

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: February 22, 2022 2:10 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: 1475 Fort St

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Bob June [REDACTED]
Sent: February 20, 2022 7:16 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: FW: 1475 Fort St

Forwarded for Ms. Bailey.

From: tamarabailey [REDACTED]
Sent: February 20, 2022 5:41 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: 1475 Fort St

Mayor and Council,

I am a resident of #10-949 Pemberton Rd, immediately behind the proposed development at 1475 Fort St. I have written to Council three times about my concerns about this proposal and I have yet see any meaningful changes to this proposal. Again, these are my concerns:

- There are far too many extensive variance requests. Why are the zoning bylaws not being applied?
- This apartment building is far too large for the size of the property. This is not downtown Victoria! The building set backs range from 13 feet to 10 feet. The 42 foot height of the building towers over the adjacent residences. The project should be designed to provide a transition to the neighbouring properties.
- The proposed underground parking lot will result in the existing vegetation, including large and beautiful trees, being permanently removed. Is all this parking necessary?
- The developer has not followed Council's direction to modify the project to lessen impacts? Why?
- Contrary to the city planner and the developer's window overlay – tenants will have a clear view into adjacent residences windows.
- This project will result in the loss of 11 social housing units. The 4 "affordable" units the developer has finally confirmed in his proposal will never replace these much needed units. Why is the city not requiring the developer to design a building which targets this need in a more substantial?

Why does the city have bylaws in place if they don't enforce them?

This proposal must be sent back to the developer to design housing that fits with the size of this very small lot.

.

Sincerely Yours,

Tamara Bailey

mayor@victoria.ca; jloveday@victoria.ca; sdubow@victoria.ca; bisitt@victoria.ca; spotts@victoria.ca; gyoung@victoria.ca; cth Thornton-joe@victoria.ca; malto@victoria.ca; stephen.andrew@victoria.ca

[REDACTED]

From: Barry Willimott [REDACTED]
Sent: February 22, 2022 4:42 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 1475 Fort Street

To Mayor and Council,

Please do not approve this development as submitted.
The proposed building is too large for this site and the architecture is not in keeping with the surroundings.

Thank you,

Vincent Turner
1030 St. Charles Street
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: February 23, 2022 12:10 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: Proposed development - 1475 Fort Street

From: Cynthia Pacheco [REDACTED]
Sent: February 22, 2022 9:42 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>; Marianne Alto (Councillor) <MAlto@victoria.ca>; Stephen Andrew (Councillor) <stephen.andrew@victoria.ca>; Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor) <sdubow@victoria.ca>; Jeremy Loveday (Councillor) <jloveday@victoria.ca>; Ben Isitt (Councillor) <BIsitt@victoria.ca>; Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor) <cthorton-joe@victoria.ca>; Sarah Potts (Councillor) <spotts@victoria.ca>
Subject: Proposed development - 1475 Fort Street

Mayor and Council,

My home, my neighbourhood and, by extension, the city are negatively impacted by the proposed development at 1475 Fort St.

We are not opposed to the redevelopment of this site and understand the challenging housing shortage in Victoria. As my neighbours and I have pointed out, the building as currently proposed is simply too large for this site. Its height and mass wedged into this small panhandle lot will significantly erode the character and liveability of the neighbourhood and city as well as impact the environment through the loss of mature trees species which can never be replaced.

I appeal to Council to send this proposal back to the developer to design a building that is better suited to this site and which conforms to the zoning bylaws which guides development in Victoria. Council did request the developer to modify the design to reduce its impact but only very minor tweaks to the design have been made. Council must appreciate that this oversized building is not going to resolve the housing shortage. I am confident that there is a compromise design which helps balances all interests and values that are in play here. We should not be supporting development at all costs but rather, as much as possible, aim for win-wins.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Pacheco
11-949 Pemberton Rd

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: February 23, 2022 9:15 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Development Permit with Variance Application # 00120

From: Gretchen Karlebach [REDACTED]
Sent: February 22, 2022 1:25 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: RE: Development Permit with Variance Application # 00120

Mayor and Council,

****WHY** was this proposal brought back to the table by the Mayor, when it was rejected by Council last year?

****WHY** were the developers allowed to continue the process for 2 years, asking for *variances*, when the proposal does **NOT** follow the By-Laws nor the Design Guidelines....

****HAS THE DEVELOPER ACTED IN GOOD FAITH?** When Council requests input from neighbourhoods, we assume you **want** to hear from us, you **will listen respectfully**, you **will seriously consider** the neighbourhood issues & concerns. Your role as a Council member representing Victoria's citizens is extremely important. Your actions & votes affect all of us permanently, so I am requesting that you review carefully all that you have heard, read, seen from the neighbours, and what the developers have presented -- have they listened? have they made changes to address the neighbourhood and/or Council concerns?

****WHAT CHANGES** have you seen in the developer's plans to address the issues brought forward during the **past 2 years?** or since the Mayor gave the developers *another chance*? There has been *minimal to no changes* in reference to any of the neighbours' or Council's concerns for 2 years. The developer continues to request multiple variances, essentially asking Council to ignore current By-Laws and Design Guidelines.

The plan still has an **OVERBLOWN FOOTPRINT** that pushes to all property lines, it will *still invade the privacy* of the immediate neighbours to the east, south, & west, it will *still block* a fair amount of sunshine for some neighbours, it will *still remove a well established healthy urban forest* during a time of climate change, that a few immature trees in pots cannot replace, and finally it sets **precedents** for future development proposals.

****Does this proposal address the issue of "AFFORDABLE HOUSING?"** I think **NOT**. It will however displace those vulnerable people currently living there. Far better to upgrade and renovate, in order to address the housing issue. However, it most likely will have a **financial affect** on the neighbours in existing housing, in addition to the changes in neighbourhood ambiance, noise levels, privacy, protections from urban forest, sunshine,

****Have you walked the development site? and walked the adjoining neighbours properties?** For 2 years neighbours have invited each of you to visit the proposed development site at 1475 Fort, in order to fully understand the issues & concerns we have presented to you. To make an *informed, knowledgeable assessment* of this application, and to cast a **valid vote**, one would have to have walked the site.

We are thanking you in advance for reading & seriously considering the issues & concerns shared,
Gretchen Karlebach
Dr. D.G. Karlebach

[REDACTED]

From: Gary Menzel [REDACTED]
Sent: February 23, 2022 2:51 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 1475 Fort Street Public Hearing

My name is Gary Menzel, and a long term Victoria resident and live at 3148 Quadra St. I am writing to support the redevelopment project proposal at 1475 Fort St.

Rental buildings are increasingly harder to find in the City. I support the developer, Lantern for replacing the existing rental building with a larger rental building. Very rare to see that these days with condos being pre-sold and built for sale. Supporting rental stock in the City of Victoria is important and council needs to support this application from Lantern.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email of support.

Yours truly,

Gary Menzel - [REDACTED]
3148 Quadra St.,
Victoria, BC
V8X 1G1

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: February 23, 2022 9:15 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Development Permit with Variances Application for 1475 Fort Street

From: Vanessa Dingley [REDACTED]
Sent: February 22, 2022 2:35 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Development Permit with Variances Application for 1475 Fort Street

Re: 1475 Fort Street – DPV00120

To: Mayor and Council:

Although you have heard from me several times before on the above topic, the decision to be made on this proposal is of considerable consequence to our neighbourhood so I am compelled to write again! I feel that my neighbours and I have made our main points quite clearly in previous correspondence. Several of us made them again at the Public Hearing on June 10th June, 2021, and we felt that we had been heard when **five members of the Council were sufficiently convinced of our case to vote against the proposal, and it was defeated 5 to 4 at that time.**

Despite that, Mayor Helps called for a Re-Consideration, and the proposal was sent back to Lantern Properties yet again for further revision. Just as on previous occasions when the proposal had been sent back to Lantern, this time it once again came back with minimal changes. The adjustments that purport to address our concerns are very far from having done so because:

- **Size of building and variances:** While the footprint of the parking area has been reduced slightly, the footprint of the building above ground has not been reduced at all. The fact remains, as Councillor Young has clearly pointed out, that **the building is simply too large for the site.**
 - Please recognize that the set-back variances requested have not been changed and continue to be excessive and unjustifiable.
 - The massing of the building has not been changed either, even though the height was previously reduced very slightly.
 - The lack of changes to the set-backs means that **the building is far too close to the perimeter of the site, and therefore too close to the neighbouring properties, seriously encroaching on our privacy.** As Councillor Isitt noted, our location “is not downtown”, where closer proximity might be expected. Such proximity is inappropriate here.
 - The adjustments to the balconies could be described as “tweaks” and are inadequate in addressing our concerns.
- **Loss of mature trees:** Although the reduction in the size of the parking area has been done to save some of the trees (and that is appreciated), it is **not enough to save the mature trees** that will have to be taken down to accommodate the over-sized building. The environmental protection provided by mature trees is increasingly important in a time of “heat domes”, and it is irresponsible to destroy them when replacement trees of that size take so long to grow. The building should be re-designed to accommodate the mature trees.
- **Affordable Housing:** We have repeatedly stated that we understand the need for additional housing in Victoria, especially affordable rental housing, and we are not against redevelopment on the site with a smaller building. **I do not believe that the over-sized building proposed will have a significant impact on Victoria’s shortage of affordable housing,** but it will have a significant negative impact on our immediate neighbourhood.

- **Feasibility of a smaller scale building:** I am not convinced by Lantern's claim that anything smaller would be uneconomic. Unfortunately, we have several times seen Lantern make statements that we know not to be true. Has anyone looked at figures to validate their assertion that a smaller building would not be feasible?

IN CONCLUSION:

Please do not accept the minimal changes that have been offered by the developer as a solution to our concerns. **The proposal needs a much more substantial re-design** to make it acceptable to neighbours. We are **not** making unreasonable requests. Please do not approve the proposal in its current form. Thank you.

Vanessa and John Dingley
949 Pemberton Road, #12
20th February 2022