



ROCKLAND NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION
P.O. Box 5276, Station B, Victoria BC, V8R 6N4

rockland.bc.ca

1737 Rockland Avenue
 Neighborhood Meeting Synopsis
 September 11, 2020

Neighbours concerned about the 1737 Rockland development met with the developer, Large and Company, on September 11 2020. The meeting, however, did not fulfill the developer's responsibility with respect to neighborhood engagement and consultation. Plans were presented as completed and final. The proponents offered only justification for their plans and did not entertain the idea of modifying or changing them. They described current zoning as being out of date at the time of enactment and stated that they as developers knew the highest and best use of the land.

Four issues dominated the meeting:

- The suitability of redevelopment, given the proposed panhandle lot configuration.
- The heights of the homes in the rezoning proposal.
- Lack of respect for the Tree Retention bylaw and general dismissal of regulation by proponents.

Neighbours supported infill densification as long as the houses were built in conformity with regulations pertaining to the panhandle lot designation and zoning regulations.

Suitability and Scope

- The current zoning is R1-A, enabling a single additional lot on the subdivision, not two as proposed, and the proposal of two lots is an additional monetary gift for the proponent.
- Two R1-B lots are possible as site-specific zoning, as in the case of the abutting lot at 928 Richmond, which provides a good template for this redevelopment.

Height

- The home proposed on Lot 2 at 7.08m. is over height and should be restricted to 5m.
- The home proposed on Lot 3 at 5.49m. is over height, built on additional fill lifting grade, not the natural grade and should be restricted to 5m. in height from natural grade.
- The proposed heights of both homes impinges on the privacy of the abutting lots.

Protection of Trees

- 12 Protected trees on site have been or will be removed.
- Four were removed on December 16th 2019 without a permit, which led to a bylaw infraction that the developer is contesting.
- Six additional trees are proposed for removal in the plan Landscape Data.
- The plan Landscape Data is misleading in that it includes eleven Off Property trees for protection.

Zoning and Regulations

- The proponents stated that zoning bylaws were out of date on date they were passed, and that the panhandle issue was a matter of "language."

- The proponent stated that as developers they were the best to consider the highest and best use of the property and that they see room for density and a return on investment on the property.

The neighbors in attendance wish to see the panhandle regulations upheld in this rezoning, as they were for the adjoining 928 Richmond development. They see room for additional density in Rockland and a return on investment for the proponent in adhering to Schedule 8 – Panhandle Lot Regulation.

Regards;
Bob June, co-chair
RNA LUC

1737 Rockland Avenue (Rockland Neighbourhood)

All feedback received from the Development Tracker online comment form

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Neil McClelland and Kay Johnson	Oppose	<p>We reside right next door, and we are very concerned about the proposed development. We see absolutely no benefit to the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Regarding: "Neighbouring trees will be preserved, and a conscious effort was made to save the existing conifer located near the northeast property line since we recognize its ability for wildlife habitat and carbon absorption for the surrounding environment. There are 19 bylaw protected trees on the property, 13 are being preserved and 6 are recommended for removal by the Arborist."</p> <p>--"was made" doesn't sound very promising for that conifer.</p> <p>--looking over the fence into the proposed development area, we can't see the "protected" trees referred to in the proposal.</p> <p>--an urban forest contributes to the health and beauty of a neighbourhood and its environment, and we see this forest declining.</p> <p>--promising to do some planting of "new trees" is not equivalent to preserving mature trees.</p> <p>--the proposal mentions a consideration of privacy, but the loss of tree cover has already led to a decline in privacy.</p> <p>Regarding: "We are also trying to balance the need for new housing and the retention of heritage assets."</p> <p>--this project does not truly address the need for new housing as the houses will be unaffordable for the people who most need new housing.</p> <p>--two-story homes will not add any more new housing than one-story homes and will just serve to block the view of the landscape.</p> <p>This neighbourhood has already been subjected, from another development, to an extended period of loud blasting and now ongoing noisy construction.</p> <p>The "new housing" argument is a very weak rationale for a development proposal that offers nothing to the neighbourhood, and is actually quite damaging.</p>	5-1731 Rockland Ave	neilmc2@telus.net	2020-09-15 2:42

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		respectfully, Neil & Kay			

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Jennifer Bennett	Support	<p>I am opposed to the proposed development at 1737 Rockland Avenue. The developer is requesting a subdivision of the existing R1A lot which will create a panhandle lot. Panhandle lot zoning allows for one storey dwellings with specific setbacks from adjoining properties to allow some privacy for those existing homes. Panhandle lot zoning does allow for infill and increased density but also respects the existing neighbourhood. This proposal does not meet the panhandle lot rezoning requirements as they are asking for variances for setbacks as well as height. The setbacks range from 7.5 metres to 1.2 metres with the majority if not all below the requirement for a panhandle lot. Another infill development was approved by council immediately adjacent to this property at 928 Richmond in 2016. The developer of that property initially proposed 3 two-storey duplexes on the property. After much back and forth and a number of years a proposal for 3 single-storey homes was approved by Council. This was what the neighbours originally requested of the developer and were willing to support.</p> <p>We now have a similar situation where the developer is proposing to subdivide the current property, retaining the original home with the addition of a new accessory building and construct an additional 2 two-storey homes. Again the neighbours are willing to support single storey homes yet the developer is requesting 2 two-storey homes which will have an impact on the existing neighbours as well as the 928 Richmond development that is currently under construction. As the proposed homes at 1737 Rockland are situated on a higher elevation even a one-storey home will rise above the homes adjoining them.</p> <p>Another area of concern is the loss of Rockland's existing tree canopy. With the 928 Richmond development a significant number of trees were removed. The 1737 Rockland development shows that of the remaining 8 bylaw protected trees still on the property 6 are to be removed leaving only two bylaw protected trees on the property. Both of these trees are located at the front of the property leaving the rear of the property treeless. Unfortunately in December of 2019 a large number of trees including bylaw protected trees were removed from this property without city issued permits. With the removal of these trees in</p>	1740 Lyman Duff Lane	jmbennett@shaw.ca	2020-09-20 19:27

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
------	----------	----------	---------	-------	------

addition to the trees removed on the adjoining property the character of the neighbourhood will be forever changed. The few remaining trees on the property need to be protected.

I am very supportive of respectful development but this project falls far short of that. It doesn't respect the Rockland Neighbourhood, it doesn't respect the immediate neighbours and it doesn't respect City of Victoria zoning. I ask that you please request modifications to this application from the developer.

Thank you.

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Susan Wynne-Hughes	Oppose	<p>As a close neighbour of this proposed development I feel strongly that this site should not be re-zoned but built according to the R1-A zone. This would allow construction of a single story home of appropriate height fitting in with the surrounding neighbours. At a similar current development on 928 Richmond which is adjacent to this property, the houses are of 1 story and they were kept at that height as it was seen to be fitting to the surroundings. Similarly building 2 homes would create a property of much higher density than is desirable in the Rockland area. In addition, the existing plan exceeds the site coverage under R1-A which would create houses much too close to the adjacent neighbours. Another factor is that the plan provides for the loss of six more trees on this property. This, in addition to the protected trees already removed from the property would be a huge loss to the neighbourhood. In summary the requirements of R1-A zoning are entirely appropriate to this site taking into account the privacy of the neighbours, the density issue and the desire to maintain the ambience of this part of town.</p> <p>I would like to add that I am astonished and dismayed at the manner in which the developer removed so many protected trees last year. There was no consultation with neighbours nor concern for the environment in this action. Actions such as this threaten the beauty of this prized part of Victoria.</p>	926 Richmond Ave, Victoria	cwynnehughes@shaw.ca	2020-09-21 1:15
David Gordon	Oppose	Owner has removed protected trees without approval, this affects all neighbours. Variance is a privilege not a right. Current plans have no respect for neighbours.	1731 Rockland Ave	Dgordon27@gmail.com	2020-09-21 16:30
Jason Cridge	Support	I believe this is respectful infill. The opposition is vocal and organized in trying to oppose this. This is the type of infill that Victoria city needs. Although this is upmarket and not considered affordable it allows for more capacity in that segment of the market which allows young families to move up leaving their homes available for first time buyers. Victoria needs housing more than it needs to protect the property values of those residents on Lyman Duff Lane. Homes matter. Supply matters.	935 Richmond Ave	j.cridge@hotmail.com	2020-09-21 23:14
Ariel Nesbitt	Support	I am a resident of 1715 Rockland (very close by the proposed development site). Victoria in general needs more housing options, and the proposed development has the potential to contribute to this. The proposed changes would respect the neighbourhood character.	1715 Rockland Avenue		2020-09-22 4:28

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		Please don't allow NIBYism to stop expanding housing options			
Ken Todd	Oppose	I would like to know WHY the developer wants to change the zoning Bylaw from R1-A to Site Specific and how that new designation would bring the development of two houses in line with the neighboring homes on the south side of the property.	1750 Rockland	kbwtodd @shaw.c a	2020-09-22 4:43
Daryl Brown	Oppose	I understand that this development proposal will require a number of variances to the Panhandle Lot Regulations in order to proceed -- i.e., site coverage, building height, number of stories, setbacks. I do not think these variances should be granted; the existing Schedule H regulations should be followed. If the City thinks that the existing panhandle zoning regulation is inadequate, then there should be a comprehensive review of that bylaw. We should not conduct city planning on an ad hoc application by application basis. If the City doesn't have the resources or the inclination to conduct proper maintenance and updating of its bylaws, local neighbourhood residents should not be the ones to bear the consequences. The existing variance game that is played between developers, the City, and neighbourhood residents almost invariably leads to conflict and is wasteful of scarce resources. I urge the City to either enforce its existing bylaws; or go through a democratic planning process to update the bylaws to reflect modern land use priorities, so that they may then be readily and consistently enforced.	1742 Green Oaks Terrace, Victoria BC		2020-09-22 4:46

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Vince Bennett	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to the proposed development at 1737 Rockland Avenue. The developer is requesting a subdivision of the existing R1A lot which will create a panhandle lot. Panhandle lot zoning allows for one storey dwellings with specific setbacks from adjoining properties to allow some privacy for existing homes. Panhandle lot zoning does allow for infill and increased density but also respects the existing neighbourhood. This proposal does not meet the panhandle lot rezoning requirements as they are asking for variances for setbacks as well as height. The setbacks range from 7.5 metres to 1.2 metres with the majority, if not all, below the requirement for a panhandle lot. Another infill development was approved by council immediately adjacent to this property at 928 Richmond in 2016. The developer had initially proposed 3 two-storey duplexes on the property. After much neighbourhood involvement and engagement with the city over a number of years, that proposal was rejected by Council. A proposal for 3 single-storey homes was eventually approved by Council. This was what the neighbours originally requested of the developer and were willing to support. This development is well underway adjacent to our property and is a much better fit considering the size of the property and the homes being only one story.</p> <p>We now have a similar situation where the developer is proposing to subdivide the current property, retaining the original home with the addition of a new accessory building (what is an accessory building?) and construct two additional 2 two-storey homes. One of the homes will also will have a nanny suite. Again, the neighbours are willing to support single storey homes yet the developer is requesting 2 two-storey homes which will have an huge impact on the existing neighbours along Lyman Duff Lane as well as the 928 Richmond development that is currently under construction. As the proposed homes at 1737 Rockland are situated on a higher elevation even a one-storey home will rise above the homes adjoining them and proposed setback variances will just make the crowding and density worse. Considering that Council rejected over-density on the 928 Richmond development and finally approved three single family homes, I would be very surprised if they consider this development as proposed.</p>	1740 Lyman Duff Lane	vinnieb@shaw.ca	2020-09-22 14:37

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		<p>Another area of concern is the loss of Rockland's existing tree canopy. With the 928 Richmond development a significant number of trees were removed. The 1737 Rockland development shows that of the remaining 8 bylaw protected trees still on the property 6 are to be removed leaving only two bylaw protected trees on the property. Both of these trees are located at the front of the property leaving the rear of the property treeless. Unfortunately in December of 2019 a large number of trees including bylaw protected trees were removed from this property without city issued permits. With the removal of these trees in addition to the trees removed on the adjoining property the character of the neighbourhood will be forever changed. The few remaining trees on the property need to be protected.</p> <p>I am very supportive of respectful development but this project falls far short of that. It doesn't respect the Rockland Neighbourhood, it doesn't respect the immediate neighbours and it doesn't respect City of Victoria zoning.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>			
Patricia Gatey	Oppose	I do not give permission for my personal information to be posted on the City of Victoria website.	952 Richmond Ave		2020-09-22 16:32
Kerry Krich	Oppose	<p>The proposal is clearly not respecting the existing zoning--it exceeds the existing Schedule H panhandle zoning in a plethora of issues. Height and # of stories, again excessive and has a complete disregard for the current neighboring housing. The site area is not large enough for what is proposed; as well the setbacks exceed the zoning limits; and once again we are destroying trees and environmental jewels that make our living in Victoria what we love. I speak to all of these issues as I bear the consequences of the development directly behind me as the homeowner of 930 Richmond. My family have owned this property for 70 years and it saddens me to see the development of residential homes that far exceed what is needed, what is respectful to our environment and yet again, provides for the wealthy their homes of excessive square footage. The trees are gone, the birds are reluctant to make a sound, and (I) now live with absolutely no privacy, either visually, aurally, or spiritually. Please let's not make another mistake in the Rockland</p>	930 Richmond Avenue	kerrykrich@gmail.com	2020-09-23 0:56

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Neighbourhood. I STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS DEVELOPMENT.					
Kim and Judy Carlton	Oppose	<p>To the best of our knowledge we do not know of any neighbours in the Rockland community who are in support of this proposal, despite what the developer has conveyed to others including members of council. We oppose the request to rezone this land. The property is currently quite suitable for a panhandle infill development which can be done in accordance with existing zoning. In relation to the Schedule H panhandle zoning the purposed development will result to in two new homes (versus one) that are too large for the area, that exceed height requirements, and do not meet the requirements for site area, coverage and setbacks. This proposed development, combined with the current home on site and proposed addition of an accessory building, will result in three over crowded homes in this limited space. We do not think this is in keeping with the Rockland area. The development at 928 Richmond Avenue has already set a poor precedent of over-development with three new homes in this limited space, and the decimation of all existing trees. This proposed development would be an unfortunate continuation of this practice. Simply put, the proposed development 1737 Rockland is nothing more than over-development.</p> <p>We also oppose the proposed development due to the impact it will have on trees on the current site, and potentially to properties adjacent to it. The proposed development eliminates 6 protected trees and all other trees on the site, while preserving only 2 protected trees. Other developers have proven the ability to create thoughtful development while preserving trees and the character of the area. Sadly that is not the case with this proposed development; the developer shows no regard for the existing trees and habitat.</p> <p>Our property at 1710 Lyman Duff Lane is adjacent to this proposed development. We are very concerned about two mature trees on our property that could be adversely impacted by this development. We strongly encourage the City's arborist to keep a close eye on this development.</p> <p>We understand the need for development. We are proponents of thoughtful development, not over-development. We fail to see how accepting this proposal and rezoning this land will add value to the</p>	1710 Lyman Duff Lane	kimandju dyc @hotmail .com	2020-09-23 4:36

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		neighbourhood and the City of Victoria. Please reject this proposal and honour the current Schedule H panhandle zoning which would allow for one home, of suitable size and height restrictions, setbacks and site coverage for this limited space.			
Robert June	Oppose	panhandle housing is appropriate.	1310 Manor Road	thejunes@telus.net	2020-09-23 17:59
Chris Hildebrand	Oppose	While residential density keeps increasing, the infrastructure to support it, is not.	911 Richmond Ave	illbeback1999@yahoo.com	2020-09-23 22:58
dug and cheryl gammage	Oppose	we would support proposal if the existing zoning was respected	1740 oak shade lane victoria	duggam mage1@gmail.com	2020-09-24 1:39
Grant Perkins	Oppose	I am not opposed to development of 1737 Rockland, but any proposal should fit existing panhandle lot zoning for Rockland. The property should not be rezoned so a proposed development can be accommodated. The developer stated zoning is obsolete before it is written. Why have zoning if it is not respected? The proposed development exceeds the limits of the current zoning in many ways – height, site area, site coverage, setbacks. This proposal does not take into consideration how the planned houses will overlook the surrounding homes, including the new homes under construction to the east (928 Richmond) of the subject property. Any development should co-exist within the current neighborhood. This proposal does not. Given what was approved in 2017 for a similar adjacent property at 928 Richmond, the current proposal for 1737 Rockland should be rejected.	1731 Lyman Duff Lane	grant.perkins@live.ca	2020-09-24 5:22
Linda Barry	Oppose	I am not opposed to development but I think consideration should always be given to the existing neighbours whose properties abut and are in view of a proposed development. Not respecting the existing zoning and planning for 2- 2 level houses in a panhandle is not being considerate in the least. The area is not large enough for 2 houses much less 2 story houses. They are proposing setbacks on 3 property lines - this is excessive. There is no doubt this development as it is	924A Richmond Ave	lrb@shaw.ca	2020-09-24 21:23

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		proposed will impact negatively on the privacy and the natural beauty of this stately neighbourhood.			
Jennifer Lowry	Oppose	<p>1737 Rockland is a suitable property for a panhandle, infill development and the proposal should respect the existing Schedule H panhandle zoning, which serves a distinct purpose, and is intended specifically for infill developments such as this.</p> <p>The current proposal for 1737 Rockland exceeds the existing panhandle zoning limits in numerous ways: height, # of storeys, site area and setbacks in addition to extensive removal tree canopy impacting privacy for existing neighbors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The max allowable height under the current zoning is 5 metres. The proposed height (5.49 and 7.08 metres) and number of storeys (2) are excessive for a panhandle lot. • Based on the Site Area and zoning, the proponent only has appropriate site area for one house. • Proposed setbacks on 3 out of the 4 property lines far exceed zoning limits. Strata 3 setbacks, in particular, would only be 3.4 metres and 5.0 metres from two of the fence lines - the zoning requires 7.5 metres for walls with windows to 'habitable rooms'. This would result in a further loss of privacy important to existing homes. • Five bylaw protected and many other non-protected trees were unlawfully removed from the property in December 2019 resulting in fines being issued. As a result of trying to overbuild the lot, six more bylaw protected trees are to be removed from the property. If approved, all but 2 of the remaining mature canopy on the property will be removed in order to accommodate the zoning variances being sought. Privacy and existing wildlife habitation were already impacted by the unauthorised tree removal in December 2019. The removal of mature trees is not at all in keeping with the Rockland neighborhood. Replacement plantings will take many years to mature and provide fundamental privacy for bordering neighbors and re-establish wildlife. There is also significant concern from the neighboring properties as to the protection of the established trees on their own properties. The intrusion of the proposed square footage of 2 houses along with the setbacks would 	1731 Lyman Duff Lane	jenlowry@live.ca	2020-09-25 1:51

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		<p>place the new houses perilously closer to established root systems of trees on neighboring properties.</p> <p>Of further concern is the recent discovery of an approximate 5 foot infill as part of the development proposal. This extreme and unnecessary elevation change would mean the proposed 2 storey houses would loom even higher than the current slope of the property.</p> <p>The proponent is proposing two, 2 storey houses on ~1,300 m2 of site area (avg 650 m2 per house) therefore seeking much more house on much less lot than the recently approved development under construction on adjacent property.</p> <p>The adjacent property (1745 Rockland) underwent a very similar (4-year) rezoning process. That proposal, also a panhandle infill of a large Rockland estate (original Rattenbury house), was eventually subdivided to create a strata development (new civic address 928 Richmond).</p> <p>The 1745 proposal should serve as a good reference here. It was introduced in 2013, rejected by the PLUC in 2014 (didn't accommodate neighbour's concerns), rejected at Public Hearing in 2015 (overreach in density), and approved in 2017 after being revised to conform with panhandle zoning. The homes were approved for only one storey and conform to height restrictions. With the changes made to the proposal, the developer gained the support of the neighbors – the same neighbours who are now impacted by the 1745 Rockland proposal.</p> <p>I cannot see how the City could justifiably approve the 1745 Rockland proposal given the changes that were required before approval of the adjacent development at 1737 Rockland (928 Richmond).</p> <p>Panhandle designation is to ensure site area is retained for the subdivision of large houses and to prevent overcrowding and invasion of privacy. A single home that conforms to height, site and other zoning restrictions is not only in keeping with the Rockland neighborhood, but would be supported by neighbors.</p>			

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Mark Schippers	Oppose	<p>I oppose the current proposal for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. entry of Rockland is just after corner that bikes, cars and even people walking may not be seen with people enter and exiting the proposed development (high danger area) this is with a posted speed of 30km/h, there would be only one entrance that would service 4 larger homes in a blind area. 2. According information i was given they removed 5 protected Gary oaks with out approval and paid the fine to be able to cash in on this development and are now asking for concession outside of the current zoning rules. I removed one tree with city permission and it was a long complex process. By awarding this you allow people who are not prepared to follow the bylaws profit while those of us how do go through a long drawn out process. I believe this is the wrong message to send. If my information is wrong please omit this point of concern 3. I walk by their at least 3 times a week and have never noticed any posting so when a concerned neighbor knocked on my door i was shocked. (lack of transparency) 4. our Neighbor hood has gone through blasting with the development that was approved for their neighbors. <p>By all means allow the a proposal that follows the current zoning rules for subdividing & creating a pan handle with out additional variances or change is status of the property.</p>	1738 green oaks terr.		2020-09-25 15:38
George Dundas & Grant Townsend	Oppose	<p>Considering that the development at 928 Richmond was approved for only one storey single family homes it is unreasonable to now allow 2- storey homes immediately adjacent. Additionally, according to the site plan, the new home on the NE corner is only 1.5m from the adjacent property line, which is not sufficient.</p>	#1 - 928 Richmond Ave	gsdundas@shaw.ca	2020-09-25 15:41

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
David S McWalter	Oppose	<p>I feel this is a suitable property for development, however, the current proposal seeks excessive variances to the existing zoning that negatively and irreparably impact the neighbouring properties. Here are a few key points that inform my opinion about this proposed rezoning:</p> <p>1) Lack of engagement with neighbours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was no notice in December 2019 that the eastern half of the lot was being clear-cut (without permits, resulting in bylaw infractions) to prepare for this development. All neighbours awoke to the sound of chainsaws and trees crashing down around the property. - There was no notice about this pending development until we received a notice in our mailbox from the City. - Lastly, after the neighbours organized their own CALUC meeting because the developer wouldn't do so, the developer made it clear there was no way that he was prepared to make any changes to the proposal based on the concerns identified by neighbours. ("Let's just let Council decide" - Earl Large) <p>2) The proposal exceeds every key metric associated with the existing zoning for an R1-A panhandle subdivision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site area (m2) for the proposed new houses does not meet the minimum requirement. - The site coverage (%) for the proposed new houses greatly exceeds the limits. - The height of the proposed new houses exceeds limits (5m). - The number of storeys of the proposed new houses (2 each) exceeds the limits for a panhandle lot (1). - Six additional bylaw protected trees are proposed to be removed, in addition to the four protected trees removed without permit in Dec-2019. This proposal would remove all of the remaining tree canopy on the east half of the property, which is stunning and brazen. - The setbacks do not meet the panhandle zoning requirements, impacting privacy of neighbours and requiring additional trees to be cut down. - The purpose and ultimate configuration of accessory building is not clear as an earlier drawing showed it with full plumbing and the current drawing does not. 	1720 Lyman Duff Lane	davemcwalter@gmail.com	2020-09-26 1:55

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		<p>3) A perfect comparison is RIGHT NEXT DOOR!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a very similar development currently under construction right next door at 1745 Rockland that should be considered a model for this one. - The development at 1745 Rockland also involved the subdivision of a large R1-A zoned property with a house of heritage value. It, too, proposed a strata development with several large homes that greatly exceeded the panhandle zoning. - That led to a contentious 4-year dispute between the developer and the neighbours – the same neighbours who are now impacted by this current proposal – which included being rejected by the City both at Committee and then later at Public Hearing. - Ultimately, the developer revised the proposal in 2017 so that it respected the panhandle zoning, only then gaining the support of the neighbours and approval from Council. - Now, although fully aware of the zoning recently approved by Council in the development over his east fence, Mr. Large is putting these same neighbours through the same painful process only 3 years later! <p>This approach shows contempt for the neighbours, the existing zoning, and Council's recent decision regarding an almost exact development occurring right next door to this one.</p> <p>I feel strongly that there is no compelling reason for allowing this rezoning. The developer is the only one who would benefit (\$\$\$) from a rezoning of this property, and the cost will be borne by the surrounding neighbours who will forever lose the privacy they currently enjoy and that is protected by the existing zoning regulations. The development next door at 928 Richmond proves that a developer can successfully build a strata infill development that respects the existing zoning, the wishes of Council, the neighbours, and the neighbourhood. I recommend the City rejects this rezoning proposal, and advises the developer to re-submit in accordance with existing zoning.</p> <p>Respectfully, Dave McWalter</p>			

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Beverley Nicole Cain	Oppose	<p>Respect the existing zoning! The proposal exceeds the existing Schedule H panhandle zoning limits in almost every way. These limits exist specifically for panhandle infill developments such as this. The proponent seeks a rezoning to avoid these zoning limitations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The proposed height and number of storeys are excessive for a panhandle lot. Both Strata 2 and Strata 3 will loom large over neighbouring houses on Lyman Duff Lane and Richmond Ave. · There is not enough site area (m2) for two new houses under the existing zoning (only 1). · The proposed new houses exceed the site coverage (%) limit under the existing zoning. · The proposed setbacks on the south, east, and north property lines far exceed zoning limits, resulting in loss of privacy for existing homes. This issue is especially relevant because the houses are being built so tall. · As a result of trying to overbuild the lot, six more bylaw protected trees will be removed from the north property line. This is in addition to the five bylaw protected trees – and many other non-protected trees - suddenly removed without permit in December 2019. The entire mature tree canopy on the east half of the existing property will be removed in order to accommodate the zoning variances being sought. · There is a very similar development currently under construction right next door at 1745 Rockland (now 928 Richmond) that should be considered a model for this one. The development at 1745 Rockland also involved the subdivision of a large R1-A zoned property with a house of heritage value. It, too, proposed a strata development with several large homes that greatly exceeded the panhandle zoning. That led to a contentious 4-year dispute between the developer and the neighbours – the same neighbours who are now impacted by this current proposal – which included being rejected by the City both at Committee and then later at Public Hearing. Ultimately, the developer ended up revising the proposal so that it respected the panhandle zoning, only then being approved from Council in 2017. Now, although fully aware of the zoning permitted by Council in the development over his east fence, Mr. Large is putting these same neighbours through the same painful process only 3 years later! This approach shows contempt for the 	1735 Green Oaks Terrace	B.Nicky.C ain@outl ook.com	2020-09-26 2:43

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		neighbours, the existing zoning, and Council's recent decision regarding an almost exact development occurring right next door to this one.			

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Emma McWalter	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose the development as presented. The current proposal seeks excessive variances to the existing zoning that negatively and irreparably impact the neighbouring properties. Here are key points that support my opinion:</p> <p>1) Lack of engagement with neighbours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was no notice in Dec'19 that the trees on the east half of the lot were being removed (without permits, resulting in bylaw infractions) to prepare for this development. Neighbours were alerted to the destruction with the sound of chainsaws and trees coming down. Despite immediate calls to the City, there was nothing that could be done. - There was no notice about this pending development until we received notice from the City. - After we organized our own CALUC meeting because the developer wouldn't, the developer made it clear there was no way that he was prepared to make any changes to the proposal based on the neighbours objections ("Let's just let Council decide" - Earl Large) <p>2) The proposal exceeds every key metric associated with the existing zoning for an R1-A panhandle subdivision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site area (m2) for the proposed new houses does not meet the minimum requirement. - The site coverage (%) for the proposed new houses greatly exceeds the limits. - The height of the proposed new houses exceeds limits (5m). - The number of storeys of the proposed new houses (2 each) exceeds the limits for a panhandle lot (1). - Six additional bylaw protected trees are proposed to be removed, in addition to the four protected trees removed without permit Dec '19. This proposal would remove all of the remaining tree canopy on the east half of the property, which is which has been growing for 100s of years. - The setbacks do not meet the panhandle zoning requirements, impacting privacy of neighbours and requiring additional trees to be cut down. - The purpose and ultimate configuration of the accessory building is not clear as an earlier drawing showed it with full plumbing and the current drawing does not. 	1720 Lyman Duff Lane	emma.m cwalter @gmail.c om	2020-09-26 2:49

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		<p>3) Lack of integration with the neighbouring properties through overdevelopment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a new development currently under construction right next door at 948 Richmond, previously subdivided from 1745 Rockland that should be considered as a model. - The development at 1745 Rockland also involved the subdivision of a large R1-A zoned property with a house of heritage value. It, too, proposed a strata development with several large homes that greatly exceeded the panhandle zoning. - Following a contentious 4-year dispute between the developer and the neighbours – which included being rejected by the City both at Committee and then later at Public Hearing - the developer revised the proposal in 2017 so that it respected the panhandle zoning, only then gaining the support of the neighbours and approval from Council. - Now, although fully aware of the zoning recently approved by Council in the development over his east fence, Mr. Large is putting these same neighbours through the same painful process only 3 years later because he can! This approach shows contempt for the neighbours, the existing zoning, and Council's recent decision regarding an almost exact development occurring right next door to this one. - Despite the development at 948 Richmond being approved, I would argue it is still overly developed for the lot size. <p>I feel strongly that there is no compelling reason for allowing this rezoning and proposed development. The developer is the only one who would benefit (\$\$) from rezoning. The cost will be borne by the neighbours, who will forever lose the privacy they currently enjoy, and the environment which will forever be impacted by extensive overdevelopment. The development at 928 Richmond proves that a developer can successfully build a strata infill development that respects the existing zoning, the wishes of Council, the neighbours, and the neighbourhood. I recommend the City rejects this rezoning proposal.</p>			

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Patsy Scott	Oppose	I am against the rezoning of this panhandle lot To allow for two storeys because the height and number of storeys will negatively effect the neighbouring lots without increasing density within the Panhandle lot itself. The added height to the proposed new structures is only for the purposes of increasing the square footage of a single family dwelling which is unnecessary for the comfort and livability of the single family dwelling. The height increases are not for the purposes of creating more house to allow for more people to dwell, i.e. a duplex or other multi family dwelling.	1710 Green Oaks Terrace		2020-09-26 3:12
Linda Hardy	Oppose	The proposal exceeds the existing Schedule H panhandle zoning limits almost entirely. The panhandle specifically addressing infill developments and limits any excess. The developer wants a rezoning to run rough shod over the existing zoning limits. What is being proposed with regard to the heights and number of storeys are far more than is permissible for a panhandle lot. Both Strata 2 and Strata 3 will oppress the neighbouring houses on Lyman Duff Lane and Richmond Ave. Furthermore, there is not enough land area for two new houses under the existing zoning, only 1. The new houses also exceed the site coverage limit under the existing panhandle zoning. The proposed setbacks on the south, east, and north property lines grossly exceed zoning limits and destroy the privacy of the existing homes. The houses proposed would loom over the existing houses. Even worse, the result of the developer's aim to overbuild the lot, would be the destruction of six more bylaw protected trees being removed from the north property line. Five bylaw protected trees have already been removed, as well as unprotected trees. All were destroyed without permit or consultation with the neighbours in December 2019. The whole of the mature tree canopy on the east half of the existing property will end up being removed in order to accommodate the zoning variances being sought. The developer says trees will be planted but mature trees such as these simply cannot be replaced. Please note: there is a similar development currently starting construction next door at 1745 Rockland Ave (now numbered 928 Richmond) that is really the precedent for this proposal. The development at 1745 Rockland also involved the subdivision of a large R1-A zoned	#2-1715 Rockland Avenue, Victoria, V8S 1W6	lhardy@u vic.ca	2020-09-26 4:42

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
		<p>property with a heritage house. It also proposed a strata development with several large houses that exceeded the panhandle zoning outrageously. The neighbours were outraged and a 4 year dispute between them and the developer ensued. These are the same neighbours who will now be impacted by the current proposal. The Richmond proposal ended up being rejected by the City at both Committee and at Public Hearing. The developer had to revise the proposal and respect the panhandle zoning in order to finally be approved by Council in 2017. Now, although he is fully aware of the zoning permitted by Council previously, Mr. Large is challenging the regulations, disrespecting the neighbours and the neighbourhood and assuming that he and his plans are all that matter. His disdain is palpable both for the existing zoning, and the Council's former decision regarding the almost exact development attempted so very recently.</p> <p>Please, have a care for the heritage of the neighbourhood, its trees, its people. The developer says infill is inevitable. That may be so but let it abide by the panhandle zoning that was put into place to address over development and the destruction of what cannot be replaced. The City of Victoria deserves better.</p>			
Reed Pridy	Oppose	Objectively, this application blatantly ignores various zoning requirements. Subjectively, I wouldn't want anybody to have to go through what my family and I went through as an adjacent property to the neighboring development at 1745 Rockland (now 928 Richmond). Because these comments are published online I prefer not to include details in this form, but I encourage any councillor or city staff member to reach out directly, as I'm happy to share details of my experience, particularly over the past 6 months.	1723 Green Oaks Terrace		2020-09-26 5:37

Name	Position	Comments	Address	Email	Date
Margaret Eckenfelder	I neither support or oppose at this stage. I have a question about the plans, below.	<p>I do have some concerns about tree preservation and replanting to ensure that the canopy remains green. The landscape plan helps - the proof will be in its execution.</p> <p>As far as lot size variances are concerned, I have a question about the accessory building/gym. If this building was not in the plan, and the land it sits on was redistributed to the other 2 lots, it appears that they might not require variances for size. Could the accessory building be reduced in size to allow more land for the other 2 lots and creating a bit more space in the development, addressing one of the neighbours' concerns?</p>	1709 Oak Shade Lane, Victoria, BC		2020-09-30 18:41