to say there were constant noise complaints from neighbours in every direction for the year they rented it. When the family departed, they left behind a tattered trampoline that eventually just slowly disintegrated into tatters.

The house, as a result of longterm negligence, is (and has always been) in shabby condition and the back yard is frequently filled with junk left over from the various renters who have come and gone. The owners of this property are not good community members. Allowing them to squeeze another house on their property would simply provide them with another source of revenue, with no vested interest in the actual space it occupies. It would be another building and yard for them to neglect.

The owners have literally been trying for years to get us and their direct neighbours to sign off on this rezoning plan in various different versions, and everyone has remained in opposition and will continue to. Time after time we have told them no, but they keep pushing back. We don't know how better to say that we are steadfastly opposed to their plan and the latest Small Lot Petition that was circulated states this unequivocally. Even the person spearheading this rezoning proposal for the owners acknowledged that.

I thank you for your time, and I hope that you will consider the points I made here in regard to the rezoning proposal for 2700 Avebury Ave.

Sincerely,
Adem Tepedelen
2718 Avebury Ave
Victoria, BC V8R 3W4

Heather McIntyre

From: Bill Moffatt [REDACTED]
Sent: August 16, 2019 4:56 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Lucina Baryluk
Cc: Ed and Jennifer Rebner; Joanne Moffatt; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Dear Mayor and Council (and Lucina),

We note the developer's representative has responded to queries from city planning staff as per the recent documents posted. Not surprisingly, the same intransigent, erroneous, and misleading approach to the proposal continues (after many repeated attempts over the years). We reiterate the points raised in previous emails (see below) and more importantly, it must be noted that the alleged (conveniently) "expanded neighbourhood survey sample" is NOT in keeping with the existing Small Lot development policy section 6.2. Accordingly, this should be removed and/or discounted completely as it is invalid. (Note: there is very little commentary nor mention of the vehement opposition of the many key adjacent stakeholders).

At the risk of wasting council's precious time governing the City, we wish to reiterate that density on our stretch of Kings has already more than doubled since the the original dwellings.

We conclude with the facts that subterfuge and misinformation (particularly when one considers some of the points put forward in previous attempts) are not in keeping with the City's democratic principles. If the developer really has the densification and the creation of "affordable" housing near and dear to his heart, perhaps he can consider subdivision of his estate in Rockland?

We (and the immediate neighbours potentially impacted) request council reject this proposal outright.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill and Joanne Moffatt
1336 Kings Rd.

From: Bill Moffatt [REDACTED] >
Sent: June 20, 2019 6:41 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: cmedd@victoria.ca <cmedd@victoria.ca>; Ed and Jennifer Rebner [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Dear Mayor and Council,

Further to my email of April 18th (please see below), it is noted that a rezoning application has, indeed, come forward from the numbered company owner's latest representative. Having reviewed the accompanying submission and documentation, (not surprisingly) there are several representations made that are erroneous:

West neighbour: "There are no privacy issues for this neighbour". A patently false statement. In fact, the wall of the proposed dwelling (1.5 meters from the property line) would obscure light, privacy, and quiet enjoyment of the property in it's current state. It would be an extremely aggressive intervention and greatly undermine quality of life for the neighbouring western household.

Northern neighbour: proposed mitigations really do little to offset the detrimentally impacted northern household. These long term residents deserve the right to preserve sunlight, quiet, and privacy in order for them to continue to enjoy their respective quality of neighbourhood life.

The landscape proposal is also contentious, as it is likely several of the mature Garry Oaks would not survive construction or displacement/relocation.

Perhaps the most contentious and erroneous statement contained in the document, concerns the comments regarding the 8 neighbours in closest proximity. The approach to neighbours by the developer's representative involved subterfuge and misdirection. Once the neighbours were able to collectively and objectively assess the proposal, it was deemed by all, (as stated below) that this portion of Kings Rd. has "densified" more than sufficiently.

Of more concern, is the statement "I have continued to to talk to others throughout the neighbourhood and the community meeting: many are supportive of the application". This is nonsense. The only people "supportive" of the application at the Community Meeting were from well outside of the neighbourhood (as far away as Mount Douglas in fact) and/or likely affiliated with the developer/owner in some capacity. One wonders how these "outsiders" were even aware off the meeting? (The Oaklands Land Use minutes are also being amended to better reflect the vociferous opposition from the "neighbours that matter").

While not related to this proposal, in terms of social commentary this is a classic case of a developer (yes, the numbered company owner is a developer) purchasing a property (albeit a number of years ago) by directly approaching a long term senior citizen resident in need of the cash, purchasing for below market value, earning an annuity of rental income while the property appreciates, then attempting to maximize profit through the proposed rezoning and subdivision. There is no corporate social responsibility or philanthropic aspect to this proposal. It is pure, unbridled profit.

We in the neighbourhood certainly expect that Mayor and Council respond accordingly.

Thank you all for your attention and service.

Bill and Joanne Moffatt
1336 Kings Rd.

Regards, Bill

From: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>

Sent: April 18, 2019 8:00 PM

To: 'Bill Moffatt'

Subject: Mayor and Council email RE: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Dear Bill and Joanne,

Thank you for your email regarding a development application at 2700 Avebury Avenue, it has been shared with Mayor and Council.

I have filed your email to be shared with Mayor and Council again, should an application be received and proceed to a Committee of the Whole Meeting for their consideration.

Thank you for sharing your thoughts with Mayor, Council and the City of Victoria.

Sincerely,

Monica Dhawan
Correspondence Coordinator
Mayor / City Manager's Office
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6



From: Bill Moffatt [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 10:12 AM

To: Land Use [REDACTED]

Cc: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>

Subject: Re: Proposed development 2700 Avebury rezoning R1B to R1-S2

Attention: David Angus

David,

We received the recent notice of meeting on April 29th. As you are aware, there have been several attempts and iterations by the (numbered company owner's various "representatives") to achieve small lot rezoning of the property. Adjacent neighbours have repeatedly voiced opposition to this and such opposition is well documented and on record with the Oaklands Land Use Committee and the City of Victoria.

For additional perspective, please consider that fact that this stretch of Kings Road is approximately 95 meters in length. Originally, there were four households with street frontage. Subsequently, two additional (full size lots) were subdivided and built upon, yielding two additional households. Subsequent and/or concurrently, two of the households also created rental suites. Thus, density on this 95 meter corridor has increased from the original four households, to the present eight. (in other words the density has doubled/increased by 100%). There are approximately twelve vehicles associated with these households.

In spite of the vigorous and consistent neighbourhood opposition, these attempts continue - with new representative "personnel" apparently recruited to attempt to yield a different result.

Rest assured that the adjacent neighbours remain adamant that our collective 95 meters of roadway has done it's share of "densification" and yet another residence is neither warranted nor desired.

We appreciate the Land Use Committee's past and present service and assistance and we will see you (again) on April 29th.

Regards, Bill and Joanne Moffatt 1336 Kings Rd.

Proposed Development of 2700 Avebury Avenue

August 20, 2019

I have lived at 1326 Kings Road for most of my life.

The block of Kings Road that I live on has been changed quite a few times over the years. We now have two more houses and two existing houses have had suites added to them. The result is that our short portion of Kings Road between Avebury and Roseberry (less than 100 metres) has had its density increased two-fold.

Since the mid 2000's Large and Company have been trying to change the status of 2700 Avebury Avenue. They have tried bribery and recently intimidation but we, the neighbours surrounding this address have continually voiced our opposition. We have attended meetings for the Oaklands Community Association Land Use Committee and voiced our concerns and opposition. We have completed the city's petition requirements for the rezoning of the said address and forwarded them to the city.

We have met with the development representative of the Large and Company and have been told that we should get on board with densification and have compassion for those young families who need housing.

Well, I have had enough of Large and Company and their tactics to make money for themselves. At our last land use meeting, Large and Company brought many members of the Large family to express their support regarding the rezoning. I would guess that these relatives do not live anywhere near 2700 Avebury Avenue or anywhere near the area and therefore should not have a say about my neighbourhood. They even brought a realtor to express his opinion, I would guess that he has a relationship with the Larges.

Now there is a large sign on the property announcing that a new development is being proposed and asking us to **"Get involved, have your say"**. Well we, tax paying residents, have been involved for quite a few years now and unfortunately it does appear that Victoria is listening to our say! To my mind, Victoria only listens to property developers who wish to increase their own personal wealth and the mayor and council only wishes to increase the city's tax base.

Years ago, when a large amount of money was offered to my neighbours to change the minds of those around them regarding the rezoning and they turned it down, Lee Large stated that "everybody has a price". I would hope that the mayor and council will represent the tax paying residents of Victoria, by being made aware of the minutes of the Land Use Committee meetings and by reading the petitions sent to the city as per the City of Victoria's Small Lot Rezoning Policy and put an end to these continual rezoning requests for 2700 Avebury Avenue.

Anita M. Loudon

1326 Kings Road.

Heather McIntyre

From: Susan Kerschbaumer [REDACTED]
Sent: August 27, 2019 8:00 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Letter re: 2700 Avebury Ave. redevelopment proposal

Hello,

Please find below a note from the Garry Oak Meadow Preservation Society regarding the proposed redevelopment of 2700 Avebury Ave.

According to the Society, the proposed redevelopment will have a negative impact on our neighbourhood's protected trees.

In particular:

- I believe that the redevelopment calls for the removal of a garry oak - a tree that the Society has assessed as being "large and in good condition."
- Even if the tree is not removed, the Society has determined that the oak will "surely be detrimentally affected by any blasting / digging."
- As a neighbour, I am also concerned about the negative effect any blasting will have on the structural soundness of the five very large garry oaks on my own property - and on the related safety issues this could pose to my family.

Thanks very much for considering this concern in relation to the developer's proposal.

Sincerely,

Susan Kerschbaumer
2718 Avebury Ave.
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Begin forwarded message:

Subject: 2700 Avebury Ave Garry oak

Date: August 27, 2019 at 12:58:08 PM [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Ms. Kerschbaumer:

I looked at the site last week and saw:

One Garry at the SE corner of 2700: **large and in good condition** – based on my superficial inspection

No other Garry in that area of the lot

No Garry in the remainder (western half) of that lot – the first is sited outside the lot's SW corner, thus on the neighbour's land.

That Garry will surely be detrimentally affected by any blasting/digging on the new lot to excavate for a basement/garage.

In view of the hump of bedrock in the west-central area of the new lot, many of the next-door Garry's roots will be concentrated in the southern half of the new lot, meaning greater damage to more of the Garry's root system than if regular soil were in the rock area, and providing needed moisture and minerals, reducing the tree's ability to build new roots.

NB: The new lot's owner will have the right to apply for permission to trim branches from the "western tree" that overhangs the new lot. Permission requires a permit and payment to Victoria.

If I have missed any concerns from you and neighbours, please point them out.

Best wishes,

Michael Meagher, Ph.D., RPF (Ret.)
Vice-President, GOMPS
Aug. 26/19

Katie Lauriston

From: Lucina Baryluk
Sent: May 25, 2020 9:04 AM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: FW: 2700 Avebury: proposed small lot subdivision

An addition to the correspondence on 2700 Avebury

From: Bill Moffatt [REDACTED]
Sent: May 24, 2020 1:31 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@victoria.com
Cc: Lucina Baryluk <lbaryluk@victoria.ca>; Ed and Jennifer Rebner [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: 2700 Avebury: proposed small lot subdivision

Dear Mayor and Council,

In the interest of brevity during these unprecedented times, we simply request your attention to the previous correspondence on file vehemently opposing this matter. As the proponent has, once again, "updated" their respective correspondence to the City, we are compelled to respond to some key erroneous points contained therein:

- She again makes reference to a larger sample size of outlying "neighbours" being in favour. There is no provision for this in the current Small Lot rezoning policy. The eight contiguous neighbours (and another four almost contiguous) are opposed as documented in the file. The larger sampling and (supposed sentiment) is blatantly outside of policy and, therefore, not relevant.
- The Northern and, to a lesser extent, Western neighbours are adversely impacted, and have never concurred in any way, shape or form.
- The impacts of the destruction of the aged Garry Oaks and habitat will be extremely detrimental to the environment.
- Additional vehicle congestion would be a huge nuisance.
- The potential for blasting and construction disruption remains a substantial concern.
- This short stretch of Kings has already *doubled in densification* (four original households to now eight) over the past several years.
- The less than scrupulous action of the developer owner (and the various representatives) over the years has worn out it's welcome. The reference in this latest correspondence to alleged "corporate social responsibility" is subject to, rightfully, significant skepticism and indignation by those of us having to deal with it.

Please decline the proposal. Thank you all for your civic leadership efforts during this challenging pandemic.

Joanne and Bill Moffatt
1336 Kings Rd.