

Good afternoon.

I had a conversation last night with Ben Ziegler who is the representative for the South Jubilee Community Association Land Use Committee and learned that yesterday it was agreed by himself and Aryze Developments Inc. to hold a Zoom meeting on **January 11th 2021 at 7:00 pm.**

As those of us who live on the north side of Fort Street (Swans, Waterford Park and The Carriage House) are in the North Jubilee Community Association Land Use area it is not Mr. Ziegler's responsibility to notify us of this meeting.

Thus this email.

We are welcome to participate however.

To do so login to landuse@southjubilee.ca and follow the prompts.

I have serious concerns about the short notice regarding both this meeting and the short notice afforded for the opportunity to to comment on the proposal at the victoria.ca/devtracker.

Best regards.
Al Bryant
402-1710 Fort Street

Mayor Helps and council members,
and Mr. Ziegler,

I have been an owner at 1821 Fern St. for approximately 30 years and I have experienced a significant deterioration in the available parking in the vicinity of my home over that time frame. The apartment building across the street from me has many residents who find themselves parking on the opposite side of Fern Street (designated residents only) and this is a constant problem all along Fern Street.

The Friends Meeting House further down also has inadequate parking for all of its many events (once they resume) putting additional pressure on other residents of this block.

In addition, a number of individuals park on Fern Street to access the pub at Christie's Carriage House Pub, which is just down the street from the proposed development.

The taxes for my home have just increased by 5%, yet I am seldom able to park in front of my own home, because the one spot is taken up by other non resident vehicles.

The City does not issue permits: rather it relies on infrequent patrols and/or citizen policing to report offenders to the parking office to send out officials to issue parking tickets.

I have several times been yelled at and harassed by individuals who have parked in front of my house who were ticketed, and who had assumed that I had reported them. On two occasions they pounded on my door and I was threatened.

There was also an ill-advised, complete loss of the second parking spot in front of my residence because of the (in my view unnecessary) extension of the yellow lines for lane way access off Fern. Even the City Engineering Office agreed with me that the extension of yellow line was not needed, but this individual was later overruled and less realistic heads prevailed.

That is the background to my lived experience in my neighbourhood Mayor Helps and council and Mr. Ziegler.

As to the current proposal at 1693 Fort, my biggest concern is with the proposed amendment to allow for fewer than 7 parking stalls in a building that will have 23 residential units. Current zoning requires 29 spots!

While I support use of public transportation, cycling, and walking as much as possible, I am concerned many tenants will have their own vehicles and they will be inevitably be visited by individuals who will also have vehicles. Where will they all park?

The suggestion that only 7 parking units for a 23 unit building is, in my view, absurd.

Why the developer would be given the opportunity to reduce the number of zoning required parking stalls to this number defies logic.

There will be serious parking issues in the neighbourhood and conflicts arising from this development if in fact it goes ahead as proposed.

What measures/ regulations are in place to stop or to prevent the developer eventually selling the units to the for-profit sector or to transfer ownership to a different kind of organization that will then turn the unit over to non-student rentals or condo owners who will be even more likely to own vehicles?

How many of the stalls will be designated shared use vehicles?

How many stalls will have charging stations given green goals?

Will there be any requirements that the students who occupy the units would be, for example, restricted to not each having their own motor vehicles.

Likely you can not do that legally, even if it were part of your greener intent.

How can you possibly assume or even imagine that there will be only 7 vehicles parked at the development at any given time?

I also see no distinction in the plans between parking stalls for residents and for visitors for example. Where will the visitors park?

And where will the residents park at night when all of the stalls are full?

In addition, you well know that use of public transportation has drastically fallen off since Covid.

There is no end in sight to the need for physical distancing and the fears that go with using public transportation in crowded conditions.

The reality is that individuals are not using public transportation as much, and they are using personal vehicles at even higher rates now.

While some of us are cycling and walking more, this does not ever make up for the increase in personal vehicle travel, all too often solo.

All of you will note that the amount of traffic in Victoria has not decreased since Covid, when you factor in the reduced tourism.

Please insist that this developer provide the current minimum number of parking stalls for the number of units ultimately approved.

My second concern is with height. Six storeys exceeds all nearby buildings and will be an outlier in this neighbourhood. Allowing this will encourage future high rise construction along an already congested corridor. Please keep multi storey units to the city centre.

And my final concern is about notice. I received the development proposal in the mail at the end of the first week of January, yet the City has had this proposal since November.

Even with Covid and seasonal mail delivery issues that may have delayed receipt, assuming it was even sent out in a timely manner, to now only allow responses to January 17th, is an inadequate and disrespectful window for local residents.

Yours sincerely,
Grant Warrington

Hello Gail,

I thank you for reaching out.

To confirm, I was previously in touch with Ben Ziegler regarding this proposed development and as indicated, I am happy to arrange a virtual meeting with both the CALUC and community to review and discuss our proposal. If you are in agreement, I will arrange a meeting for January 11th, 2021, at 7:00 pm via Zoom or you are welcome to propose an alternative date and time.

I look forward to meeting with you and the other members of the Land Use Committee. However, should you have any questions or comments in the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,
Carly Abrahams

Development Manager

ARYZE Developments Inc.
1839 Fairfield Rd.
Victoria, BC, V8S 1G9

On Wed, Dec 23, 2020 at 12:07 PM Gail < wrote:
TO: Mayor and Council and Planning Department City of Victoria
RE: Proposed Development at 1693-1699 Fort St., Folder CLC00318

I am writing on behalf of the South Jubilee Land Use Committee. We have been notified that a "Pre-Application" has been submitted for the rezoning and development of 1693-1699 Fort St. This project is quite unusual as it is, I believe, the first privately owned student housing development in Victoria. Since this development also will entail the loss of 4 affordable rental homes and will increase the density of this neighbourhood considerably, we feel that it needs to be presented to the South Jubilee and North Jubilee communities in a format that will allow the community the opportunity to engage the developers and City in a dialogue where questions can be asked and community members' insights be freely exchanged.

Although Covid protocols do not allow in person meetings it is still possible to hold one or more community meetings via Zoom or a comparable platform. We would like to request that the City or Aryze Developments host a meeting platform as soon as possible. The SJNA

can send out an email, post notices on our webpage, Facebook, and Instagram accounts and community newsletter.

We do feel that the timing of this application with only a 30 day response window over the Christmas holidays is problematic and would like to see an extension of this deadline if possible.

I look forward to hearing from the City and Aryze soon. Please feel free to call or email anytime.

Sincerely,

Gail Anthony
South Jubilee Land Use Committee

TO: Mayor and Council and Planning Department City of Victoria
RE: Proposed Development at 1693-1699 Fort St., Folder CLC00318

I am writing on behalf of the South Jubilee Land Use Committee. We have been notified that a "Pre-Application" has been submitted for the rezoning and development of 1693-1699 Fort St. This project is quite unusual as it is, I believe, the first privately owned student housing development in Victoria. Since this development also will entail the loss of 4 affordable rental homes and will increase the density of this neighbourhood considerably, we feel that it needs to be presented to the South Jubilee and North Jubilee communities in a format that will allow the community the opportunity to engage the developers and City in a dialogue where questions can be asked and community members' insights be freely exchanged.

Although Covid protocols do not allow in person meetings it is still possible to hold one or more community meetings via Zoom or a comparable platform. We would like to request that the City or Aryze Developments host a meeting platform as soon as possible. The SJNA can send out an email, post notices on our webpage, Facebook, and Instagram accounts and community newsletter.

We do feel that the timing of this application with only a 30 day response window over the Christmas holidays is problematic and would like to see an extension of this deadline if possible.

I look forward to hearing from the City and Aryze soon. Please feel free to call or email anytime.

Sincerely,

Gail Anthony
South Jubilee Land Use Committee

Dear Council

We have received the letter regarding the proposal at the above address. We have lived across Fort St. at 1801 Fern St. for the past 14 years. We have noticed an increase in traffic and vandalism recently with increased theft and graffiti being the main issues. We already live in a fairly densely populated area of Victoria with many rental units as well as condominiums contributing to the traffic volume on Fort St.. As well, Fern St is used as a freeway between Fort and Begbie due to the access closure to surrounding streets in the area. Be aware that there is also a children's playground, Fern St Park used by young families in the area. We are waiting for some traffic calming speed bumps that were apparently to be constructed in Fall 2020.

Presumably the proposed building of 6 stories and 23 units, composed mostly of students, will have at least two people sharing a suite due to cost concerns. So another 50 or so people along with their vehicles and friends and whatnot. We have a high volume of students who arrive yearly and rent at the St Margaret's apartments across the street from this development. The street is filled with parked cars day and night. Also a 6 story structure will tower over everything else in the area. If this has to happen, at least reduce the height to 4 stories or less in keeping with the appearance and consistency of the neighbourhood. I prefer not to be written off as NIMBY but we are already dealing with a very high density of living. I'm presuming the applicants, Aryze et al, do not reside in the Jubilee neighbourhoods. Perhaps they would have a better understanding of the community concerns regarding traffic, crowding and crime.

If it is not clear already we are opposed to the proposal as presented.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Kind regards,

Stephen and Ursula Adams

104-1801 Fern St.

Victoria B.C.

V8R 4K4

As a neighbour of this proposal I recently received notice of the intent to build a 6 story structure for "Student rental".

I have several concerns about this proposal :

1. Parking loss. Experience has shown that each residence is likely to have at least one vehicle and will cause pressure on nearby Chestnut, Belcher and Fern Streets. The Student housing is a red herring to gain favour with reduction of numbers. It is impossible to restrict rental units to students only.
2. Setback reductions further crowd out sidewalk traffic on Fort St. and shade existing condominiums. The construction of this proposal will create a huge monolith that encroaches on Fort Street. Presently the buildings on the North side are set back enough to at least see some sky.
3. Height restrictions are concerning because the building will be so close to the existing sidewalk. This will not allow an easement for future expansion of Fort St. or sidewalk/bike lanes.
4. Number of rental units is concerning because of the potential for up to 40-50 residents in such a small area. Presently many rental units are priced so that combined incomes are required to pay rent.

I am very concerned that this development proposal appears to want concessions to so many zoning requirements. It offers nothing to our neighborhood but more density, less sky and much reduced affordable rental space.

Wayne Galbraith
1831 Chestnut Street

From: _____
To: [Development Services email inquiries](#)
Cc: carly@aryze.ca
Subject: Proposed Development @ 1693 Fort Street
Date: December 30, 2020 6:31:53 PM

I strongly protest the proposed 23 Rental Unit to be built on this site, with suggested total number of parking stalls of 7 ONLY!!!

Belcher already has a parking problem (never enough). This new building would essentially take away any street parking for residents!

If the developer provided sufficient parking for the number of suites being built (ie. one for every suite) then I would not object. But PLEASE, DO NOT allow this to proceed with insufficient parking stalls as suggested on the notice I received in the mail !!!

Thank you
D Peebles
101 – 1537 Belcher Ave
Victoria, BC
V8R 4N2

- Mr. Ben Ziegler
- Mayor & Council

To Whom it May Concern;

Thank you for appreciating our position regarding the construction of a proposed new 6 storey student rental building at 1693 Fort St.

While we have no objection to rental housing for students in our neighbourhood, we strongly object to its proposed 6 storey height.

The great majority of the multi-unit residential buildings in this area exist happily with just 4 storeys.

Our Concerns

We do wish to underline that these concerns are not intended to diminish the character of young people in general.

Overall we object to:

- 6 storey sun-blocking shadows
- Even greater local traffic congestion
- Negative impact on local property values
- Potentially more local break-ins and vandalism*

** Perhaps fuelled by the eager purveyors of spirits and beer at Christie's Pub which operates within easy crawling distance!*

Once again, we do NOT object to this particular development proposal other than to its intended 6 storey height.

We suggest a new 4 storey facility would provide its investors sufficient financial returns.

While, at the same time, allow our generally peaceful neighbourhood to expand in a way respectful of its many long time, tax paying, politically astute residents.

Thanks all,

Chris O'Brien
Victoria, BC

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing Regarding the proposed development at 1693 Fort Street. I am a neighbour from across the way. Over the years I have watched the people living at 1693 from my windows, walking their dogs, letting their children play. Unfortunately, our neighbourhood is becoming less and less open to people with children, dogs, the elderly or the disabled. Not only are families being priced out of the neighbourhood but there are becoming fewer and fewer places that one could have a pet or that the elderly or disabled can have access to. The units at 1693 are attached but they have small yards and provide places for lower income persons in our neighbourhood. How will the loss of these units be addressed. It saddens me that most young families could not afford to buy a unit in my building. Where will our young people go?

Parking has become a huge issue for our neighbourhood. Many of our streets already have restricted parking for residents only as the existing apartments and condos have not provided sufficient parking for their residents. In my building each unit has one underground parking spot, we have some extras within our secure parking which our condo rents out and 4 extra guest spots. These are almost always full. Already with the current parking restrictions and how few open spaces are normally there within a three block radius of my home I have friends that have difficulty visiting me (pre-Covid). If a senior or disabled person cannot walk 1 or two blocks, often they cannot come visit me, as no parking is available. If you want our community to be truly inclusive then the disabled and seniors need to be able to get around.

Two of the three condo buildings that exist already on Fort St have no parking on Fort. The third building only has a couple of above ground spots. On any given day you will see delivery trucks (Fed ex, Canada Post, sometimes even moving trucks) parked half on the side walk half on the road over the bike lane, blocking and slowing the traffic on Fort St. They cannot find suitable legal parking in the vicinity to deliver nor can they access the underground parking provided by some buildings.

For awhile my elderly mother lived with me and for her to use Handidart, the Handidart had to illegally park on Fort St. or when my mother was able to she would have to walk with her walker to Fern St. Or I would have to get her across Fort St to Belcher or Leighton where the Handidart might find parking or would illegally park. As her mobility declined it became clear that she could no longer live with me if she required Handidart. It is a shame for the elderly, the disabled or the mobility challenged to have to go into a home because they cannot access transport.

Soon we will have the bike lane connector to add into the mix. Two of the three proposals will have a separated bike lane running past the proposed site along Fort. The traffic on

Fort St is only increasing and the new bike lanes will further narrow the street. The bike lane connector which ever option is taken will once again reduce available parking spaces in our neighbourhood, either on Oak Bay Ave, on Fort or on Leighton.

These bike lanes help the bicycling community but they reduce parking spots, and cause traffic congestion as well as producing barriers for the blind, the disabled and seniors. We may wish to get people out of their cars but we need to think of those most vulnerable, those for whom we will be adding more difficulties in accessing transit, and people who cannot access regular transit or ride a bike.

The current proposal only provides for 7 parking spaces for 23 units where the old zoning requires 29.4. My submission is for the building proposed the existing zoning does not provide for adequate parking, even for the present time. Clearly residents of this area still need their cars. Delivery of goods will only increase and delivery trucks need places to park. I suggest that any changes to the zoning should actually increase the parking stalls to be provided, adding a place for delivery trucks, guest parking or passenger pick up, and specified adequate parking spots for disabled or mobility challenged individuals. The planning should also provide a plan so that trucks servicing any new building have places to do so off street. There is no place on street for the proposed unit to have a passenger pick up zone or a place for their delivery trucks





(they are on a corner with no parking on Fort and no parking/stopping on their side Belcher). The parking allowed on east side of Belcher is already always full. There also most likely will be a separated bike lane along Fort as well. As you can see, the garbage recycling people already illegally (on the yellow) park their smaller trucks and their garbage and recycling bins on Belcher Street while they await the larger trucks that come and empty them. Where will these residents access their parking? I assume off of Belcher, what exists there now is a single driveway lane. I would assume that will need to be enlarged as well . The traffic on the street is already crowded. These are very practical concerns.

My final concern is the loss of greenery in our neighbourhood. As condo buildings take over, less and less grass, vegetation and trees result. Soon Fort street will look like a concrete wall. We already lost trees on this block for bike lanes and perhaps it was sewer upgrades. Any proposal should require not only a retention of protected trees but also a frontage of grass or vegetation. People use Fort as a way to walk through our neighbourhood and access services. The trees and the greenery add to the liveability of our neighbourhood. My comments are meant not just for this proposal but every proposal you consider.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns.

Shannon Buchan
Apt301-1714 Fort St.,
Victoria, BC V8R1J2

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: January 4, 2021 5:28 PM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: Re: Development Services - City of Victoria Feedback Form
Attachments: image001.gif; image002.png; image003.gif; image004.png; image005.png

Hello Katie Lauriston - Certainly pass on my feedback to the applicant. Also mention that I'm very impressed with their doing something constructive on creating housing for the homeless from the modification of storage containers. Such innovative ideas show what can be done to alleviate the homeless situation, but having social supports nearby are important in siting this housing project. Sincerely - Rafe Sunshine, Victoria, BC.

From: "Katie Lauriston" <klauriston@victoria.ca>
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 4, 2021 12:03:47 PM
Subject: RE: Development Services - City of Victoria Feedback Form

Good morning Mr. Sunshine,

Thank you for your feedback regarding the proposal at 1693 Fort Street. At this stage, the applicants are completing a Community Consultation and no Rezoning application is submitted yet. This pre-application stage allows for feedback like yours to be shared with the applicants, so that they may make changes to their proposal before submitting a Rezoning application to the City.

Would you like for me to share your feedback with the Community Association and Applicant along with other community feedback?

Thank you,

Katie Lauriston
Administrative Assistant
Sustainable Planning and Community Development
Development Services Division
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

Email: klauriston@victoria.ca
T 250.361.0498



From: webforms@victoria.ca <webforms@victoria.ca>
Sent: January 1, 2021 8:48 AM

To: Development Services email inquiries <DevelopmentServices@victoria.ca>

Subject: Development Services - City of Victoria Feedback Form

You have received an email from Mr. Rafe Sunshine via the City of Victoria website feedback form

Name: Mr. Rafe Sunshine

Email: [REDACTED]

Topic: Development Services

Phone: [REDACTED]

Address: #304 - 1653 Oak Bay Ave.

Message: As per the proposed development at 1693 Fort St. The proposed building is too high by two stories to fit into the neighbourhood of four story buildings, The idea of 23 rental units to replace a single story multi-family dwelling (that is also rental) is unacceptable upon such a small footprint with limited setbacks from Fort. St. I assume that the parking would be at the back of the building as the subsurface is rock requiring blasting that would be disruptive to the surrounding environment (trees and other buildings in the immediate area. The site area is too small for the proposed project. Sincerely -

Date: Friday, January 1, 2021 8:48:03 AM

From: Gail [REDACTED]
Sent: January 19, 2021 1:24 PM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: Fwd: 1693 Fort development proposal

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Grant Warrington <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sun, Jan 10, 2021 at 4:35 PM
Subject: 1693 Fort development proposal
To: <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>, <landuse@southjubilee.ca>
Cc: <sjna@southjubilee.ca>

Mayor Helps and council members,
and Mr. Ziegler,

I have been an owner at 1821 Fern St. for approximately 30 years and I have experienced a significant deterioration in the available parking in the vicinity of my home over that time frame.

The apartment building across the street from me has many residents who find themselves parking on the opposite side of Fern Street (designated residents only) and this is a constant problem all along Fern Street.

The Friends Meeting House further down also has inadequate parking for all of its many events (once they resume) putting additional pressure on other residents of this block.

In addition, a number of individuals park on Fern Street to access the pub at Christie's Carriage House Pub, which is just down the street from the proposed development.

The taxes for my home have just increased by 5%, yet I am seldom able to park in front of my own home, because the one spot is taken up by other non resident vehicles.

The City does not issue permits: rather it relies on infrequent patrols and/or citizen policing to report offenders to the parking office to send out officials to issue parking tickets.

I have several times been yelled at and harassed by individuals who have parked in front of my house who were ticketed, and who had assumed that I had reported them. On two occasions they pounded on my door and I was threatened.

There was also an ill-advised, complete loss of the second parking spot in front of my residence because of the (in my view unnecessary) extension of the yellow lines for lane way access off Fern. Even the City Engineering Office agreed with me that the extension of yellow line was not needed, but this individual was later overruled and less realistic heads prevailed.

That is the background to my lived experience in my neighbourhood Mayor Helps and council and Mr. Ziegler.

As to the current proposal at 1693 Fort, my biggest concern is with the proposed amendment to allow for fewer than 7 parking stalls in a building that will have 23 residential units. Current zoning requires 29 spots!

While I support use of public transportation, cycling, and walking as much as possible, I am concerned many tenants will have their own vehicles and they will be inevitably be visited by individuals who will also have vehicles. Where will they all park?

The suggestion that only 7 parking units for a 23 unit building is, in my view, absurd.

Why the developer would be given the opportunity to reduce the number of zoning required parking stalls to this number defies logic.

There will be serious parking issues in the neighbourhood and conflicts arising from this development if in fact it goes ahead as proposed.

What measures/ regulations are in place to stop or to prevent the developer eventually selling the units to the for-profit

sector or to transfer ownership to a different kind of organization that will then turn the unit over to non-student rentals or condo owners who will be even more likely to own vehicles?
How many of the stalls will be designated shared use vehicles?
How many stalls will have charging stations given green goals?
Will there be any requirements that the students who occupy the units would be, for example, restricted to not each having their own motor vehicles.
Likely you can not do that legally, even if it were part of your greener intent.
How can you possibly assume or even imagine that there will be only 7 vehicles parked at the development at any given time?
I also see no distinction in the plans between parking stalls for residents and for visitors for example. Where will the visitors park?
And where will the residents park at night when all of the stalls are full?
In addition, you well know that use of public transportation has drastically fallen off since Covid.
There is no end in sight to the need for physical distancing and the fears that go with using public transportation in crowded conditions.
The reality is that individuals are not using public transportation as much, and they are using personal vehicles at even higher rates now.
While some of us are cycling and walking more, this does not ever make up for the increase in personal vehicle travel, all too often solo.
All of you will note that the amount of traffic in Victoria has not decreased since Covid, when you factor in the reduced tourism.
Please insist that this developer provide the current minimum number of parking stalls for the number of units ultimately approved.

My second concern is with height. Six storeys exceeds all nearby buildings and will be an outlier in this neighbourhood. Allowing this will encourage future high rise construction along an already congested corridor. Please keep multi storey units to the city centre.

And my final concern is about notice. I received the development proposal in the mail at the end of the first week of January, yet the City has had this proposal since November.
Even with Covid and seasonal mail delivery issues that may have delayed receipt, assuming it was even sent out in a timely manner, to now only allow responses to January 17th, is an inadequate and disrespectful window for local residents.

Yours sincerely,
Grant Warrington

From: Gail <[REDACTED]>
Sent: January 19, 2021 1:23 PM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: Fwd: Feedback - proposed development at 1693 Fort Street

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Helena Ewald [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Jan 11, 2021 at 8:09 PM
Subject: Feedback - proposed development at 1693 Fort Street
To: <developmentservices@victoria.ca>
Cc: <landuse@southjubilee.ca>

Dear Sir or Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the proposed development at 1693 Fort Street. I have filled in the on-line feedback form, but felt an additional email was necessary in order to more formally register my opposition to the proposed development.

I am very much concerned with the height of the building: the fact that it will be six stories is worrisome. I have lived in this neighbourhood for almost 15 years and in that time, have enjoyed the view of the trees and skyline from my apartment. This view was particularly important to me during the recent lockdown since I do not have access to a yard or other greenspace. I am concerned that the six-storey structure will negatively impact my ability to see sunlight, trees and other natural parts of our landscape, particularly given the potential for another lock-down in the near or distant future.

I am also concerned about the lack of parking that is proposed for the building. It is already quite difficult to find street parking in this neighbourhood, particularly with its proximity to Jubilee Hospital. I feel that the lack of planned parking will negatively impact the current residents in our building and in the community.

I am very supportive of the need to provide housing options to the residents of Victoria, particularly to students. However, I feel that several factors (namely, the height of the building and the lack of parking facilities) will need to be adjusted in order to better meet the needs of both current and future residents of the South Jubilee community.

Thank you for your consideration,

Helena Ewald
#401-1615 Belcher Avenue

From: Gail [REDACTED]
Sent: January 19, 2021 12:56 PM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: Fwd: Comments regarding the development at 1693 Fort Street
Attachments: 1693 FORT Response KK.pdf

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kim Kennedy [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, Jan 17, 2021 at 10:57 PM
Subject: Comments regarding the development at 1693 Fort Street
To: <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: <DevelopmentServices@victoria.ca>, <landuse@southjubilee.ca>, <carly@aryze.ca>

Hello,

I live directly across from the proposed student housing development at 1693 fort street, and I have some comments and requests regarding the proposed development - please see the attached document.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Kim Kennedy
1801 Fern street.

What I love:

1) The core concept – much needed student housing

Student housing addresses housing pressures in Victoria by providing a built-to purpose solution that will serve Victoria's university community for many years to come.

Student housing will free-up other rental suites in the area for families and working professionals.

2) Focus on Green Transportation

The car-share and bicycle focus for transportation makes sense for international students who are unlikely to have cars.

International students are unlikely to own cars (especially with the car-share) to the low amount of parking make sense.

3) Right Location

The multi-story building is placed in among other low-rises on a busy street, so it "fits for the chosen site.

The building does a good job of maximizes the amount of housing for the footprint.

It's a relatively safe neighbourhood to live in for students, is walkable to downtown, and is on a major Uvic transit corridor, close to groceries etc.

Requested Changes:

1) Make the building less jarring, disorderly, and frustrating to look at.

I live directly across the street, and my kitchen and dining room windows face 1693 Fort directly, which means I will be looking at this building for an hour or two every day for the foreseeable future, and every time I leave or return to my home.

I appreciate that the architect has tried their best to have the building "fit in" with the buildings around it, however the surrounding buildings are a collection of mostly ugly low-rise condos and apartments.

These old condos and apartments reflect low-cost utilitarian construction budgets and a bygone era of public tolerance for ugly buildings.

The existing buildings do not represent the architectural aspirations of the neighbourhood residents and should not be considered good aesthetic guidance for future developments in the area.

I respect that the architect has put many hours into designing the building to reflect the current buildings and pull the neighbourhood into “the future of architecture”, however, the “playful” design just looks messy because the brain naturally seeks order and patterns and the randomized windows make the building ugly and hard to look at.

Please bring us 3 new exterior design options and let the Neighbourhood Associations choose the final exterior design.

Please see the following drawings for examples of how to make the window placement less jarring, yet still playful.

North Elevation Original



A discordant level of asymmetry. The building irritating to look at because the mind seeks patterns.

North Elevation Revised 1



Windows re-aligned for symmetry. The building is easier on the eyes, but still “playful” as intended by the architect

North Elevation Revised 2



Windows re-aligned for symmetry. Center focus of the building has more clean vertical lines

North Elevation Revised 1 - No trees



Windows re-aligned for symmetry. The building is easier on the eyes, but still “playful” as intended by the architect

North Elevation Revised 2 – No trees



Windows re-aligned for symmetry. Center focus of the building has more clean vertical lines



South Elevation Original: Too much asymmetry.



South Elevation Revised Right side : 5th floor windows aligned to match 3rd floor windows

2) Consider making the building more beautiful, by softening the starkness of the black and white with the use of some colored panels in blue and green instead of all black. Buildings on Fort and throughout Victoria often use the copper verdigris color as an echo of the parliament buildings, and a nice blue-slate color to echo the ocean. Some colour would make the student residence more cheerful and beautiful.

North Elevation Revised 1 - No trees



Windows re-aligned for symmetry. The building is easier on the eyes, but still “playful” as intended by the architect



3) Finish the bare concrete so algae/moss won't grow. Algae has been a big problem at 1531 Elford Street location). Bare concrete will require ongoing maintenance costs including semi-annual power washing.

The low-rise condos and apartments in the neighbourhood all have either brick or stone cladding at the base, so a building with a finished base would be lower maintenance and a better match to the existing buildings in the neighbourhood.



4) Have art on the building be local First Nations Art – see the unity wall at Ogden Point as an example.

5) Make windows into the bike lock-up translucent rather than transparent so bike thieves won't be able to ogle the bikes and plan thefts. Remove the temptation for a safer building – out of sight, out of mind.

6) Plant Tall Oregon Grape and “Hawkshead” hardy fuchsia as part of the landscaping for the hummingbirds. This neighbourhood has a significant hummingbird population, and these plants are important fall and winter nectar sources.



6) Plant blossoming cherry trees like those found on Belcher street, so the trees match belcher street.

7) Have a traffic/parking plan for parcel and food delivery.

Students do a lot of online shopping and order a lot of delivery food.

There should be parcel lockers in the mail area for amazon deliveries and other packages. Have an easy-to-access 5-minute delivery parking spot for food delivery drivers to pull-in to that doesn't disrupt neighbourhood parking and flow of traffic.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I hope the new building will be built quickly and be a beautiful addition to the neighbourhood.

From: Gail [REDACTED]
Sent: January 19, 2021 12:56 PM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: Fwd: 1693 Fort St Pre-Application Comments

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Liz Hoar [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, Jan 17, 2021 at 4:14 PM
Subject: 1693 Fort St Pre-Application Comments
To: SJNA Land Use Committee <landuse@southjubilee.ca>, Development Services email inquiries <developmentsservices@victoria.ca>

To the Development Services

Just as a comment - when you say comments are open until January 17, I would assume that I could still comment on January 17th through your Feedback portal but it was now closed. I assume these comments will be included in the Pre-Application phase.

Comments:

This building is being presented as "Student Housing", yet at the Aryze Zoom meeting January 11th, no details were presented as to how this would work as student housing. Questions regarding who would handle rentals, whether there would be live-in management, how they define a student, what happens if a student drops out of school, what happens to rooms over summer break (allusions to Airbnb-type uses were made by Aryze in answer to this question), were all left pretty much unanswered with vague suggestions of working with this institution or that organization or this short term rental company. This vagueness of the definition of this project makes it hard to comment on the design. Would their current design be allowed as general housing? I suspect if the word "Student" was removed from the project description, any attempt at zero parking would be ignored. And while we're on the topic of students, can they legally deny housing to a non-student single who is looking for a room?

Parking – I don't think we're at a point with city parking management where we can allow a building to have no resident parking in a residential area. This property is on Fort – no on-street parking and Belcher – parking on one side of the street which, from my experience walking in the neighbourhood, is always full. Even if this building was used as student housing to assume none of the 75 students would have a car is a bit of a stretch.

Size: The project itself is too large for the modest lot. There is very little outdoor space provided – no balconies on suites, just a couple of tables on the ground floor and a 6th floor balcony for 75 people. All the suites are limited in common space and each bedroom is tiny. The kitchens in the drawing look like afterthoughts - if you have four students in a pod I think you need a proper kitchen with different storage areas for each person and proper preparation room. As Covid has shown us with remote learning and working being common, these small spaces just don't work as well as they might have in the past.

If this project goes ahead and proves not to be financially viable as student housing, what does it then become?

In conclusion I don't think this is an appropriate use of this property.

--

Liz Hoar
1752 Davie St

From: Gail [REDACTED]
Sent: January 19, 2021 12:55 PM
To: Katie Lauriston
Subject: Fwd: pre-application development comments, 1693 Fort Street, Victoria

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Pierre G Dunn** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sun, Jan 17, 2021 at 12:49 PM
Subject: pre-application development comments, 1693 Fort Street, Victoria
To: <landuse@southjubilee.ca>, <carly@aryze.ca>, <developmentservices@victoria.ca>

According to the notice I received and the information on your website, you're accepting comments on the proposed development at 1693 Fort Street through January 17, 2021. Today, January 17, I went to the website to submit comments from my wife and myself, and found it closed. Since it has apparently been closed prematurely, I'm sending the comments to you directly for your inclusion in your deliberations.

Here are those comments:

- - - - -

Victoria drifts slowly but steadily away from what makes our city attractive. In our attempt to accommodate all who want to live and work here, we dismantle and discard the features that make living here worthwhile. We keep trying to shoehorn more people into a space whose primary quality was that people weren't shoehorned in. There was room to breathe, space to see, a feeling of community instead of a sensation of crowded, dehumanized anonymity.

There is a reason that restrictions were placed on the height and spread of buildings — it was to maintain liveability. It was to avoid the slow slide into urban congestion and all the problems that come with it. Every time a variance is granted, it seems like a small thing. But it provides precedent for the granting of the next variance, and the next. It is death by a thousand cuts. "It's all right," someone might claim — someone who has something short term to gain from the variance — "this is just one insignificant adjustment."

No, it's the slippery slope. Another acceleration of the slide the original restrictions were put in place to halt.

This development is in our neighborhood. More and more buildings are going up, each a little taller than the last, each a little closer to the sidewalk, each adding more to the amount of traffic moving through the streets, each blocking more of the sun, each doing a little more to turn once pleasant streets into arid concrete canyons.

Does the city really have to grow? No, it doesn't. We live in a high-tech age. Business can be conducted from anywhere. We don't achieve efficiency by crowding ever-greater numbers of people into what used to be an attractive city — in fact, we achieve *inefficiency*. At a time when we're frustrated by a lack of places to park, we're increasing the number of vehicles on the street, from private cars to delivery trucks. We're threatening city green spaces by increasing the numbers of users.

We're not opposed to replacing current structures with new ones, but there's no reason to scrap the established building restrictions to do so. The restrictions were created for a reason. And this building, as proposed, will be too tall,

will house too many people, will add too much pressure to traffic, and will remove too much green space. The building currently in the space is smaller than the restrictions allow. Go ahead and replace it with a larger building, up to the size already allowed. But respect and accept the current restrictions!

There's no reason to accept urban decay as inevitable. There are many ways to improve life in our city. But granting variances like this will only hasten the decay.

That's the large picture. If this plan is allowed to move ahead, we would also like to call attention to what we regard as a problem — a fence is planned for the southwest corner of the lot that will cut into the existing driveway leading to the neighboring building (1610 Belcher). Granted, that driveway technically impinges on the lot where the development is being considered. But cutting into that driveway space will make ingress and egress difficult, especially for the garbage and recycling service trucks that must back in to access the containers located in the parking area to which the driveway leads. Rounding the fence of the new development at that corner to follow the path of the existing driveway would go a great way toward preventing problems.

Thanks for your consideration.

Pierre and Linda Dunn, residents, 1610 Belcher

PIERRE DUNN
101 - 1610 Belcher Ave
Victoria, BC V8R 4N1
Canada

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Hello,

I would like to express our concern over the proposed development notice we received through the mail. We have several concerns surrounding this listed below.

- The look of the new proposal is out of character with existing buildings in the neighbourhood and would stand out more than necessary. Reducing visibility on a already difficult corner to turn after recent modifications.
- Foremost the height of six stories is not consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood of which 4 stories is the existing norm. On Begbie, Fern and Fort street.
- R3-2 Zoning is 20% site coverage the applicant is asking for 60.4% which is three times the zoning requirement.
- The area needs single family affordable housing not student residences as is been requested.
- R3-2 Zoning requires parking for 29.4 stalls for the size of this development the proposal is asking this be reduced to 7 over 23 units. I would suggest even if half the units have a vehicle each that would add another 4-5 vehicles looking for street parking that does not exist.
- Parking is already a huge issue on surrounding streets even though the address of this development is Fort street the only other on street parking is Begbie which has parking only available on one side and currently is extremely tight for vehicles passing each other, with six existing apartment buildings and two town house complexes and Fern with 4 existing apartment buildings and 3 single family houses. Fern is also a connector between Fort and Begbie and receives a significant amount of traffic.
- There are 6 Bylaw protected trees two of which they are looking to remove losing healthy older trees for new saplings.

I wanted to submit this notification on the development tracker site but it is not available as of today. This feedback is only open till 17th January we only received this notification on the 4th January even though it was dated 12th November.

Regards

Dean Fanning | Andrea Gaines-Fanning

1830 Chestnut Street | Victoria, BC, V8R 4N5

Hi,

I live across the street from the proposed development. Although development to some degree is necessary, the 23 "student" rental residential units are going to dwarf the neighbouring buildings which are 3 to 4 stories high. I think the developer should know that.

Street parking is limited already and they will have only 7 parking stalls. I get that they are trying to maximize density to get more value but in this area this size doesn't fit. They want people to use street parking. There aren't many in general.

Even the setbacks are basically at the sidewalk to maximize space.

I am not sure what they mean by "student". Are they going to get each resident's student number as a prerequisite to renting? Not sure about that one. Daycare children are also considered a student also. Therefore that comment has a lot of gray areas anyways, so not sure why that was even mentioned.

The developer needs to go back to the drawing board and make a development that properly fits the area without causing future issues to the neighbouring properties. I am fairly certain they have other plans that may work (although it will decrease their profit margins).

Thanks.

S.Parmar

1615 Belcher Avenue.

Hi there

I just wanted to share this with you. In addition to my comments sent, I also wanted to make two more comments.

The proposal is keeping four existing trees, removing two existing trees and replacing those with new trees. I am concerned about the replacement of the two existing trees. I would hope that the replacement trees would be native to our area and of a similar vintage to the existing trees being removed. It's too bad that they cannot just dig the two trees up and move them to a different location on the subject lot if they are in the way of the development.

One final thought is that I hope that there has been some archeological assessment done on this property prior to increasing the footprint of the existing building.

Sincerely
Heather Chia
1710 Fort Street

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Heather Chia** < >

Date: Sun, Jan 3, 2021 at 2:10 PM

Subject: 1693 to 1699 Fort Street Development

To: developmentservices@victoria.ca <developmentservices@victoria.ca>

Good day

I am writing to voice my deep concerns over the proposed development by Aryze Developments Inc for a 6 storey student rental unit across the street from my condo building.

Two concerns:

1. That the proposed building is 6 stories high. All other buildings surrounding the subject property are 4 stories high. This will take a lot of our light as our building faces south. I am opposed to anything higher than 4 stories, in keeping with the neighborhood and surrounding buildings.
2. The proposal states that will be used for a student rental building with 23 residential units. Does this mean that the building will become a frat house with people coming and

going at all hours and parties galore? I hope not as our neighborhood is very quiet after about 9 pm. Will Aryze pay for extra policing of the area if this were to occur?

Please advise as to the outcome of this proposal. I am, along with my neighbours, very concerned about this proposal. I am not opposed to the development in general, just the height and the use.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Heather Chia
1710 Fort St, Victoria, BC V8R 1J2

P.S. When I clicked "comment here" nothing happened on the website, hence my email to you directly. Thank you.

Mr Ben Ziegler - South Jubilee,
Victoria City Council

I am H  l  ne Anne C  t  , owner of the unit 402 of 1615 Belcher.

I am taking time today to voice my concerns about the proposed development at 1693 Fort street, Victoria.

Independently of the supposed purpose of this proposed building (student housing?) I like the good will this building proposal shows regarding public transport but go around UVic and Camosun college, despite free bus passes and high parking cost, the students (local or international) prefer driving.

I am very concerned of the lack of **required parking places** planned for this building: seven stalls are unrealistic.

I understand cycling and MODO, there will still be a need for more than seven stalls, even the staff who will come to do the cleaning will want to park somewhere.

The request for variant for this topic is unacceptable, since despite the zoning requirement currently in place in the neighbourhood,

the surrounding street parking is at capacity. Student housing or not, here will be a need for a greater number of parking spaces on this lot,

something any developers have to provide for projects in this city.

I am concerned over a **FSR of 2.78/1 which is over the 2.5/1** adopted by the city. I am concerned that using public art to circumvent this ratio is pulling extreme...

Let's respect the rules here please.

I have concerns about the change of zoning requirement regarding the **setback and internal side lot line on Fort and on Belcher**. The proposed zoning requirement changes go way over the current **Urban Residential Multiple Dwelling District zoning** it alludes to be part of. See part 3.112 of the city zoning.

This would be change it from a residential neighbourhood to a downtown setting, something that our neighbourhood does not want nor need.

The building **overhangs** passed the first storey on Fort street, misleading.

There is not much space for the trees to grow...in the proposal either. The plans on their website seem to show a large setback for trees to grow but when you look at it more carefully, 0.7 m from the wall to the sidewalk...

I would like to know if the **CRU zone** on the main floor will have a commercial activity, as there is no request to change the residential character to allow a commercial activity within this building.

I am very concerned that this proposed development is using the idea of **student housing** to circumvent strict zoning for our neighbourhood and might not keep the vocation of the building once the land is rezoned and the variant approved.

I have concerns on the purpose of the building, how likely will it stay student housing and not become low income rentals, a shelter, a transition housing...

Who will own and manage this "student housing"? We have no indication regarding how this high-density occupation building will be rented, allocated, maintained.

I will participate to the virtual meeting later today regarding this project,

Regards,
Hélène Anne Côté

Hello Mayor Helps and Council,

I would like to express my concerns about a rezoning application proposed in my area directly across from my building on Fort Street.

My concerns are as follows:

1) This area has a few buildings that are 4 stories but the developer is proposing 6. This is not in keeping with the aesthetic of the area - there are no 6 story buildings in our neighbourhood. In addition, it is a very congested area and I'm worried about the density of people and cars.

2) The proposal outlines only 7 underground parking spots for 23 units! My building has one parking spot per unit and the overflow of units with more than one car must then park on the already full streets. There isn't enough street parking available and it is absurd to assume only 7 residents will have cars. Furthermore, I have done several degrees and many students in my experience have cars.

3) The proposal is labeling this housing as "student housing" which is not suitable for a diverse residential area. Student housing should be located on campus with appropriate supports for students. This suggests a more transient population who may not care for their housing the way renters who are more long term want to make a home for themselves. When a student graduates, are they contracted to leave? Again, it isn't part of Uvic or Camosun therefore it is not suitable to be named a student building. We have students in my building and they all have cars and often lots of visitors with cars.

4) I would like to see a smaller building/dwelling in this lot. It currently is a small structure with 4 units. The green space around the existing dwelling would inevitably be erased in place of the larger footprint of the proposed building. This may be a busy neighbourhood with excellent amenities, but it is also proudly diverse and with many people who care and cherish where they live. Please consider the fragility of Fort as an easy target for developers to increase density at the expense of what is best for the area.

Thank you,

Julianne Cameron

1710 Fort St.

Good afternoon,

I have serious concerns regarding the new development.

1. They say this is for student rentals....I don't believe that for one second. They will rent to anyone who wants a place to rent. Most students wouldn't be able to afford to live in the location
2. I do not agree with a 6 story building. If you look around our neighbourhood 98% of the buildings are 4 storeys or less. If this building is permitted to build 6 storeys this will open a door for more building to be that high and everyone I've talked to in the area don't want this.
3. The plan states that this will be a 23 unit building but only have 7 parking stalls. How is that allowed. The street parking in the area is already pretty hard to find a spot and this would only make it worse. How is this building allowed to build 23 units and not have enough parking for each rental.

Over all I am against this change and would like it to be noted and taken into consideration.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Carla Lair
302-1619 Morrison Street

I live at 1714 Fort Street so this new building is in close proximity. After attending the Zoom meeting arranged by Aryze, I am concerned about several things which I will outline:

- 1) A six storey building is inappropriate in a neighbourhood where 4 storeys is the norm. Also I do not think the appearance of the building fits in with others in the area.
- 2) The setbacks proposed are radically reduced from the existing setbacks. For instance
It appears that
on the Fort Street side that the building will come within 0.745 m of the sidewalk.
The building footprint is far too large for the parcel of land.
- 3) On street parking is already very limited in the immediate area. The proposal only allows for seven (7) underground parking stalls for 23 apartments. It is not reasonable to assume that this will be anywhere near enough.
- 4) There does not seem to have been enough preparation regarding management of the property, how students will be chosen and what happens when they leave university.
5. There is apparently to be a roof top patio which will be limited to hours of use. How will this be monitored as I can foresee loud parties taking place.
6. Many people attended the Zoom meeting and the majority were against the idea.

I hope council is able to review the comments made by the people attending th Zoom meeting as there were other valid concerns apart from my opinions

Yours truly
Gillian bloom 105 1714 Fort Street

The proposed development and rezoning of the property located at the south-west corner of Fort and Jubilee Streets is extensive.

The density of a six storey, 23 unit building is a considerable difference for the already highly populated area and the other buildings are mostly four storey, some with a daylight lower level. A four storey building would be a greater addition to the neighbourhood esthetically.

In regards to the parking: seven parking stalls for 23 units is a very small ratio and will increase the on-street parking for tenants who cannot secure a permanent stall as well as for any guests visiting the building. Some units may have two cars per which again increases on-street parking. At present, there are many occasions when on-street parking is nowhere to be found as visitors to buildings on Belcher etc. Streets are parking on Fern Street, et al, due to the limited parking at existing buildings. I notice there is no indication of ingress/egress for the parking under the building. The Fort and Fern Street "T" is dangerous for anyone making a left turn onto Fort Street for either vehicles or pedestrians attempting to use the crosswalks. Many occasions I have had close calls with both cars and cyclists. Some cyclists go right through the crosswalk when there is a red light for traffic and drivers increase speed on the amber light.

Trees: since the building is very close to the street setbacks, there does not appear to be much space for any vegetation and/or trees. We need more greenery, not less.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Maureen G Hodgetts

"Don't let the behaviour of others destroy your inner peace."
Dalai Lama

Dear Mayor Helps and Victoria City Council,

First we would like to thank you for the support that you have provided to our Jubilee neighbourhood since you have been in office. Our residential community has been under intense pressure for the last two decades and is in desperate need of strengthening! However, the proposed rezoning to build a student complex would do just the opposite and could compromise/destroy whatever is left of our residential character! Building a student rental complex across from a Pub in a residential area would certainly result in and invite the following:

- Property Vandalism,
- Drunkenness and Violence,
- Dramatic Increase in Noise Level all hours of the Day/Night,
- Property Devaluation,
- Break in/Burglary,
- Compromise the Overall Security of our Residential Seniors.
- Overwhelm Residential Parking, which is pushed to the limit as is.

As such a student complex is best suited to be built within walking distance of UVic, we urge you to reconsider this proposed location for student housing and instead consider the well being of our residents and strengthening what's left of our Community Neighbourhood. Thank you for your support in this matter. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

W & C Haddad
The Swans
1801 Fern Street
Victoria, BC

Hello Mayor and Council,

I'm writing in regards to the Aryze Proposal for 1693 Fort Street.

I reside in one of the condos across the street from the proposed development site with my partner. We love walking around our neighborhood and I feel like such a large building in this spot will throw off the vibe we have come to love and enjoy from our block. The size of the proposal is too large and I feel like a building the height of those around it would fit much better with the feel of the neighborhood.

Aside from feeling like a building that size would dwarf everything around it, I think adding that much density to the block would further disrupt traffic in an already congested area. This will only get worse yet again when whatever next phase of bike lanes happen on this neighborhood begins construction. As it is now, I sometimes need to wait 2-3 light cycles to be able to turn left off of Fort st onto Fern St where access to our garage is when trying to get home after work.

My other concern is with the lack of parking for residents the development is proposing. There are already serious parking issues in this area and a building of that density with not enough parking would just increase these and make day to day life of the residents already here more frustrating. While it would be great to imagine that all the new tenants of this building will cycle and car share, I just think it is unrealistic and a whatever is built should provide adequate parking for residents and their guests as all the other buildings in the area have had to.

Thanks for your time and attention.
Dave Roche

Mayor and Council City of Victoria
#1 Centennial Square
Victoria, B.C. V8W 1P6



Re: 1693 Fort Street Development Proposal

Dear Mayor and Council,

The Friends of Bowker Creek ask that the proposal for the development of 1693 Fort Street advance the goals of the [Bowker Creek Blueprint](#).

Our Society's goals are those presented in the *Bowker Creek Blueprint* that was endorsed by the municipalities of Saanich, Oak Bay and the City of Victoria.

The *Blueprint's* central goal for restoring the watershed is to shift our approach to managing rainwater. Rather than sending rainwater immediately to storm drains and receiving waters, the City has committed to retaining and delaying rainwater where it falls, removing pollutants, mitigating floods, reducing creek erosion and siltation, and putting rainwater to use onsite.

We think it is unfortunate that the development proposal makes no mention of its location in the Bowker Creek watershed, of the *Bowker Creek Blueprint*, or how the development follows the guidelines and advances the goals of the *Blueprint*.

With its enlarged footprint, intensified site use and increased impervious surfaces, the development appears to ignore environmental responsibility and would add to climate change impacts by adding greater quantities of rainwater to the creek, contributing to the already extreme fluctuations in Bowker Creek flow, adding pollutants, erosion of the creek bank, siltation and flooding downstream.

The proximity of this development 1693 Fort Street to Bowker Creek offers significant opportunities to help adapt to climate change impacts by implementing the *Blueprint* guidelines. We encourage the City of Victoria to ensure development at this location will contribute improved outcomes for the watershed and downstream communities.

We respectfully request the City of Victoria to ensure this proposal contributes to the implementation of the *Bowker Creek Blueprint*. We further encourage the proponent to consider and pursue the [City of Victoria Rainwater Rewards Program](#) for this proposal.

Respectfully,

Soren Henrich, Director
Friends of Bowker Creek Society

I am an owner/resident at 1615 Belcher Ave (Sheldon Court). I have lived here for 10 years. I have serious concerns about the proposed development at 1693 Fort Street...

- **A 6-storey structure** - A 6-storey building is inappropriate in a neighbourhood where 4 storeys is the norm. This will dwarf our building given we are a 4-storey building with our lowest level below street level. I'm concerned about how this will affect daylight / sunlight loss on the front of our building. I'm also concerned with what this will mean for our landscaping.
- **Parking** - On street parking is already very limited in the immediate area. The proposal only allows for seven 7 underground parking stalls for 23 apartments. It is not reasonable to assume that this will be anywhere near enough. The zoning requirement calls for 29.4 stalls. Where are they expecting everyone to park?
- **Parking during Construction** - Where are they planning to park all the work vehicles / trade vehicles / and worker vehicles during construction? Are they planning to get a permit and occupy our whole street? How will they accommodate displaced residents?
- **Setbacks** - The setbacks proposed are radically reduced from the existing setbacks. They are proposing a reduction on the Fort St side from 13.5m to 0.745m and on the Belcher Ave side a reduction from 13.5m to 3.023m

I appreciate your attention to this matter.

--

Jackie Adamthwaite

206-1615 Belcher Ave, Victoria BC V8R 4N2

Dear Victoria Councillors,

Regarding the proposed development by Aryze at 1693 - 1699 Fort St:

My partner and I purchased a condo in this neighbourhood because the buildings are set well back from the the street with many mature trees. The building Aryze proposes is too big for the lot. It would stick out like a sore thumb!

Acceptable would be a smaller building with a deeper set-back . All the surrounding buildings on Fort street are set back appx 8 to 18 meters (26 to 55 feet). This new building would be 2 FEET from the street.

A 6 storey building at the end of Fern St where it T's with Fort St would tower over the intersection - an already tight and uncomfortable intersection.

This building would be great downtown or in one of the villages where minimal setbacks are the norm, but not here in Jubilee.

Housing simply for the sake of housing is not a principal that should be applied here as that philosophy can easily become 'Housing at any cost'.

My hope is that council will NOT approve the project as proposed but have Aryze reduce the height of the building and increase the setback from Fort St.

Thanks you very much for considering my concerns.

Kind regards,
Kevin Attewell

My husband and I are residents of Sheldon Court at 1615 Belcher Avenue. We would like to raise the following concerns in opposition to the proposed development at 1693 - 1699 Fort Street , directly across the street from us.

1. The proposed 6-story structure is seriously out of proportion to the existing 4 story buildings in the neighbourhood. Sheldon Court will be overshadowed for a large part of the day.
2. Since the setbacks will be much, much, smaller than currently exists anywhere in the area – the bulk of the proposed building will be visually intrusive. As well, it will further challenge the visibility for drivers attempting to turn onto Fort from Belcher.
3. The proposal of 7 parking spaces is preposterous! I guess we are supposed to think that the “student” tenants will all be devoted cyclists but there is no guarantee that this would be the case. There is absolutely no additional on-street parking in the whole area. This is already a serious issue for trades people doing work in our building, personal care service providers, and anyone else having short term business in our building. Given the possible number of residents in the proposed building (75+) there are certainly going to be more than 7 vehicles. There is a zoning requirement to provide 29 stalls and that is a requirement that must not be waived. If fact, if environmental issues are a serious consideration then perhaps some parking stalls should be equipped with charging stations.
4. I appreciate the need for student housing and I have no objection to students per se, although they do tend to be noisy neighbours. There is no guarantee that only students will rent there. I suppose that the idea of “student” housing plays into the issue of parking spaces as discussed in #3 above. We are supposed to think that “students” are so environmentally concerned that they all will cycle or take public transportation. I doubt this will be the case and it is disingenuous to suggest that “student rental” excuses the transgression of neighbourhood norms regarding building height, setbacks, and parking spaces.

Please give consideration to these concerns in your decision making regarding this proposal.

Alexander Rankin
Miriam Cooley

The proposed development at this address would produce a severe traffic congestion in this area. It would have a big parking problem because the development only consider seven parking stalls. Currently this area has pedestrians , cyclists, buses and others . Protected trees would be removed which is a contradiction. Thank you if you consider NO give authorization to this development. Maria Maiben Rodriguez .

Dear City of Victoria Councillors,

I am writing regarding concerns I have with proposed development by Aryze at 1693-1699 Fort St.

In 2016, I bought a condo and moved to this neighbourhood from the Langford area. A huge draw for me was the setting and big lots, not having huge buildings dominating a quaint neighbourhood with character. I am extremely disheartened to hear that our neighbourhood might lose the charm and space it's known for by letting a building of this type over take the area.

While I do agree student and affordable housing is an important issues in Victoria, I feel the size of this building is unacceptable for upper Fort. My partner and I often walk around the area and have been paying close attention to buildings in the recent month due to this proposal- this building would be extremely dominant in this area and in my opinion, an unwelcome type of dominance.

I am also concerned about the parking situation. I understand the philosophy Aryze is promoting regarding Modo and cycling... but I feel that might not be realistic and residents of this building might have more vehicles than spots allotted, increasing an already problematic area for street parking.

I feel the City of Victoria should NOT approve the current proposal from Aryze. I feel a more appropriate proposal (building height and appropriate size for lot) fitting with already set standards in this neighbourhood would be much more welcomed by residents.

Thank you,

Tamara Thomas

From: webforms@victoria.ca
To: [Development Services email inquiries](#)
Subject: Development Services - City of Victoria Feedback Form
Date: January 18, 2021 9:40:52 PM

You have received an email from KIMBERLEE ROSEBOROUGH via the City of Victoria website feedback form

Name: KIMBERLEE ROSEBOROUGH

Email: [REDACTED]

Topic: Development Services

Phone: [REDACTED]

Address: 1742B Fort St.

Message: 1693 Fort Street

It should only be a 4 story building and will block my sun at any height. I hope this project gets denied. It is very sad to lose part of the charm of this neighbourhood. Filthy lucre.

Date: Monday, January 18, 2021 9:40:49 PM

As a homeowner at 1710 Fort St., I have concerns about the lack of available on-street parking today. The proposed development at 1693 Fort St. includes **NO** parking for the approximately 75 residents (the development includes 7 guest parking spaces only). At a January 11th neighbourhood association meeting, the developer presented information obtained from the University of Victoria relating to the number of off-campus students regularly accessing parking services at the university and extrapolated from that that students do not have cars. This is flawed – students may have cars and choose to not drive them to the university due to the cost of parking and access to public transit. I think it would be a mistake to build this development without building adequate parking within the building for residents.

Brenda Uhrynuk
#402 – 1710 Fort St.

Dear Council

I was dismayed to receive the Proposed Development Notice in the mail with a request by Aryze Developments seeking a new zone to accommodate a development proposal at 1693-1699 Fort St. As a resident and homeowner at 1619 Morrison St. This request for a variance is of great concern to me as I feel it will "substantially affect the use and enjoyment of my neighboring property".

I am curious that this proposal is termed a "Student Rental". Perhaps with only 7 underground parking spaces available for a 23 unit building we are to assume that the other 15 units are going to be using Public Transit and bikes for transportation. Assuming that "students" are going to use alternate means of transportation to move around in an already congested area.

As a person who supports affordable housing for students and all residents in the city of Victoria I would be curious to know how affordable this "Student Rental" will be?

Without hesitation I do not support Aryze Developments request for a variance in the current Zone Requirement which I believe is reflective of the needs of the existing neighborhood.

This request being put forth during the holiday season, a Global Pandemic and an affordable housing crisis in our city is disingenuous and opportunistic!

Sincerely,

Julianna Spooner
205-1619 Morrison St.
Victoria, BC

- 1) A six story building is inappropriate in a neighbourhood where 4 story's is the norm.
- 2) The setbacks proposed are radically reduced from the existing setbacks. For instance
It appears that
on the Fort Street side that the building will come within 0.745 m of the sidewalk. My general
impression
is that the building footprint is far too large for the parcel of land.
- 3) On street parking is already very limited in the immediate area. The proposal only allows for seven (7)
underground parking stalls for 23 apartments. It is not reasonable to assume that this will be anywhere
near enough.
- 4) Student Housing is more appropriately constructed on University or College property.
One individual that I have spoken with commented that for the builder to refer to the project
as a "student rental building" is an deliberate attempt to candy coat the project. I concur.
I think it is transparently disingenuous
- 5)Traffic is heavy and congested in this area now, with every 20 minutes buses on both
sides, frequent emergency vehicles due to Royal Jubilee Hospital location. I have lived here
for 15 years and the increase in traffic and collisions is exponential on an already narrow 2
lane street.

Another location needs to be assessed for such a large proposal.

Thank you for the work you all do and your consideration in this very concerning matter.

Sincerely

Debra Kerr, Registered Nurse

1710 Fort St., #302

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing regarding the Proposed Development Notice I received about the six storey, 23 rental unit building proposed for 1693 Fort Street. I am a condo owner who lives directly across the street on Belcher Ave. and wanted to provide you my feedback in hopes that these considerations are taken into account.

I support beautiful development in Victoria that is designed to enhance our community, along with recognizing that what makes Victoria a wonderful place to live is it's character. I also support making it liveable for everyone and am very aware of the need for affordable housing.

1. Please consider 4 stories rather than 6 as this height will block the light that comes in to many suites across the street. It will also stand out as much taller than the other buildings in an unattractive way.

2, Please use an architect, building design and materials that will retain the character and style of this community. Vancouver-style developments with odd colour blocking and plastic materials, are not attractive additions to neighbourhoods.

3. How is a student rental building run? For example, is there a property manager onsite who handles maintenance?

To Mayor and Council

We have been made aware of a proposed property development site at 1693 Fort street. This development is a concern to us living at 1714 Fort street for the following reasons:

- 1 - all surrounding buildings are 4 story high; this proposal state 6 levels therefore goes against logic and surrounding properties;
- 2 -the proposal calls for a "student building". What is needed is for multi-family type rental units for all. This proposal for student will increase noise, party, furniture left on the side of the street at the end of every school year.
- 3 - This proposal only calls for 23 units but only 7 parking stall therefore more cars parked on the street, vehicle left unattended, etc;
- 4 - UVIC is building new student accommodations therefore while situate a "student building" in an area not close to UVIC???
- 5 - what bylaws are not required by calling it a student rental building??

We do not support this application!

Regards

Donald Leblanc

Justine Wendland

From: Debra Kerr <[REDACTED]>
Sent: November 25, 2021 12:21 PM
To: Development Services email inquiries
Cc: landuse@southjubilee.ca
Subject: 1693-1699 Fort St proposal

To whom it may concern,

I am an owner at 1710 Fort St, unit 302.
We are one of 3 condominium 4 story buildings across the street.

I have lived here over 10 years and watched the increase in traffic congestion and accidents along this area of Fort St.

My concerns are the height of this proposal being out of line with the neighbouring properties and the lack of parking (9 spots for 39 units). This is already a dense neighbourhood with many apartment buildings and condos.

Increasing the density to this level where there are constant emergency vehicles accessing Jubilee hospital many times a day and traffic congestion with increased accidents is extremely short sighted for safety reasons.

My concerns are important and prudent, having lived here for many years and observed the level of safety concerns escalate.

With concern
Debra Kerr RN (retired)
#302-1710 Fort St.
Victoria. V8R 1J2

Hello,

Our family member lives in a 78 unit condo at 1745 Leighton road, a block from the proposed 6 storey condo building with 34 units at 1693 Fort Street. Her condo has its own underground parking. Still, the area is congested for visitors and limited to 2 hours.

This makes it challenging when people need home support workers and other service people.

Our Province is gratefully moving towards more “At Home” living, rather than institutionalization for people who need support services due to aging and/or other types of disability. Parking is a necessity. The service providers (nurses, home care workers, housekeepers etc) travel from client to client and do not always have time to use public transport or hunt for parking that doesn’t exist.

What are you providing the 34 units for parking? The notice says nothing about that. The existing 4 unit building has its own parking now. This is a huge concern since it is a congested area already with a major hospital nearby.

Sincerely, Janice and Robert Maxwell

Hello,

Us again. We want to say we want more affordable housing. We just think the ground floor at 1693 should be used for parking. Please install electric charger, more than the 20% for bikes. . It is not realistic to think everyone will be able to use a bicycle. Electric cars are coming fast but they need to be **parked.**

From: Kevin Attewell [REDACTED]
Sent: December 8, 2021 10:23 AM
To: Chelsea Medd <cmedd@victoria.ca>
Subject: Proposed Aryze building at 1693 Fort Street

Hello!

My name is Kevin Attewell. I live at 1714 Fort Street - kitty corner to the 6 story building proposed by Aryze at 1693 Fort St.

I am opposed to this project and put the following comment on the survey that was sent out:

"A 6 story building 2 feet from the sidewalk does not fit in this neighbourhood. All the buildings along this section of Fort street have a setback of several meters allowing for large trees. I agree with increased housing density in this city, but not at any cost - the integrity of an affected neighbourhood needs to be respected".

The lot at 1693 Fort St is way too small for the proposed 6 story building and simply could not accomodate the setback required to be in keeping with the treed nature of this neighbourhood.

Thanks you for considering my concerns and passing them along .

Kind regards,
Kevin Attewell

As a direct neighbour of this proposed building, I am concerned about the lack of underground parking for tenants and the proposed height of the building.

1. While we are a pro bike city, the reality is that people still use cars. The surrounding area has very little street parking and this will put additional strain on people.
2. All the buildings in this area are 4 stories tall which is agreeable since the street is narrow. This proposal is for 6 stories which doesn't respect the look and feel of the surrounding buildings.

I am also unclear about how this project offers stable housing when eligible tenants must fit a narrow financial scale to qualify and to remain. It sounds transient and not welcoming to a diverse population.

Thank you,
JC

City Council and CALUC:

Thank you for the opportunity to give my input to the proposed new development in my neighbourhood.

Simply: I do not want to see changes in the zoning of this area....especially increasing the number of storeys/height to six.

Increasing zoning height in this area would totally change the landscape, it would be an eye soar. The apt. building beside it would be totally dwarfed and as it is a older rental building accommodating many seniors on low income, the outcome would be demolishing that building as well...creating more evictions and increased housing problems.

Student housing is best done closer to the university and where zoning for such development already exists.

Please, do not change the zoning in South Jubilee!

Thank you.

Lynda Cowan & Bob Lyford
Property owner within 200 metres of proposed development

Justine Wendland

From: Dorrie Collins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: December 13, 2021 8:50 AM
To: Development Services email inquiries
Subject: Feedback on 1693 Fort St building proposal - Aryze

To Whom it May Concern:

I have watched the two public presentations for this building carefully and although the new version is an improvement on the old, I still resist the massiveness of the building filling the location. It in no measure fits in with the local buildings and is 2 full stories higher than the next but one neighbouring building. It's hugeness and solidity makes it ugly. I would be much happier if it were reduced by at least one story, but of course would prefer two (but realise that simply won't happen).

The developers say it has to be this height because of the affordable housing legal agreement. However by not constraining themselves to existing set backs and is a huge financial benefit to them and is allowing them a density that would probably not be allowed for uncontrolled rental condos.

Thank you for consideration of my feedback,

Dorrie Collins,
1904 Duchess St.

Hello,

I attended the information meeting Dec 8/21 about 1693 Fort. Thank you. Everyone seems dedicated to developing more lower rental housing and we completely agree. We were concerned about parking but when we learned that residents will not be allowed to use local street parking long term we felt better.

There is one concern we can't stop thinking about. The fact that in a 34 unit low rental development there is not one wheelchair accessible apartment. Often people who use wheelchairs have a very low income. It was explained that it is a cramped space and could not be done. We must keep advocating. In the past it seemed too difficult to drop curbs but we have made enormous progress. Could two units be turned into one? Then I know there would only be 33 units but it would allow one wheelchair user in. The accessible unit can be used for a person who walks but a wheelchair user cannot manage in a non accessible unit.

Thank you for considering this issue.

Sincerely, Janice Maxwell

Hello,

Us again. We want to say we want more affordable housing. We just think the ground floor at 1693 should be used for parking. Please install electric charger, more than the 20% for bikes. . It is not realistic to think everyone will be able to use a bicycle. Electric cars are coming fast but they need to be [parked](#).

Hello,

Our family member lives in a 78 unit condo at 1745 Leighton road, a block from the proposed 6 storey condo building with 34 units at 1693 Fort Street. Her condo has its own underground parking. Still, the area is congested for visitors and limited to 2 hours.

This makes it challenging when people need home support workers and other service people.

Our Province is gratefully moving towards more "At Home" living, rather than institutionalization for people who need

support services due to aging and/or other types of disability.
Parking is a necessity. The service providers (nurses, home care workers, housekeepers etc) travel from client to client and do not always have time to use public transport or hunt for parking that doesn't exist.

What are you providing the 34 units for parking? The notice says nothing about that. The existing 4 unit building has its own parking now. This is a huge concern since it is a congested area already with a major hospital nearby.

Sincerely, Janice and Robert Maxwell

Dear Mayor Helps and City Council,

We own the building next door to the proposed development at 1693-1699 Fort St. Our address is 1610 Belcher Ave. We oppose this development on several grounds:

This project is far too large for this site. It would be the tallest building on the block. While it may be zoned for 6 storeys, the OCP calls for a maximum of 4 storeys. Also, the 2.74 FSR far exceeds the 1.2 FSR currently allowed (as well as the 2.0 FSR in the Official Community Plan). Our building is only three storeys and would now be wedged in between two giant buildings.

We don't feel the City should allow a variance to the existing 9.7 meter setback on the south border to a proposed tiny 3.36 meters. Our tenants on our north side will now be looking at a wall of a building 65 feet high! They will no longer be able to see the sky.

Construction is projected to take 18-24 months. That's a very long time to live with almost constant daytime noise, especially at a time when some of our tenants have been forced to work from home during the current pandemic. What about the quality of life for the immediate neighbours? Does the developer even care? Will my tenants be compensated in any way?

Let's be absolutely clear; this project is only about making money for the owner/developer and it can only be built if council approves all of the requested variances. There would be a lot less opposition to this project if all the existing setback, FSR and height zoning requirements were adhered to.

The close proximity and height of the project to our building will prevent our ground floor bachelor, who only has one window that faces north, to get any sunlight in the summertime. In June the sun comes up in the northeast and sets in the northwest. Early morning and early evening are the only times this tenant gets any sunlight. I've seen the shadow studies and don't believe them to be accurate (they don't show shadows at 7am or 8pm). I firmly believe this project, if allowed, will block any sunlight to this suite 365 days a year!

In addition to the noise and dust created during construction there will be a parking shortage for the workers as there is no parking available on Fort Street and Belcher and Fern have residential only parking (always full). No doubt frustrated workers will end up parking in our lot (which is adjacent to the project).

Our tenants suffered greatly 6 years ago when the City gave multiple variances to allow the construction of a 9 unit condo building immediately south of our project. Tenants had to endure 2 years of construction noise and dust and when the project was finished it was so large that it blocked all sunlight to our building for 4 months of the year (during the winter). We also protested against that project but were ignored by City Council. This time we hope Council listens to those that are most affected by an unwanted project.

The size of this project is simply too large for such a small piece of property. It certainly doesn't belong in this neighbourhood. We agree that the existing fourplex is old and isn't the best use for this site. Why not build a 2-4 storey building, adhere to the existing zoning requirements and keep all the neighbours happy?

Sincerely,

Mike Hudec, Owner of 1610 Belcher Ave.

Dear Mayor and Council,

Thank you for your letter on the proposed development for 50 Douglas St. I have been happily living at 110 Douglas St. for more than four years. I work online at home as a hypnotherapist and teach meditation classes. I'm also a full-time Ph.D. student at UVic and all of my coursework is online. However, I'll be unable to work if there is construction noise during the day which will directly threaten my ability to 1) earn income and 2) continue with pursuing my degree.

I also have a diagnosed connective tissue disorder which causes severe migraine headaches that result in vomiting and choking in addition to other medical conditions that are worsened by noise. I cannot move because this building is the only one in James Bay that was able to accommodate the medical equipment that is keeping me alive.

Good afternoon Mayor and Council,

I ask that you consider carefully the application for rezoning of 1693 Fort St for the rental building that Aryse is working on.

1. **Height** Moving from 4 to 6 stories will block the view of all west side trees, sunshine and sky from the street side of 1615 Belcher Ave, the neighbouring strata owner owned building, directly across Belcher Ave. Allowing six stories will be a precedent setting move in this established neighbourhood that will irrevocably change the community/residential feel of this area between two economic hubs. As a neighbour who will stare directly at the building from my condo, that height difference would have a significant impact on 15 suites in 1615 Belcher Ave.

2. **Parking.** A few years ago, the loading zone parking spot in front of 1615 Belcher was removed due to the installation of traffic calming measures around the corner of Fort and Belcher. We now have cars unsafely parking under the stop sign to try to load and unload. With no extra parking and moving from a 4 unit building to a 30+ unit building, where will all the cars go? I understand the need to move people away from car driving but Victoria has many seniors who are not able to ride e-bikes in bad weather. Without underground parking, there will be even more cars on a street that cannot support what is here now.

Thank you for considering these points when you assess their application.

Sarah Phillips

Owner of 308-1615 Belcher Ave.

1693-1699 FORT ST DPV00175 REZ00766

Dear CHELSEA MEDD,

Hi, with regards to the above development and rezoning permits,
I don't have a problem with an apartment building being built on the corner,
but it should be limited to 4 stories and not 6 in keeping with the architectural vocabulary of the
neighborhood.

All the surrounding buildings are 4 stories, even the commercial building where the Shopper's Drug Mart
is located just up the street.

To suddenly introduce a 6 story building would be a radical departure in an established neighborhood.
The setbacks from the road and sidewalk should also be in keeping with the surrounding buildings to
maintain the character of the neighborhood.

thanks for allowing me to have some input.

John Goodman

303-1555 Jubilee Ave, Victoria, BC V8R 4N4

Dear Mayor and council,

I am writing to register my hopes and concerns for the development at 1693-1699 Fort Street, which as a homeowner on Fern Street raising a family here, is something I hope is worth presenting to you as our city's decision-makers.

While I am in support of more housing, and this proposal seems fine in general, this intersection of Fort and Fern Streets is extremely busy and already dangerous for pedestrians and vehicles. We already went through a multi-year process to get traffic calming on Fern. It has hardly slowed the flow of cars using the street as a shortcut, and we worry the new development will add to the danger if proper plans are not made and implemented.

If this project was to go ahead, there would need to be major changes made to the area around the development to ensure safety for residents, such as an actual timed traffic light for the Fern Street/Fort Street intersection, not a pedestrian-controlled one. Ideally, there would be a timed separation between an arrow-light directing cars turning left onto Fort, and a crossing signal for pedestrians. As it is, cars using Fern as a shortcut creep out, drivers full of stress, inching closer to crossing pedestrians, kids, seniors, whoever it may be. Another traffic light for letting cars from Belcher onto Fort would be needed too; otherwise, you are asking for stress, anger, and accidents.

Even though it seems this building is proposed for students, which is much needed, it cannot be assumed that they will not be car owners, or that the proposed amount of parking will be enough. Not all will bike or bus. What is the plan to safely get cars out onto Fort Street? How can it be assured that parking, which is already at a premium, will not be even more stressed? How will the safety of dozens of new residents, in addition to those of us already here, be ensured as we all cross Fort Street on foot?

We cannot add a six-storey building full of people to a very busy street and not make massive, proactive changes to ensure traffic and pedestrian safety, as well as community harmony. There needs to be realism and active planning, not simply hoping for the best.

Thank you for your time, and I hope you take these concerns seriously while considering the development, so that it can be the best it can be for our neighbourhood.

Sincerely, Max Olesen
Fern Street resident

Hello Mayor and Council,

I'm responding to you about the rezoning application for 1693-1699 Fort Street. I'm very concerned about the proposal for a 6 story building in an area surrounded by many (and only) 4 story buildings. It seems disrespectful to the area to want to cast shadow where we are already very building central. Also, there is a lack of planning around underground car parking that is concerning. Street parking is a premium around here. To assume our demographic is able to afford electric bikes is not reasonable. Also, there seems to be a suggestion that this is student housing and not open to other population groups. It is such a congested area already, I would hope that minimizing the impact to neighbours is part of the plan. I've read through the developer's responses to the city's inquiry and they are vague and often challenge city requests to compromise for the betterment of the community.

Originally the concept was to provide temporary housing for students in a dormitory capacity which raised flags around this being a disguise for helping the unhoused. There is emphasis on low income affordability, etc. I'm passionate about our vulnerable populations but there needs some very careful planning if this is what is happening. I would like transparency and a plan for how supports are placed to help people enter and receive help.

It seems this project is perpetually in an infancy stage that is not in alignment with our neighbourhood needs or wants.

Thanks for hearing me out.

J Cameron

RE: Development application REZ00766
1693 - 1699 Fort St., Victoria, BC

DATE: June 13, 2022

TO: Mayor and Council
cc: Aryze Developments

I am writing as Co-chair of the Land Use Committee for South Jubilee on behalf of the South Jubilee Neighbourhood Association.

We have just received notice of the most recent changes to the development application by Aryze Developments for the property at 1693-1699 Fort St. ; application REZ0076. This development application has undergone several changes since its first presentation to our neighbourhood. During our neighbourhood association AGM on Tuesday, June 7 the most recent iteration of this application was discussed. We have a few comments that we would like the City to take into consideration during the approval process for this project.

The original project in Feb. 2021 was to be student housing with pod style accommodation. This idea was shelved by Aryze and in Nov. 2021 a new project was presented featuring affordable housing apartments as per the Letter to Council attached to the new application as follows:

"Lastly, in an effort to provide more attainable housing solutions, the building will meet the City's definition of affordable rental housing with all units being leased for below market rate with no tenant paying more than 30% of their income on rent."

The property currently is designated in the Official Community Plan for a 3 storey building with an FSR of 2.0. As an affordable rental project, Aryze asked to be approved for a 6 storey building with an FSR of 2.74. This is a 37% increase in density. As well, a relaxation of parking requirements was requested in the application to allow only 9 at grade parking stalls for a 34 unit building with 6 studio, 13 @ 1 bdrm, and 15 @ 2 bdrm units; a potential for at least 34 people but likely up to 70 residents.

There was extensive concern expressed by the neighbours to this project about the height of the proposed building and the serious lack of parking available for the future building residents in an area where the existing homes most often do not have driveways and must park on their street. The South Jubilee neighbourhood recognized the benefit to the City for 34 new affordable apartments to be built and did not actively protest this proposal.

However, the new concept for this property presented by Aryze Developments on June 6, 2022 has abandoned the November 2021 project of 100% affordable units for a

period of 35 years and instead is proposing that only 4 of the 34 units (1 @ 2 bdrm, 1 @ 1 bdrm, 2 @ studio) be designated affordable as follows:

" Secure 4 units (12% of the building) as deeply affordable, with maximum rents adjusted by the City of Victoria's rental targets for median income households per the Victoria Housing Strategy (Phase Two) for a minimum commitment of 10 years."

This is a radical change from 100% of the units at no more than 30% of income for 35 years to 4 affordable units for 10 years.

The South Jubilee LUC debated requesting another community meeting and raised this issue during our AGM. The consensus expressed at the South Jubilee Neighbourhood AGM was that the designation of 4 units (10% of the building) as 'affordable' is not enough to justify the bonus density requested and the lack of parking spaces in the design. We do understand that rental accommodation is in short supply in Victoria and needs to be built, but we feel that not only should developers be incentivized to build rental, but the communities surrounding new development should benefit as well. It should also be noted that the building being demolished to promote this development has been at this location for many decades and provides affordable housing for more than the 4 affordable units. Before the City approves this project we would like Council to consider the following:

- 1) Increase parking spaces or decrease the number of units;
- 2) Increase the number of 'affordable' units to at least half of the bonus density equal to approximately 18% of units.
- 3) Contribution by Aryze Developments to the South Jubilee neighbourhood amenities that will be used by the new tenants. For example a cash contribution of \$25,000 would allow the community to proceed with the exciting Public Redfern Commons garden project approved for Redfern Park as detailed in the link here:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1tOnkailkATPV1wzrD-JF3EqHLfvmo4iMMm6sPjJxvlo/edit?usp=sharing>

We thank you for your consideration and look forward to hearing from the City and Aryze regarding our concerns.

Sincerely

Gail Anthony
Co-chair South Jubilee Land Use Committee