

[REDACTED]

From: Jerry Groneberg [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 17, 2022 8:12 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road proposed development.

I implore you to scale down the development at 902 Foul Bay Road.

My reasons:

1. Due to global warming, it is unconscionable to cut down so many trees. The tree canopy provides shade, oxygen and aesthetic value.
We have three laneway homes, one group home, rentals large construction company with trucks etc. on our street. That equates to a large number of cars parked on our narrow street. When we (two super seniors) walk to the grocery store or just go for a walk, we need to dodge cars parked and driving down our street. We can't walk on grass as we need level ground for our balance challenged bodies. There are no sidewalks on our street.
2. A scaled down version without tree removal is a reasonable approach for all but the developer.
3. Walking on our street is dangerous.

From: Adrian Science [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 1:27 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Comments on the development at 902 Foul Bay Road

Reference 902 Foul Bay Rd. Victoria development

To the members of the Victoria City Council

May I start by referencing, as I have in my prior correspondence, that I am a resident of OakBay and hope that does not mitigate against considering my concerns for the proposed development of 902, Foul Bay Rd. I would make the point I have close proximity to the development.

To repeat my previous submission, I am supportive of adding sensible housing in the space being reviewed. The need to provide places for people to live is a profound one that deserves full recognition and consideration. I recognise the need for a 'socially and environmentally' equitable housing development of the land on 902 Foul Bay. Here's why I think, at the risk of being repetitive, the proposed development is out of line with what is needed and equitable:-

1. There are too many houses in too small a space. People much more expert than me have opined as to why the proposed development is too dense in terms of housing and the consonant number of people. I would urge that there be a solution that recognises the balance between the need to build homes and doing this in a proportional way. I urge you to accept my suggestion that a committee be formed, reflective of the developer and the local community, with the city clearly having oversight, to find an outcome that satisfies the need for living space, in harmony with the local community.
2. Killing of protected trees with other negative environmental impact from the project and then waiting over 40 years for substitution to try and replace some of what is lost is unfair to those who live nearby and to the environment. As a householder I can not cut down any of the Garry Oaks on my property, whatever the reason. Why should the developer have privileges beyond the average householder if a compromise between building and saving the Garry Oaks, at 902, can be reached.
3. Although parking and traffic are a subtext of the density issue I do not, from personal observation, believe there will be adequate community parking for the density being proposed. I also find the corner on Foul Bay road that approaches 935 is already a traffic hazard. Adding the amount of houses contemplated seems to me to create a substantially increased jeopardy.
4. It is a well respected principle that "he who seeks equity should come with clean hands". I think it is evident from the previous behaviour of the developer he does not come with "clean hands"..... behaviour towards those who raised issues.... suggesting that "affordable" housing was being provided when no supporting financing was in place. He should not, therefore, be entitled to the benefit of doubt with his other arguments nor should get favourable treatment over those living close by to his development. A thorough, balanced analysis with input and standing from both major positions seems the only way of reaching an equitable solution. The increased mortgage borrowing rates must further compromise the thinking of the developer in providing 'discounted' housing. Against all this background I urge that a rigorous, scrupulous platform be given by the council to both contending parties so that the best possible assessment and a positive conclusion may be reached.

Regards,

Adrian Science.

935 Foul Bay rd. Victoria, V8S 4H9.

Madison Heiser

From: Barb Hall [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 8:50 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: The proposed development st 902 Foul Bay Road

Barbara and Thomas Hall.
939 Cowichan Street.
Victoria.
V8S 4E6.
[REDACTED]

We have lived close to this property for 46 years. Over the years the density has increased with the addition of secondary suites and garden suites.

We expect that over the upcoming years the density will continue to grow. We are not opposed to the increase of density in our neighbourhood as long as it is reasonable.

The proposed development for the lot at 902 Foul Bay is not reasonable. It is far too large.

A smaller development with less townhouses would be far more acceptable.

The request by the developer to remove 29 trees including two 100 yr old Copper Beech trees and 7 large Gary Oak trees should not even be considered. The loss of those tall mature trees would be a tragedy. The developer plans to plant replacement trees but it will take years for those small trees to reach maturity. We also did not appreciate the developer's offer of small trees to plant on our property. It was an insult to our intelligence to think we would accept his small trees and in return agree to his plan to destroy that beautiful tree canopy.

This development will do nothing to add affordable housing to the neighborhood. The townhouses will most likely be priced similarly to the Rhodo townhouses on Fairfield road which were sold in the range of \$900,000 to over a million dollars.

With this development there will be a large increase of traffic on Redfern and Quamichan streets and with only 14 parking spots available for 18 townhouses there will surely be a large increase of parked cars on the streets.

In conclusion we feel that the proposed development with its long list of variances should not be approved.

Barbara Hall
Thomas Hall

[REDACTED]

From: Dave and Wendy Cornock [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 11:41 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Development Permit No00192 - re 902 Foul Bay Rd

We are writing to express concern for the proposed development at 902 Foul Bay Rd. We attended a community Information Session on Sept 6th to find out more about the development and after attending we still have concerns.

We are familiar with the street as we live close by on Brighton Crescent.

The property is a lot that is fronted by Foul Bay Rd, Redfern St, and Quamichan Street.

The slide presentation at the session showed sidewalks on all three sides of the development when in actual fact when questioned the sidewalks proposed on Foul Bay and Redfern will only be in front of the new development.

Redfern is a very narrow street - and there is no sidewalk on either side - putting in a sidewalk that doesn't connect to anything does not make it a walkable street. The development is asking for reduced vehicle parking from 27 stalls to 14 and only 1 visitor parking. Increasing the side street parking on to Redfern means that foot traffic, bike traffic, and vehicles will be sharing basically a one lane street - and depending on the size of two vehicles parked across from each other it could make it difficult for a vehicle to pass between them. We worry about what this might mean if an emergency vehicle can't get through. We have seen this happen with a larger SUV that was trying to get down the street and had to back up through the cars because they couldn't pass through. We also heard at the hearing from a gentleman who's elderly mother has to use the road to travel down Redfern in her wheelchair and she is concerned with the increased parking making it difficult to move in and around the cars parked.

Parking is not allowed on Foul Bay or on sections of Quamichan so it makes sense that this development with reduced parking will be encouraging parking on to Redfern.

We are also concerned with how increased density of this # of units will increase traffic on all three of these streets especially considering that the area already is seeing an increase in vehicle traffic with the closure of Richardson Street to vehicles.

The development is too dense for the lot that it is on. We support increased thoughtful density but this is too large for the site and doesn't provide enough affordable units. Affordable which is just a % off of the market rate still means that it is unattainable for some families to move into the area.

This is a townhouse development which is also proposing that 1/2 of the units front on to Foul Bay Rd, without set back for play areas or individual homes having their own family green space.

There is a playground area proposed for shared use of the complex but no outside areas for individuals to enjoy the outside at their own home.

A smaller development with homes that have small yards with enough parking would get our support - this doesn't.

There are too many variances requested for us to support this proposal.

Wendy and Dave Cornock

995 Brighton Cres
Victoria, B.C.

[REDACTED]

From: trish aikens [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 12:13 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul bay public hearing

Dear mayor and council

Please accept this submission respecting the proposed development at 902 Foul Bay road.

I cannot support this proposed development. Not only will it destroy valuable tree canopy, I believe it will create dissension and rancour and erect barriers amongst neighbours. Is that the kind of community you want? The things you have done so far in this city seem to try and embrace community - bike lanes, parkettes, community gardens etc. This development enshrines none of that community feel, rather it is an overwhelming structure plunked in the middle of an urban Forrest and is not appropriate for the small site.

Did you know there is a tree On the grounds of Windsor castle that is 1000 years old. Trees live long and give so much. Imagine what a lovely park this site would make .

Sent from my iPad

1657 Richardson St.
Victoria, BC
September 18, 2022

Re: Rezoning and Heritage Designation Amendment Application for 902 Foul Bay

Dear Mayor and Council:

Let's do some myth-busting about 902 Foul Bay.

Myth: *Fairfield-Gonzales residents are NIMBY-ites who are opposed to densification and worried about their property values.*

First, no-one living in Fairfield-Gonzales is worried about the value of his or her property. Residents in the immediate area are not opposed to densification; what they are opposed to is the removal of 29 mature trees providing shade and wildlife sustenance to their neighbourhood. Redfern St. itself is home to several infill housing projects, and residents are totally supportive of these changes. A walk around neighbouring streets reveals to any observant person that the area has a greater population than it did 20 years ago: duplexes are being turned into triplexes and even quadruplexes; new granny flats are being built on every street; up to a quarter of homeowners are renting their basements or garages to tenants; and Margaret Jenkins school yard is full of portables.

Myth: *The development proposed by Aryze will provide lower-cost housing in an expensive neighbourhood.*

Buyers of units at 902 Foul Bay will be paying full market rates and will get exactly what they're paying for: a new, upscale home in an upscale neighbourhood on a tiny lot with no privacy and NO shade. Buyers will not be young people looking for their first family home because they cannot afford these prices, Purchasers of these units will likely be well-to-do retired Victorians looking to downsize, and well-to-do Canadians from other provinces who have saved their entire lives to be able to retire in Victoria.

Myth: *Allowing a housing project for wealthy buyers to be built at this location will, by some kind of magical, trickle-down osmosis, "free up" more housing for rental elsewhere in the City.*

Hundreds of condominium units have been built in the centre of the City in recent years, and the rental situation is as tight as ever (not to mention more expensive), revealing the fallacy of this supposition.

Myth: *The City has a lot of trees. It can afford to lose 29.*

The Mayor is fond of observing that citizens are "attached" to their trees, as if this were some sort of emotional weakness. However, there is real science behind alarm at the potential loss of tree cover. As noted on the City's website, trees

- reduce overall temperatures
- shield citizens from air pollution
- create privacy
- reduce energy bills

- absorb excess water during storms
- act as a carbon sink, and
- shelter and sustain wildlife.

Scientists like Suzanne Simard and Douglas Tallamy have written convincingly about the interrelated nature of ecosystems surrounding trees; lose the trees and you lose the other species that depend upon trees for their livelihood.

In 2019 the City pledged to plant 5000 trees by the end of 2020 as part of The Trees in Cities Challenge. By the end of 2020, 500 had been added to parks and boulevards, a 40% increase in the usual rate but still well below the goal. Moreover, a great many boulevard trees are succumbing to disease, drought and old age, leaving some once-shady streets looking like a new subdivision. Scientists tell us that a tree with a 30" diameter delivers 70 times the environmental benefits of one with a 2-3" diameter. Scientists also say the ideal tree canopy for a city is 30-40%. Victoria stands at 28% and cannot afford to lose more healthy trees.

Here is a quote from Mayor Helps (June 3, 2021): "... we can continue to develop and grow as a city while also protecting and growing the urban forest necessary for public enjoyment and to address climate change and long-term resilience." Where is the protection for 902 Foul Bay? The Mayor cannot continue to speak out of both sides of her mouth on this issue. Either she is opposed to losing a healthy segment of the urban forest, or she prefers to see it paved over.

The best and highest use for this plot of land would be to turn it into a pocket park for all citizens to enjoy. The second best use for it would be to build rental housing in the centre of the lot so that most of the trees can be preserved.

Myth: 902 Foul Bay will return to its sylvan glory after about 60 years thanks to new tree planting.

The developer and the City will never be able to replicate the population of mature tall trees at this site because large trees cannot establish healthy root systems in an area that's largely under concrete. In the meantime, residents will be exposed to heat pollution in an era that is predicted to get steadily warmer due to climate change. Except for Redfern St. and Foul Bay Rd., streets in the immediate vicinity (Richardson, Quamichan, Cowichen, Lawndale, Runnymede) are not heavily treed and are likely to lose even more trees to disease and old age, a process that is in full swing now. This area is badly in need of shade.

Myth: By approving the rezoning for 902 Foul Bay and allowing this project to go ahead as proposed, Council will be adhering to its pledge of improving the housing situation in Victoria.

By approving the rezoning for 902 Foul Bay and allowing this project to go ahead as proposed, Council will be signalling that it supports despoiling the natural environment for the sake of enabling a developer to line his pockets and welcoming more wealthy homebuyers to the City and its tax rolls, while completely ignoring the plight of renters and others who are still looking – in vain – for "missing middle" housing.

Yours truly,
Barbara Abercrombie

[REDACTED]

From: Brian Vatne [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 4:30 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fwd: Letter of support for proposed development at 902 Foul Bay Rd

Hello mayor and council,

My name is Brian Vatne, and I live on Cowichan St less than 100 meters from the proposed development site at 902 Foul Bay Rd. I am writing in support of the proposed development.

There are several reasons why I support the project:

- I like how the project is designed, and I would be pleased to have this development in my neighbourhood
- The Gonzales neighbourhood desperately needs more housing options other than single family homes, I know precariously housed people in my area who need options other than \$1.2M+ single family homes. We need to give families like this a chance in our neighbourhood
- We can't just rely on areas like downtown, Harris Green, Vic West, Burnside-Gorge to be the location for multi-unit dwellings. Gonzales needs to host its fair share of different types of housing
- I appreciate the units that will provide a below-market housing opportunity for people, this point alone should be enough for strong consideration for approval

Thank you,
Brian Vatne
Cowichan St resident, property backs on Redfern St

[REDACTED]

From: Guy Whitman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 4:22 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Rezoning of 902 Foul Bay Rd.; Development Variance Permit application #192

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the above-captioned rezoning proposal and development variance permit. Properly and accurately described, without the use of misleading euphemisms ("stacked townhouses") this project constitutes 2 smallish condominium buildings crammed into a small lot. The proposed buildings will be too high, cover most of the lot (leaving inadequate room for realistic parking requirements. Setbacks are inadequate. Such extreme density will necessitate removal of virtually all of the trees on site, reducing once more the city's canopy, but with such a small average size will not be realistically suitable for family accommodation; nor will it do anything to remedy the lack of affordable housing. In short, there is nothing positive that can be said about the proposal, except that it will result in a substantial profit for the developer. A project like this is completely inappropriate for the neighbourhood and should be rejected outright by council. Any councilor who supports it will not have my vote in the upcoming election, whether as councilor or mayor.

Guy Whitman
1950 Fairfield Place
Victoria
[REDACTED]

Note: This a replacement of an earlier email in which I failed to provide my address and other contact information. Please disregard the previous submission.

[REDACTED]

From: SB Julian [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 7:23 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Densification at 902 Foul Bay Road

Dear Council,

I wish to protest the over-densification of landscape in a heritage neighbourhood of long-time detached housing, proposed for an out-of-scale for-profit development at the corner of Foul Bay Road and Quamichan Road.

This profit-driven enterprise would do nothing for housing affordability, and would remove many bylaw-protected trees. If Council doesn't respect city bylaws, why should anyone else, regarding trees or any other issue?

Trees of value have already been removed from this site (correspondents have told [Treewatchvictoria.blogspot.com](https://treewatchvictoria.blogspot.com) that even trees on adjoining public land have already been removed). Overly-dense, unaffordable development destroys canopy which helps to mitigate climate change in an urban area where such canopy is most needed -- which goes against Council's stated environmental goals.

Please do not entertain ludicrous desperate allegations of a "racist covenant" -
- a manufactured diversion which disrespects wishes of existing neighbours.
Please permit building only on a scale appropriate for the neighbourhood.

Thank you,
Sandra B. Julian

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: shawn robins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 7:21 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed development at 902 Foul Bay Road. As a longtime Fairfield resident I feel compelled to express my disappointment at the developers tone deaf proposal. It is too large and dense to suit the surrounding neighbourhood. There is insufficient parking and not enough preservation of landscape. The lack of affordability prohibits access by young families. This is simply just not good enough. Go back to the drawing board or do not proceed.

Shawn Robins
330 Robertson Street
Victoria

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

From: Bob June [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 10:39 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road - Development Permit with Variances No. 00912

Refer the proposal for 902 Foul Bay Road back to Development Services.

An achievable and allowable development under current zoning of four homes with ancillary suites would provide adequate density without the negative impacts of the current proposal. Further, the grossly inadequate setbacks proposed are inadequate for residential streetscapes. (note the setback rational and requirements proposed in the MMHI)

The loss of protected trees and significant tree canopy is untenable in this day and age. The planting of saplings which will take half a century to grow to anything resembling what exists now is ludicrous in a time of global warming.

Bob June
1310 Manor Rd.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay

Hi,
I'm writing to express my support for the townhouses proposed at 902 Foul Bay Rd. I live approximately 200m from this site, and in the 4 years my family has lived here we have seen family, friends, and the classmates of our children move away due to the lack of housing options in the neighbourhood. Victoria needs more diverse housing types, and Gonzales should not be exempt from filling this need. I urge you to vote in favour of this development. Thanks for your consideration,

Heather Davidson

Sent from my iPhone

September 18, 2022

Dear Mayor Helps and Members of Council,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed development at 902 Foul Bay Rd. I live within a few blocks of the site and have been following the process over the past year or more.

My response to the proposal has remained positive overall from the outset for several reasons;

- The project is an innovative example of gentle densification within an established residential neighbourhood,
- The price range proposed makes the units as close to affordable as anything in the vicinity, especially with the four below market rate units,
- Given the number of units proposed, the footprint is quite modest, ensuring a significant amount of useable and greenspace on site,
- The D'Ambrosio Architecture and Urbanism design promises to be a well-conceived, quality built and attractive addition to the neighbourhood, with many sustainable features,
- It aligns with several key Victoria Climate Plan objectives to promote car-lite lifestyles, including its proximity to public transit and walkability to community amenities,
- And most important, it would provide a desperately needed housing choice for those with moderate incomes including first time home buyers, young families, and seniors, who may be long-time residents or new to Victoria.

I've heard the concerns expressed by some neighbours in the immediate area, many having already been addressed by Heritage Advisory, City staff or the developer, Aryze. The well-researched, comprehensive March 2021 article in the Capital Daily also served to clarify common misunderstandings regarding restrictive land use covenants and Heritage Designation. As a former Policy Analyst with the Provincial Heritage Branch I am well aware of how poorly understood these tools can be.

It is a fact that greater Victoria is experiencing an ongoing housing crisis. Our adult children, among so many others, are struggling to find decent, moderately-priced housing in the community where they grew up and now hope to raise their own children in their hometown. Housing prices, predominantly single family, remain high while supply is an ongoing challenge. Something has to change!

The Save the Trees signs on streets in the neighbourhood have been placed there by opponents to this development. There is no argument - we need both. But providing well-constructed and designed alternatives to single family homes that increase supply, diversity and relative affordability within established residential neighborhoods like ours enabling a mixed demographic with a range of incomes to stay in the city, is to my mind top priority. As aptly stated in the January 2021 TC editorial, "If not at 902 Foul Bay, then where?"

Respectfully yours,

Pam Copley, 1925 Brighton Avenue

[REDACTED]

From: Virginia Erick [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 1:00 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay development

Dear Mayor and Council,

A time of climate crisis and housing insecurity is not the time to pit one issue against the other. The mature tree canopy is necessary and so is more affordable housing.

The buildings and driveway have too much lot coverage and are badly placed in this development proposal.

There is too much mature tree removal and too much canopy loss.

The units are not affordable.

There are other more sympathetic ways for redevelopment to occur.

With centrally located buildings on this property, tree loss will be reduced and densification can be achieved.

Please, vote against this development plan for 902 Foul Bay Road.

Virginia Errick
615 Foul Bay Rd.
Sent from my iPad