

**Received**

City of Victoria

**JAN 15 2018**Planning & Development Department  
Community Planning Division

PLANNING DEPARTMENT REGISTERED MAIL 12 JAN 2018  
CORPORATION OF CITY OF VICTORIA  
CITY HALL, VICTORIA VBW 176

**PROPOSAL TO AMEND RI- G #137 / 139 ROBERTSON**

AS ONE OF THE SIGNATORIES TO THE  
THE ORIGINAL RI -G PLAN OF A FEW  
YEARS AGO THE WRITER AND MOST  
OF THE OWNERS WITHIN ITS BOUNDARY  
GAVE UP MANY VERY VALUABLE FREEDOMS OF  
DEVELOPMENT FOR THE JOINT PROTECTION  
OF THE R1 -G REGION.

UNDER THIS PROTECTION THOUSANDS OF  
HOURS OF INCONVENIENT AND DIFFICULT HAND LABOUR  
AND SOME MILLIONS OF PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION  
DOLLARS HAVE BEEN EXPENDED TO PRESERVE  
AND ENHANCE THIS RI -G AREA WHICH IS PART OF  
THE GRAND SEASIDE ENTRANCE FOR BOTH TOURIST  
AND RETIREMENT ECONOMIES OF VICTORIA, BOTH BEING  
LONG TERM FINANCIAL PILLARS OF THE ENTIRE REGION .

THE 4 LANDS IN QUESTION IF CONSOLIDATED INTO ONE  
ARE IDEAL FOR FOR THE CONSTRUCTION ONE  
TASTEFUL HOME, CONSISTENT WITH PROPERTIES  
WHICH HAVE AND ARE BEING RESTORED AND IMPROVED  
ON ALL SIDES.( SUCH A SITE SHOULD BE VERY VALUABLE  
FOR SALE) AND WOULD ATTRACT THOSE WHO CAN AFFORD  
TO PAY THE TAXES IN THIS VERY VERY HIGH TAX AREA.

DESPITE THE PAST NEGLECT OF OWNERS  
THE LANDS HAVE PROVIDE LOW COST RENTAL HOUSING  
AND HAVE OVER THE YEARS PROVIDED HOMES  
TO MANY INTERESTING PEOPLE. CLEARLY  
THIS WILL NO LONGER BE LOW COST RENTALS.



FOR ALL THESE REASONS, IT WOULD SEEM TO BE THE HEIGHT OF FOLLY TO SETTLE FOR FOUR SEPARATE COSTLY SMALL NEW RABBIT HUTCHES WITH BASEMENT LIVING BLASTED OUT OF THE LOCAL VERY VERY HARD COLQUITZ GNEISS WHICH AS THE FORESHORE EXPOSURES ATTEST IS SUBJECT TO SHEARS WHICH CAN GIVE RISE TO NASTY AND COSTLY DAMAGE TO NEARBY STRUCTURES AND AGING MUNICIPAL WORKS.

I APPOSE THIS PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO R1 -G

IAN M. SHERWIN ( 40 YEAR OWNER)  
1863 HOLLYWOOD CR  
VICTORIA B.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ian M. Sherwin', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

---

**From:** John Harding [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** January 26, 2018 10:36 AM  
**To:** Alec Johnston; Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Subject:** Development Proposal for 137/139 Robertson Street, Victoria  
**Attachments:** 137 Robertson Development Letter to City.docx

Dear Sirs,

We recently attended a Community Meeting for a proposed development at 137/139 Robertson Street. We oppose the rezoning as the proposed development is too large for the site, and the building does not fit into the streetscape. We feel that a development with lower square footage and fewer units would be more acceptable. A more detailed letter addressing our concerns is attached.

Yours truly

John Harding and Madeline Rigg  
Owners – 1869 Hollywood Crescent

To the Planning Department, Corporation of the City of Victoria

January 26, 2018

Dear Sirs,

**Change of Land Use of 137/139 Robertson Street to a Site Specific 4-Plex Zone**

As taxpayers and permanent residents directly across the street from 137 Robertson, we strongly object to the approval of a new 4-plex being built on this property.

1) If the owner chooses to strata title the property, other developers of properties in the neighbourhood will expect the same concessions. This changes our community immensely! Strata title is unnecessary and should not be allowed here.

2) Parking is a problem on our street, Hollywood Crescent, with only one side available. Continuous single-family zoning will improve this issue.

3) The proposed structure is out of proportion and design with other properties in the vicinity. Most have pitched roofs and blend in with the streetscape. The proposal is for a large box, with a height that is at, or over allowable height for its entire footprint.

4) The building is far too dense with 4 suites. Single-family zoning should apply to this property. Regulations for the Single Family R1-G zoning allow for either 2 stories without a basement, or 1.5 stories with a basement. The proposed size of the development at 4,190sq. ft. is approximately 30% higher than allowed. We consider that this addition of square footage is in effect an overbuild of the site from a two storey to a three-storey building, and request that the building size be moderated accordingly.

We welcome development of the current structure, as it is old, neglected, and probably hazardous. However, we object to overdevelopment of the site.

In summary, this beautiful neighbourhood has been carefully maintained and improved by caring owners. An oversized four-plex does not make any sense here.

Yours truly,

**Madeline Rigg, John Harding**

**Owners 1869 Hollywood Crescent**

To: [ajohnston@victoria.ca](mailto:ajohnston@victoria.ca); [mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca).

Robin and David Ley  
141 Robertson St.  
Victoria, BC V8S 3X2

October 3, 2019

Land Use Committee Chair  
Fairfield Community Association  
1300 Fairfield Road  
Victoria BC V8S 5J1

RE: Proposed Development and Rezoning of 137/139 Robertson Street, Victoria

We are writing this letter, as the adjacent and impacted neighbours, in response to a redevelopment proposal for the 137/139 Robertson Street in Gonzales. Note that also attached is a copy of a letter submitted in January 2018 regarding the same development. Issues identified in this previous letter have not been addressed with the revised design.

Our home is located immediately adjacent and to the north of this proposed development. As with many properties in Gonzales our home is built directly up to the property boundary. It is estimated that our home was built in the early 1900s with modifications made with approval of the city. We live in our home with our two children and rent out the first floor legal suite to long term tenants. We have lived in this home for over ten years and have no plans on moving. We love our community and want to work with the developer to find a plan that works for our family. Despite efforts on both our part and the developer's we have not found an acceptable solutions. The following outlines the main issues we have with the development primarily from the perspective of the impact on our home, usability of our space, and our quality of life.

The proposed footprint and increased height of the proposed development will negatively affect our quality of life particularly in the northeast corner of the new development (the southeast corner of our property). Our kitchen, dining area, and bedroom are in the southeast corner of the property with lovely large windows. This is the heart of our home and is used for family dinners, homework sessions, art & craft projects, spontaneous dance parties, Sunday pancakes and coffee, parties and gatherings, tough conversations, working from home, and watching the marathon and bike races.

The proposed footprint and height of the development will negatively effect our privacy, increase noise and air pollution, and will take away every bit of sunshine that enters the southern side of our space and that of our first floor long term tenants. Specifically, the proposed footprint will allow for the future residents to easily look into our space including our bedroom and even listen to our conversations. Noise is a concern as there will be the potential for multiple residents to use their outside space, allowing for significant noise increase from our current very quiet neighbours. Any future residents that chose to smoke outside will directly impact our indoor air quality. The proposed storage bins located close to our southern side will also have the potential for noise, debris, and damage to our house and are just unattractive. The proposed footprint and height will eliminate natural light entirely during winter months. The months when just a few moments of sunshine are precious.

We understand that due to the unique layout of the lot and the surrounding houses property boundaries, adjustments to the setbacks requirements will be needed. However, we kindly ask the developer to revise the footprint and height of the development to take into consideration our quality of life particularly in regards the southern side of our home. We request the following:

- the proposed setbacks on the Hollywood Crescent and the northern side of the property be consistent with the existing footprint. We request that no windows be placed in the proposed building with a view of our kitchen area. We request that no balconies be placed on the northeast side of the proposed building.
- the maximum height of the proposed building not exceed that of the existing building and pitched roof be maintained such that our natural light is maintained.
- We request no storage units or bike racks be placed along the northern side yard to reduce noise and debris potential.
- We request a comparison of the proposed site specific zoning be done to that of low or medium density zoning (as four units are proposed) or a small lot (as the lot size is smaller than that of a R1-G) in addition to or instead of R1-G. Using R1-G zoning as the only guide in developing the site specific zoning is not consistent with the proposed use of the property and misleading.
- We request that any reduction to minimum set backs be carefully evaluated by city staff involved in developing and setting these setbacks. The setbacks serve a purpose of which is not entirely clear when simply reading the regulations but carefully considered by the city engineers. If a setback is required for safety, noise reduction, natural light, quality of life, fire protection, or other reasons, any changes to the setbacks should be justified and remedies put in place to ensure that the intention of the regulated setback is addressed.

As a resident, we feel very vulnerable and have experience threatening language during the process. This has caused stress and has negatively effected the relationships in our community. We would like to thank the community group for hosting this meeting. We would also like to acknowledge that although we are not in favour of the proposed footprint, setbacks, and height of the proposed development, we appreciate efforts made by the community group and the developer to engage with the community.

Regards,

Robin and David Ley (141 Robertson St.)

---

**From:** Alan Dibb [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** March 30, 2020 9:07 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Proposed development: 137/139 Robertson and 1848/1850 Hollywood

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

I live nearby to this location and have concerns about the proposed development because of its size relative to the site and because it potentially would create a precedent for higher density and site coverage in the neighbourhood. I would be concerned if council's position is that houses that are already non-conforming to zoning regulations are grandfathered in to continue to non-conform even after complete redevelopment. Specific concerns include the following:

1. The proposed development exceeds the Zoning Regulations Floor space ratio limit of 0.5. This is even though the lower level of the proposed building apparently is not included in the total floor area calculation.
2. The proposal also exceeds the site coverage % of 30% and, as I understand it, exceeds the prescribed height and number of storeys.
3. I am concerned about the loss of open soil and greenery from the yard, with most of the yard proposed to be covered in patios, paving stones and parking areas. This is out of keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, in which the vast majority of homes have attractive yards, gardens, and trees which provide habitat for birds and make the neighbourhood attractive to walk in.
4. Two of the four suites are to become two bedroom and 2.5-3 bathroom suites. Such suites are likely to be occupied by high income owners with at least two vehicles. We could easily end up with 6 or more vehicles at that location thereby occupying several spaces of street parking in an area where street parking is already heavily used, especially on the Hollywood Crescent side.
5. It does seem a shame that 3 existing tenants that are long-time Victoria residents will be displaced and almost certainly unable to afford rents in the new building.

In my view a scaled down version of this proposal, perhaps a duplex, would be more suitable for this location.

Alan Dibb