

[REDACTED]

From: Paula Parker [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2021 2:20 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: R-100, Richmond Road Multiple Dwelling District

Hi there,

I would like to submit my **opposition** to this public hearing item: proposed changes to 2440 and 2448 Richmond Road: Zoning Regulation Bylaw.

We are a young family with a four month old baby, who own our home at 1794 Emerson Street and am concerned that a three storey building in that location would greatly impede our current privacy.

Thank you very much,
Paula & Lucas Parker

e: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Felix Zivcec [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 19, 2021 9:32 PM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: comments regarding development permit No. 00159 - Council of City of Victoria

To whom it my concern:

Since 1997, we have been the owners of the single family dwelling on 1788 Emerson Street and we are opposed to the proposed intensification projects on 2440 and 2448 Richmond Road. There are several reasons why we are opposed to the projects presented by Cadillac developments:

1. too much density ; eleven fold increase in number of dwelling , 1100% increase
 2. the character of proposed dwelling doesn't fit well in the single family dwelling district
 3. the proposed units are not suitable for families with the children, disabled and senior people
 4. the rental units are not affordable housing and are relatively expensive
 5. the proposed units would hurt the liveability of the neighbourhood
 6. lowering the standard of dwelling for the future generations
-
1. The proposed development would drastically increase the density, and the building lot sizes of 7481 and 7835 square feet are too small for such an increase.
 2. This form of residential intensification is in contrast to the character of a single family neighbourhood and this project is not a good fit in our neighbourhood. If this project is approved the whole area would bear no resemblance to what existed previously, and the identity and the neighbourhood character would be lost.
 3. The 400 sq. ft. units are not suitable to house children, so there will be no children in these buildings. Since there are no elevators

in the three story buildings, disabled people and seniors with the mobility issues would be also excluded from the potential tenants.

4. The developer is advertising the units as affordable housing, which is hard to believe. The average rent per month in Victoria is \$ 1800 for a 1000 sq.ft. apartment or \$ 1.8 per sq.ft. These units would rent for \$ 1400 per month for 400 sq.ft, or \$ 3.5 per sq.ft., which is almost double the rent. For this reason these units cannot be considered as affordable housing. A single retired person living on CCP and OAS definitively cannot afford this kind of rent.
5. The Boutique Workforce Rental apartments as described by the developer would create more noise, traffic congestion and parking problems for this quiet, family oriented neighbourhood and therefore negatively affect this community.
6. Most of the buildings in the neighbourhood were built over hundred years ago, and with some upgrades they are still comfortable, spacious and livable. It is not good and necessary to build homes that are only one third of the size of the homes built a century ago. Although there is a shortage of affordable housing , Victoria is still not New York, Hong Kong or Tokyo to build micro units, especially not in the single family dwelling district.

However, we would support the development of townhouses similar to Avery Lane Townhomes built by Abstract Development on Kings Road, or units with the minimum square footage of 1000 sq. ft.

We believe that Cadillac Developments is a good company and is able to come up with a better project that would stand the test of time, with dwellings that will be spacious enough and still livable in a hundred years from now.

Marina & Felix Zivcec
1788 Emerson Street
tel [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Susan Slavik [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 3:15 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Proposed development of 2440 and 2448 Richmond Road

To: The City of Victoria Council

Subject: Proposed development of 2440 and 2448 Richmond Road

I am opposed to the proposed development of the properties at 2440 and 2448 Richmond Road.

I have been the owner of the property at 1790 Emerson Street since 1991. An eight-foot length in the back corner of my yard is next to the 2440 property.

Currently, the entire block, bordered by Richmond, Emerson, Shelbourne, and Adanac, consists of single family dwellings, with residents of all ages ranging from families with young children to retired seniors. Adanac and Emerson are both single block, dead end streets, with friendly neighbours walking dogs and with kids riding their bikes and playing ball in the streets. There are flower and vegetable gardens along the sidewalks on both Emerson and Adanac.

Adding the proposed two structures with 11 units each would change the nature of this generally quiet neighbourhood. It would increase the noise and pollution levels. It would increase foot traffic and it would also increase automotive traffic and traffic congestion on Richmond Road, an already very busy street near the emergency entrance to the hospital. Inadequate parking spaces would force some residents to park on nearby streets, already fully utilized by residents and visitors to the hospital. Architecturally, they would not likely fit the pattern of housing presently on the block.

I know there is a great need for low rental housing in Victoria. If one purpose of this project is to provide low rental units, this development would certainly not meet that need. At \$1400 per month per unit, the cost would be too high for most

single people or retired people; as well, two people with a combined income could not live comfortably in a 400 square foot unit. If pets were allowed, this would increase foot traffic and trash on the street. Many people would also be reluctant to live on Richmond Road, given the noise levels of traffic and ambulance entrances to and exits from the hospital. There is also the additional noise of periodic helicopter arrivals and departures to and from the hospital.

If the 2 existing houses, which seem to be in fairly good shape, must be torn down, I think a better fit for the neighbourhood could be several small houses like those on the corner of Shelbourne and Haultain, built by Earl Large, or even several town houses. This would also reduce the levels of noise and traffic, and would more likely fit the style of current housing.

In general, I believe that the proposed units would be a bad fit for this neighbourhood; with some creative thinking, a better solution for the use of those two properties could be found.

Thank you for reading my letter.

Sincerely,

Susan Slavik
1790 Emerson Street
