

**From:** [John Boon](#)  
**To:** [Development Services email inquiries](#)  
**Cc:** [planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca](mailto:planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca)  
**Subject:** Proposed development 1042-1044 Richardson st  
**Date:** September 7, 2020 7:48:46 PM

---

Dear Sir/Madam

As a close neighbour of this planned development please take note of our objection to the height of the building . Six stories is not in keeping with the rest of the buildings on the street and would result in lack of views and sunlight for those next to the building.

Another issue is the lack of proposed parking spaces especially in view of the changes being made to Richardson Street.

John and Anne Boon  
1020 Richardson Street

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or files associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

As an owner of a condo in The Richardson building at 1037 Richardson Street, I am concerned that the proposed development will be too tall and out of character for the neighbourhood.

There are already too many vehicles parked on Richardson street and with 19 units, I don't think 9 parking spaces is sufficient.

If three protected trees will be removed, what plan is there to replace those trees, or preferably increase the number of trees,

ie: if three trees are removed, six trees should be planted. Anyway, if these trees are protected, why would the property developer be allowed to remove them?

And dogs. Will there be any restrictions on the size of dogs or number of dogs per unit. And what about other pets?

Is there an affordable rent guideline that a landlord has to follow? Where can I look for that information?

Will short-term rentals be allowed, like AirBnB. I don't think that is desirable.

I think six stories with 19 units on 7190 square feet is too dense for this area and will set an undesirable precedent for all future development applications.

Narda Agar

To Whom It May Concern:

We have received the Proposed Development Notice as we are property owners within range of this proposed development. We are adamantly opposed to the Proposed Development at the above address. This area of Fairfield should have no higher density that is currently applied and that the height limitation in this area remain as currently applied. The Floor space ratio of 1:83:1.0 is not what this open green neighbourhood would benefit from. Surely the size of structure contemplated on this small lot; would create large residential shadows of light for adjoining residences. We are in Complete DISAGREEMENT with the size and ethos of this development.

Penrith Properties

I have a few concerns regarding this development, the main ones being the lack of parking spots , the height of the six story building, increase in traffic and removal of 3 trees on site.

submitted by Donna F. Greenwood owner of condo at 1037 Richardson St Victoria B.C.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I wish to provide my objection to the proposed development at this location. My objection is to the proposed parking for 9 vehicles whereas the zoning requirement is for 17.

Parking is already congested in this area . I am anticipating a loading zone will be needed to accommodate moving vans / vehicles for a rental building of this size especially in light of the bike lanes soon to be added to this block .

A loading zone will result in a reduced number of parking spots while at the same time increased demand will be added based on the proposed development .

Thank you  
Cathy Wallace  
201, 1037 Richardson Street  
Victoria, BC V8V 3C6

I am a resident in a condominium that backs on the proposed development at 1042-1044 Richardson St. Victoria, B.C.

This proposal for a six story residence with 19 suites - on a small lot - with only 9 parking spaces (no visitor parking), in an already overcrowded area, is beyond ridiculous!

This short block between Vancouver St. and Cook Street is already beyond capacity for on-street parking. There is only room for single lane traffic. (and the bus will not back up!!)

This proposal is definitely not suitable for this site and location.

S. Rae McDonald  
201, 1035 McClure, Victoria, V8V 3G1

607, 777 Blanshard Street  
Victoria, B.C., V8W 2G9  
28 August 2020

Mayor and Council,  
Victoria, B.C.  
mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca

Dear Mayor and Councilors,

As owner of a unit in the condo building that backs on the proposed development at 1042-1044 Richardson, Victoria, B.C. (and whose parking lot is adjacent to the proposed development) I wish to protest strongly.

To propose a residential building of 19 units and only 9 parking spaces is ludicrous. Richardson, a very short, narrow street, has already reached and surpassed its saturation point. Cars park on both sides, making it virtually a one-way street and reducing visibility to a dangerous level.

Also, 6 stories is excessive for the area and the “garden suite” is nothing but a converted garage.

The entire proposal needs to be rethought and significantly down-sized.

Your truly,

(Mrs) Sandra Holloway  
Owner. #201 1035 McClure St, Victoria

cc. Fairfield Gonzales Community Association Land Use Committee

Hello,

I am responding to the proposed development of 1042-1044 Richardson Street.

I am not in favour of this proposal as it stands for the following reasons:

- 3 protected trees are to be removed
- surrounding buildings are 4 stories - does the OCP allow for 6 stories?
- parking is to be reduced to 9 for a 19 rental unit building - this is inadequate and will impact the street
- the developer does not state how many units will be affordable and how many will be market units.

We have an Official Community Plan that is the result of the thinking of a large group of people and we should follow it. Otherwise why bother making these plans at all if we are not going to protect the neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Mary James  
1015 Rockland Ave



Dear CALUC and Victoria City Council,

1248330 BC LTD is proposing a six-storey purpose built rental building – specifically a 19 unit building with 9 parking stalls (10 without) at the above address and the removal of three (3) protected trees.

I live at 1037 Richardson St. – slightly west and across the street from the proposed building.

The neighbourhood consists almost entirely of multi-residential buildings – all between 2- 4 stories (max). The site for the proposed building is located in the middle of a street in between Vancouver St and Cook St. Its neighbors would be a 2-storey condominium complex built in 2008 on the west and a 3-storey apartment building on the east. It would be facing a 3-storey apartment complex.

It is easy to see how a 6-storey building would stick out like a sore thumb. The proposal is so inconsistent with the neighbourhood's distinct character, I question whether the developers have considered the effect of their proposal on the livability and stability of our neighbourhood.

The highest buildings in the area are 4-stories. This current level of density supports a healthy, livable neighbourhood – it strikes a good balance between minimizing individual footprints while conserving public spaces and the natural environment. The buildings blend in well with the heights of the trees giving the neighbourhood a green space feel.

By allowing a 6-storey building in this location, the City of Victoria will be setting a precedent which will not only destroy the distinctive nature of our neighbourhood – it will set the City of Victoria back years in terms of building livable and environmentally sound neighbourhoods. The street will take on the character of a main street with tall cement buildings and little green space. This goes against all that Victoria City Council has been promoting in terms of green initiatives and livable neighbourhoods.

The builder is also proposing 9 parking spaces for 19 units in an area where parking is already at a premium. The current structure has 17 parking spaces. The arithmetic is easy. You are adding 19 families with 8 less parking stalls. The notion that the 10 units without parking spaces will not have a car is a huge leap – where will these new residents, their friends and family park?

As we speak the city is working to add bike traffic/lanes on Richardson St. changing the nature of the traffic flow and parking in the area. According to news reports the proposed changes will increase traffic time however the trade off for “livability” should balance it out; but then to increase the inefficiency of the traffic issues in the area even more with a badly planned building proposal will be indefensible.

I believe additional work needs to be done on this proposal. In 2020 the design for the new building should be an improvement on the livability and natural environment of the neighbourhood. We have the knowhow and the resources. Anything less would be a cop out.

Frances Linguanti

September 3, 2020

Dear CALUC Representative Kevin White, Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

We believe, as we imagine many of our nearby neighbours might, that redevelopment of 1042-1044 Richardson would be a welcome addition to our neighbourhood from an aesthetic viewpoint as well as from the point of view of more housing becoming available, including very important affordable housing.

There are just a few faults with the proposed development notice details ...

### 1) Protected Trees

We appreciate that a construction site needs access and space, but if those 3 trees are indeed 'protected', why are they proposed for removal? Other sites make work-arounds.

2) Rental Unit Size – 1226m<sup>2</sup> for 19 units, minus common areas such as hallways, stairwells, and utility rooms will mean the units will be less than 600 sq. feet average.

Further, the 1 bedroom units would be significantly smaller since the 2 bedrooms would be larger than 600.

Such tiny spaces makes us wonder if these units might ultimately become transient rentals, like AirB&B units, with temporary residents, unfamiliar with courtesies, cooperation, and driving habits (especially re the new bike lanes slated for Richardson).

Also, transient rentals (like AirB&B) would mean those units would be removed from the city's permanent rental pool.

### 3) Parking – 9 instead of the required 17

It is a fallacy to assume that tenants in affordable housing will not have a car.

It is a fallacy to assume that those who rent at market rental rates will only have one car.

It is a fallacy to assume that those in rental units won't have friends visit, who would want to park their cars nearby.

9 parking spots for 19 units is pathetically underservicing the residents, and pushes overflow into the already overcrowded Richardson Street parking.

A wander along Richardson Street between Vancouver and Cook Streets, any evening, will convince you that there is not a single extra parking spot currently available.

And it now appears that the government will be mandating that parking spaces be available for EV charging stations within multi-family buildings.

Luckily, our address has 4 dedicated parking stalls for visitors, along with one stall per unit. It is likely that the other nearby strata buildings have similar. It is very apparent that this new structure will have no visitor parking, along with not enough parking for the residents themselves.

#### 4) Clogged Arteries

There is general malaise among residents that “the bicycle lanes are coming” and with it a narrowing of car movement space (much zigging and zagging).

Also, with that change, it will create more anxiety and more danger when pulling out of our driveways, along with more potential danger to cyclists.

One can imagine there will be dozens more unsightly parking informational poles along this block as that unfolds.

This is a RESIDENTIAL street.

Additionally, with the city’s plans to carve up Vancouver Street, residents on Richardson and Collinson will be forced to exit our residential street via busy Cook Street, a very anxiety provoking, risky, possibly dangerous situation when turning left (north).

Hopefully the city administrators will see fit to move bike lanes and the city bus off Richardson (this bus seems never to stop on our block to drop off or pick up passengers). Diversion to Yates Street or Fairfield Road are viable alternatives.

#### 5) Missing Figures

The proposal sounds ideally suited for this neighbourhood because rental units are so needed, and especially affordable ones. But where are the figures? If for instance, the majority of units will be market rate rentals and 2 will be affordable units, it is hardly a reason for the city to make concessions to the builder re number of parking stalls.

We remember vividly the Co-housing development at Fairfield Road and Harbinger which was proposed to have had a few affordable units, but after pressure from the early buyers, the requirement for affordable units was dropped and all it took was a multi-signature petition to City Hall. Where was the commitment?

In summary, this proposal for 1042/44 Richardson is way out of sync with what this neighbourhood can support. Perhaps the answer is an 8 or 10 unit, 4 storey building, with 10 parking stalls.

Respectfully,  
Lynn and Edward Davidson  
205 – 1037 Richardson Street  
Victoria, BC V8V 3C6

My name is Anya Slater and I reside at 750 Cook St, Victoria BC. I am writing to oppose the proposed development at 1042-1044 Richardson St, Victoria BC due to concerns with the scale compared to the surrounding buildings, displacement, and affordability.

Removing the existing two-storey building and replacing it with a six-storey building would dramatically shift the skyline in the neighbourhood. The neighbouring buildings on this block are two- to four-storeys. The scale of the proposed building compared to its surroundings would mean that many inhabitants of the neighbourhood would have views of the trees and sky degraded by this building. The proposed building would tower over the surrounding apartments, casting a considerable shadow and blocking most of the direct sunlight in the winter months.

The 5 meter setback from the apartments at 1035 McClure St would mean residents' balconies would face a wall. This would give very little "breathing room" for both the neighbours and potential new residents. Although the setback reduces massing in relation to Richardson St, it increases massing in relation to the buildings on Cook St and McClure St. Additionally, a building of this height would mean considerable loss of privacy for buildings to the East and West. My apartment is to the North-East of 1042-1044 Richardson, and this proposed building would mean new residents could see directly into my suite. The proposal also includes the removal of three trees with no plan to replace any of them. This would further erode the privacy between buildings (in addition to changing the view and displacing birds).

The applicants letter mentions only the displacement of the tenants of 1042-1044 Richardson St, but the proposed development should also take into consideration the neighbouring residents. If this proposed development were to be built I would have to move to a new apartment because of the impacts on privacy and light. I imagine the impact on residents at 1035 McClure St and 1050 Richardson St would be even greater.

I am in favour of having more affordable housing in this city. As a new resident in this neighbourhood the rent for my one-bedroom apartment is over 50% of my monthly income with two jobs. However, the potential gains of this new development need to be weighed against the losses caused by the displacement it may create. With no cap on rental increases between tenancies, any time tenants move it drives up the cost of rent in this city. The displacement of residents in the area due to this proposed development will lead to a lack of affordability more generally.

I strongly oppose the proposed development in it's current state and urge you to consider the surrounding neighbours, displacement, and affordability more generally.

Warmly,  
Anya Slater

Donald L Main  
#205-1041 Richardson Street  
Victoria, BC V8V 3C6

September 6, 2020

Mayor and Council  
City of Victoria  
email: [mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca)

**Re: Proposed Development, 1042/44 Richardson Street, Victoria, BC, Applicant 1248330 BC LTD**

Mayor, Council and City Staff;

Please accept this letter as **opposition** to the proposed development at 1042/44 Richardson St.

I have lived at 1041 Richardson for 19 years and am acutely familiar with life on the 1000 block of Richardson, the deciduous tree lined street, bus route, thoroughfare to Vancouver St and east, the parking issues, single loading zone used as parking, the history of emergency service vehicles, the immense increase in home delivery vehicles (Amazon, restaurants, etc), and the community. I would think that those in receipt of this letter would have some knowledge of the 1000 block of Richardson through their misguided proposals for bikelane bastardization of the street, but clearly some education is necessary.

The following points must be taken into consideration:

1. The tallest building on this residential block is 3.5 storeys, with John Teague designed heritage homes at Vancouver (2.5 storeys) and apartment blocks at Cook Street (2.5+ storeys). Most of the less than three storey trees are deciduous, meaning bare in winter and removes any sense of privacy for the 100s of residents on the street. (The only evergreen trees were removed from the Terra Verde site during development.)
2. The 1000 Block of Richardson is both rental and strata housing, with not enough parking as it is. Some residents have up to four vehicles that they juggle on the street. When residents can't find a spot to park, they resort in using the three-minute loading zone at 1041...thereby eliminating taxi, assistance vehicles and emergency vehicles to stop in the middle of the street...not safe for the elderly, infirm, and wheelchair residents.
3. The current building at 1042/44 Richardson resembles a two storey family home with a front lawn that the building residents often use. There is nothing architecturally unique about the current building, however it is in keeping with the current scale of buildings in the neighbourhood. The 1000 block of Richardson is not urban or village core...which is where buildings of a six storey scale belong.
4. The proposed development intends 19 rental units with 9 parking stalls...ridiculous! It is naive think that that only renters without vehicles will rent here in this desirable neighbourhood.
5. The proposed development is a tower...6 storeys...higher than any other building...even taller than Government House...are you kidding? The proposed development is not all sympathetic to anything in the neighbourhood. Think about approaching this building from Vancouver St...2 to 2.5 storey buildings, and a parking lot (for 1035 Maclure)...then a grossly over-developed tower. This is bad urban planning and streetscape design.

6. When the trees are bare in the winter, the proposed development will be akin to View Towers, dwarfing all else around it. Imagine this grain silo development from all angles of approach.
7. The proposal notice states that efforts will be made to retain as much of the building as possible...which means nothing...there's nothing to retain architecturally and the proposed development is pushing to the very limits of the lot.

Cook Street Village and the urban core development at Fort & Cook are blocks away from Richardson, that's why many of us chose to live in the area – once you leave the core areas, we have scale of homes that allow visibility to blue sky, trees, and a community neighbourhood...an overbuilt proposed development of the scale is sincerely unwelcome and unnecessary and frankly...ugly.

Please do not allow this development to proceed in it's current form.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DL Main', written in a cursive style.

Donald L Main

Dear Mayor and Council

I am writing to state my opposition to a six-storey building proposed for 1042 – 1044 Richardson Street.

This is a residential area where the current buildings are not more than four storeys and a six-storey building will tower over everything in the area, not to mention blocking the light for some residents whose properties abut 1042 – 1044 Richardson.

I also question how parking will be affected by this construction as it would appear there is no extra parking in the 1000 block of Richardson now, and once the City destroys Vancouver Street and puts a bike lane on Richardson, parking may be non-existent. Should this development go ahead, where will the construction workers park? I live only one block away and our portion of McClure could be inundated with construction vehicles, as I'm quite sure these workers will not be biking to their jobs.

Respectfully submitted,

Edie Jefferson  
301 – 1019 McClure Street

Good day,

I live across the street from this proposed development at 1042 Richardson St.

I am opposed to this six-storey building being developed here for many reasons. The height of the building and the trees that will be removed are concerning. This part of town is beginning to lose its quaint character and is becoming a louder, more concrete, busier metropolis want-to-be.

The more pressing concern is the parking situation and the traffic increase and congestion that will ensue. Richardson St. is already busy as it is with parked cars and being a bus route. We don't need to make that situation any worse by increasing the amount of units that much, and people begin to feel crowded in their own neighborhoods.

Thank you,  
Nicole



Dear Mayor / City Council and Kevin White (Fairfield Gonzales Community Association Land Use Committee),

Re: Proposed Development Notice for 1042-1044 Richardson Street (Applicant Name 1248330 BC LTD).

I recently received a proposed development notice for this property in my neighbourhood. I tried to comment as per the instructions on the Victoria Development Tracker / CALUC but was unable to find the application.

A 6-story building would be completely out of place in this neighbourhood. As you know, it is currently a mixture of single family homes, large older homes that have been converted to condos, and low-rise apartment buildings (3 stories). A six-story building (with 19 units no less!) would stand out like a sore thumb / dwarf surrounding homes and buildings, and would increase the density of this quiet block of Richardson Street dramatically.

I would like to register my objection to this proposal. A smaller, 3-story building that 'fits in' with this lovely neighbourhood would be an acceptable alternative.

Thank you very much,

Rosemary Binnie  
1129 McClure Street

I received a Proposed Development Notice from the City for a new six-storey apartment building to be constructed at 1042-1044 Richardson Street. Based on the information in the notice I do not support this proposed rezoning. I live in the locally-owned 4-story 1970s rental apartment building at 666 Cook Street. The proposed development site is approximately 50 metres from my home and is prominently visible from my west-facing balcony.

I have two primary concerns: the proposal includes insufficient off-street parking, but more importantly, rezoning to the proposed density and height would encourage developers buy and seek redevelopment of the many mid-age rental buildings in this neighbourhood. I do not share the notice's assessment that this proposal "appears to align with the OCP" (although it does acknowledge that it "may require" OCP amendment.). Also, there is a heritage tree issue that should be considered in relation to this property.

### Parking

With no on-street parking on Cook Street, parking is already a problem on this block of Richardson even though it currently has residential-only parking on both sides of the street. (I rent an off-street parking space, but whenever I have visitors I always encourage them to park on Collinson Street instead, even though it is further away.) The provision of nine parking stalls for 19 units is totally insufficient for this location.

The City's Bicycle Master Plan envisions Richardson Street (including this block, to connect with the Vancouver Street bike route) as becoming part of the cycling network. Creating bike lanes is do-able (and I support it) east of Cook Street, where there is already parking on only one side of the street. Reducing on-street parking in this block to enable bike lanes will already face neighbourhood opposition due to the existing shortage of parking spaces (Although I believe that bike lanes may not be needed for safety on this block, which cars already avoid or go very slowly because of the narrowness of the travelling lanes.) But approval of this proposal would remove even the option of considering reducing on-street parking on this street.

### Neighbourhood suitability

This is my main argument. Almost all of the housing in this part of Fairfield are older houses (often converted to duplex, triplex or four-plexes), mid-age three and four-storey wood-frame apartment buildings, and relatively new low-rise townhouses. There are no six-storey buildings within several blocks of this location.

The site's current R-K zoning allows 0.6 to 1 fsr, and permits a maximum building site coverage of 55%. The current use of this property is five (affordable) rental units. This is approximately equivalent to the allowed density of the townhouses (which would probably not be affordable) that could replace these units under the current zoning. But at least that type of redevelopment would be consistent with the existing and OCP-envisioned neighbourhood character.

Rental buildings in Victoria are already the target of speculative investment by large non-local development companies. A spot rezoning of this property, and an OCP amendment to enable it, would signal that the City is not committed to protection of any of its "Urban Residential" designated areas. This would lead to expanded speculative investment here, and even before redevelopment is proposed companies would use renoviction and other techniques to increase their revenues from existing buildings, leading to a massive loss of affordable rental housing in Victoria.

#### OCP compliance

This proposal is well within the Urban Residential designation of the OCP which generally permits up to 1.2: 1 fsr. This proposal is for 1.83: 1.0 fsr density. As far as I can tell, the only policy in the OCP that could be used to justify this proposal as being in compliant with the OCP is in the "Density" column of the *Figure 8: Urban Place Guidelines*, which states: "Increased density up to a total of approximately 2:1 may be considered in strategic locations for the advancement of plan objectives (see policy 6.22)."

Policy 6.22 clarifies that exceptions can be made for higher density only if "the proposal significantly advances the objectives of this plan" and if one of three preconditions is met. The only information in the notice that I received that might be used to argue that this proposal meets the first requirement is that the new building would be limited to rental accommodation, some of which would be "affordable". As argued above, I believe that this proposal would be contrary to rental and affordable housing objectives, not in support of them.

With regard to the three required preconditions, I don't believe that the site is within 200 metres of the urban core (or a town centre or large urban village), and Map 4 of Section 7 of the OCP shows this block of Richardson Street to function as a local street, not as an arterial or secondary arterial road. Thus, this proposal meets neither of the OCP's provisions that allow "wobble room" for increasing

density beyond 1.2: 1 fsr. Such a rezoning would clearly require an OCP amendment.

Heritage tree

If the above isn't sufficient reason to reject this proposal, one additional consideration that I suggest the Planning Department look into is the loss of protected trees. The notice states that there are three protected trees on the property, all of which would be removed. The developer who now owns the property has already removed a large tree from the back of the site, and in doing so has weakened a very large oak tree on the North-East corner of the site. Although that tree is not very conspicuous to the general public, I believe that it might be one of the largest oak trees in the City of Victoria.

**Bill Huot**

410 666 Cook Street

Greetings,

I have not heard or read anything further on the proposed development and I know there were a great many concerns expressed by people living next to this property. The CALUC tracker says the proposal is 'active'. What does that mean?

This morning a beautiful large tree was taken down and removed by a local company. This is shocking to those of us directly impacted by the proposed project and the loss of the tree. I had enjoyed seeing and hearing the birds in the tree, and now there is one less. The developer had wanted to remove 3 trees. Does the removal of one mean they are all approved for removal? Did City Hall approve the removal of this first tree?

I would really appreciate a response. I hope that this project is not slowly moving forward without transparency.

Thank you,

Wendy Townsend  
#406- 1035 McClure St.

Good Morning,

As a resident of 1035 McClure Street, I am opposed to the development proposal submitted for 1042/1044 Richardson Street. I have read the initial proposal and the current submission with revisions and am disappointed that the height of the proposed building has not been addressed. While the inadequate parking has been moved underground, my concerns about the height and aesthetic of the structure have not been responded to.

I purchased my unit last year (before any proposal was made by Mr. Johnson) mainly because of the unobstructed sunlight my suite gets. I'm on the third floor facing south and the current proposal will block all sunlight from my unit from Fall until Spring. My view would be a large, dark, grey concrete wall. I can't imagine any of you would want to look at that all day long.

While Mr. Johnson has stated in his proposal that he has considered the effects the new building would have on 1035 McClure, he is either lying or has considered those effects and chosen to ignore them. The effects would obviously be detrimental to our quality of life and property values. As I stated previously, who will compensate me and other residents of our building for this?

Mr. Johnson has also proposed removing the Japanese Maple on our property. It is not clear to me why he wants to take down yet another beautiful tree to put up this eyesore of a building, and I am opposed to removal of any of the trees or foliage on our property.

There are many concerns with the density, height, inadequate parking, aesthetics, strain on Richardson Street, privacy and safety in Mr. Johnson's proposal. I trust that Mayor and Council will look out for the interests of the residents already living and paying taxes in our lovely city, and not prioritize this development over the needs of those of us who fund the operations of the city.

Thank you,

Sandy Enns  
#304 - 1035 McClure Street

To: Victoria City Council

Re: 1042-44 Richardson Development Application

Date: May 27, 2021

Dear Council,

Though I do support higher density in my neighbourhood, and understand that development happens and needs to happen, I don't support the development at 1042-44 Richardson.

The home and carriage house that exist already are providing rental opportunities to at least five residents or families, currently. I don't think the time is right to tear these buildings down. I'd like to see this development paused for some years, as long as possible, so that current lower priced, more affordable accommodation can be maintained.

Eventually, if and when it is necessary to replace these buildings, years from now, I hope a design that doesn't highlight a gaping multi-story concrete stairwell that hovers menacingly over passing pedestrians and cyclists might be considered. In fact, if the current plan was basically reversed, and I know that is more complex than it sounds, many more residents could enjoy some sunlight, rather than giving the bulk of sunlight to a looming stairwell and just a few units. This is not California. People need as much sunlight as they can get.

Thank you,

Tobin Stokes  
731 Vancouver St  
Victoria BC

Good evening – Yet another overbuild on a small lot. What is stated as 5-storeys is really 7+ storeys as has underground parking and rooftop common space. And of course 9' ceilings, not like 8' as done in the past (adds another ½ storey to build). Monster building – the poor people next door in 1045. And likely little feedback to City as street has many rental units on it. If you want to see what an overbuild of supposed 5 storeys looks like, bike down to the end of Quadra and observe the monster-build Beacon on the Park. And of course then there is the new building Telus is proposing on Douglas – again way higher than number of storeys reported. Bigger isn't always better, isn't always the recipe for more livable city.

Thank you,  
Lisa Hebb



Good morning,

I am the owner of #304 - 1035 McClure Street and am reviewing the latest submission in the development proposal for 1042/1044 Richardson Street. It appears that Appendices B-E are not attached to the November 2, 2021 letter to council. Can those please be provided?

The impact of this development on my home remains concerning. It will completely block sunlight from my unit from Fall until Spring each year. The design of the building does not make up for this in any way, as the North facing wall will be dark grey, with windows and patio doors at eye level to the units in my building. The last thing I want to see when I sit on my balcony or look out my windows is a large, dark cement wall and someone else's bedroom. One of the main reasons I purchased my unit was because it had unobstructed daylight. If this development is allowed to be built with the current design, I again ask who will be compensating me for the inevitable drop in property value and the cost of moving to another location? Will Council prioritize this rental development over the wellbeing of current property owners?

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Sandy Enns

Hello,

I deeply oppose this redevelopment proposal.

<https://tender.victoria.ca/webapps/ourcity/Prospero/Details.aspx?folderNumber=REZ00753>

This property already exists as a multi-dwelling home. Multiple families live in this home. Redeveloping it does not serve the community or address the housing crisis. Building modern rental eyesores in this neighbourhood is inexcusable when the house that already exists here maximises its occupancy and upholds the integrity of character and heritage that Fairfield is known for. To set the precedent to destroy heritage buildings that have already optimised their usage by allowing multiple families to dwell is an unsustainable one.

The applicant for rezoning should highly consider investing greater care into the upkeep of the current property rather than damaging existing resources that are valuable to the city. The Fairfield neighbourhood has expressed time and time again that character buildings are of greater value than vapid newbuilds.

Olivia