

[REDACTED]

From: Barbara Rieti [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 8:11 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road

I am writing to register my opposition to the proposal for development of 902 Foul Bay Road, mainly on the grounds of size and environmental destruction.

Size:

It is simply too much and too big for this site and surroundings, even if this were a bare level lot. Redfern Street is narrow with no sidewalks, completely unsuited to handling the traffic from a multiplex housing development.

Environment:

The trees on this site (many of them allegedly protected Garry oaks) took decades to reach their present park-like state which has, until recently, been designated a heritage landscape. The importance of urban tree canopies, especially in mitigating climate change, is too well-known to need rehearsing here. Increasingly, trees are being recognized by city administrations as not just niceties, but critical infrastructure in maintaining ground health and avoiding heat sinks created by concrete and intensive development. The bigger the trees, the bigger the benefits. But trees are expensive to plant and maintain: take, for example, their need for large amounts of water to become established. Then there is not always room for them to mature safely, and of course they can be lost to storms, pests and disease.

So here in Gonzales is a valuable setting of varied and endangered trees, *already in place*, yet this project would strip them out for an unimaginative complex that is in no way affordable housing - just speculators trying to squeeze maximum profit from the land.

Victoria may need more housing, but that need has to be balanced with environmental considerations. Green space - public and private - is breathing room for everyone. So density, yes, but not at any expense. And the expense in this case is very great.

Barbara Rieti
1903 Brighton Avenue
[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 12:19 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Support for 902 Foul Bay project

From: Alice <[REDACTED]>
Sent: September 22, 2022 10:58 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: Support for 902 Foul Bay project

Dear Mayor and Councillors

I'm unable to attend tonight's hearing but want to voice my support for the proposed townhouse project at 902 Foul Bay Road.

As you know, Victoria is in the middle of a housing crisis, and this proposed project is exactly what is needed to provide more family housing in established neighbourhoods. This site is adjacent to transit, close to schools and shopping, and perfect for such a development. The developer and architects have worked creatively to make a reasonable number of family homes fit in this space, and the financing options will open this up to families who otherwise could not afford to live in this neighbourhood. What is required now is a courageous city council who is willing to approve this development and pave the way for more diversity in family housing options in our established neighbourhoods.

I live nearby this site, and regularly walk through the neighborhood. I have been appalled by the abundance of "Save the Trees" signs, which signal to me that surrounding homeowners care more about trees than about housing families. The neighbourhood is full of mature trees, on boulevards, in yards, in green spaces (like the Brighton Street greenway) and in nearby parks. The removal of the trees necessary to allow development of 902 Foul Bay will barely make a dent in the mature tree cover of the neighbourhood and, in my opinion, is a complete red herring that neighbours are using to hide their fear of density and diversity. (Similarly, complaints about "affordability" are another red herring: home ownership in Victoria may never be affordable for all families, but this project is more affordable than most. Don't let perfect be the enemy of done.)

Most of you are not running again and have nothing to lose by standing up to the NIMBY contingent and voting in favour of this necessary family housing. I encourage you to approve this project and open the door to more diverse forms of family housing in Victoria.

Sincerely,
Alice Cochran

From: Brad Atchison
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 1:30 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road

Importance: High

Re: 902 Foul Bay Road

A RESOUNDING "NO" TO THIS PROPOSED ARYZE PROJECT!

REASONS:

1. Most importantly, **Mayor Helps, on behalf of Council and local governance, declared a "Climate Emergency" back in February 2019**, and, yet to-date, have exhibited **no bona fide "emergency behaviours" (i.e., urgent behaviours) in dealing with the Climate Crisis**. This project does not meet the acid test of climate change mitigation or adaptation.
2. With due respect, **Victoria Council and Mayor routinely talk out of both sides of their mouths in the dissonance between words and reconciling actions**. On the one hand, they indicate that we are in a **"Climate Emergency"** and, yet with land development project after project, encourage design, construction methods and materials, and infrastructure demands which **run counter to a reduction in carbon emissions in the region**.
3. **Instead of viewing trees as critical climate mitigation and adaptation infrastructure in reducing the Heat Island Effect of this region and optimizing carbon sequestration**, the City colludes with and enables developers to continue the insidious/continual, incremental, and unnecessary cutting down of trees, in this case the **further removal of 28 trees (67% of this existing urban forest ecosystem!)**, **INCLUDING 17 TREES WHICH ARE PROTECTED UNDER THE CITY'S OWN TREE PRESERVATION BYLAW!** (or does Council regard this bylaw as **nothing more than lip service when it comes to the City's strategic land development objectives?**). Replacing some of these trees with new, immature trees doesn't come close to mimicking the biodiversity and carbon sequestration of living mature trees in an existing urban forest stand. Trees are communal and also communicate and express stress reactions regarding damage to their neighbours. These are very elemental and fundamental environmental considerations in dealing with the Climate Crisis and the Species Extinction crisis. The actual number of any live trees cut for any construction projects (unless there is a safety issue) should be ZERO!
4. There are **Garry oaks which are proposed to be cut with this project**. The Mayor and Council should know that we are down to our last stands of this species of tree (3 to 4%) compared to their original range about 100 years ago. Furthermore, the **City has deemed these trees a protected species, yet, is willing to, again, flaunt their own guidelines and bylaws** to accommodate a developer.
5. The City commits to OCPs and Neighbourhood Plans, particularly the **"Urban Village Concept"** to densify the nearby Fairfield Road corridor. Similar densification along narrow Foul Bay Road is an aggravating and worsening Quality of Life issue. For example, the Aryze Rhodo townhouse development just built now has 22 households egressing onto Fairfield Road instead of the original

two households, magnifying the worsening traffic problem along Fairfield Road (which **sounds all-too-familiar with this 902 Foul Bay Road Aryze project near Margaret Jenkins School which poses the same problems, with 18 rowhouse households egressing onto Foul Bay Road, instead of the original 1 household!** The location of these Urban Villages and clusters of densification along busy, narrow roads should be revisited. Unfortunately, the same consideration will occur in the not-too-distant future with a substantial densification of and around any re-developed Fairfield Shopping Centre, again with the traffic egressing to/from Fairfield Road as well as St. Charles Street. Furthermore, these types of housing projects do NOTHING to net reduce housing prices!

NO, TO SUCH A PROJECT WHICH ACCENTUATES CARBON EMISSIONS, AGGRAVATES AND ADDS TO WORSENING TRAFFIC IN THE AREA, AND INVENTS A NEW SAFETY EGRESS ISSUE ON AN ALREADY-BUSY FOUL BAY ROAD (IN THE VICINITY OF AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL!). Aryze's bicycle and electric vehicle amenities attached to the project are merely cursory in the grand scheme of a developer or a municipality dealing with the Climate Crisis.

Do the right thing and turn this project down...or any other approximation of it. Also, start committing to fully "walking the talk" with urgency and exhibiting emergency behaviours in dealing with the Climate Crisis.

Yours respectfully,
Brad Atchison

--

Brad Atchison, MBA, CMC, M.Sc., B.Sc. (Hon.), P.Mgr.
1968 Fairfield Place, Victoria, B.C., Canada V8S 4J4

This email (and attachments, if any) is intended solely for the person or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain privileged information. Any review, dissemination, copying, printing, or other use of this email by persons or entities other than the addressee is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete the material from any computer. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:16 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: Support for 902 Foul Bay

From: Caitlin McGuire [REDACTED]
Sent: September 21, 2022 9:16 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>
Subject: Support for 902 Foul Bay

Hello,

I am writing to voice my support for the proposed development at 902 Foul Bay Road. As a resident of the Gonzales neighbourhood, and an owner of a single-family home, I want to see more thoughtful density added to the area in order to increase the vibrancy and affordability of my community.

Caitlin McGuire
1821 Lillian Road

From: Cheryl Shoji [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 1:09 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road

Re: 902 Foul Bay Road

I do not support the development request for 902 Foul Bay Road....

I live near a house that is currently under construction on top of Gonzales Hill and it has emphasized the amount of steps, traffic, construction material, industrial vehicles etc. that it take to make ONE house.

I understand the fine balance juggling Economy, Housing, etc issues ...

....but I am concerned about our contribution to Carbon Emission for every property built. I am sympathetic to the challenge of housing people. And I would have supported construction prior to understanding what we are "contributing" to a world increasingly affected by a severe climate backlash.

Right now, mitigation of Carbon Emissions takes precedence over all because there is no PLANet B if we screw this up.

I use the the development beside my house as an example of what I have seen. **All of these steps contributed to Carbon Emission :**

- A grove of Garry Oak Trees- a critically imperilled species - cut down for a driveway. (Carbon released with cutting)
- specialized heavy truck dispensed to cut the trees
- blasting to level the new property for development over months (!!) (specialized heavy equipment, daily visits from trucks to load and offload rocks and gravel)
- utility service installation- sewer, electricity, water etc by the city
- all of the materials "needed" to put this house together - wood, cement, gravel, drywall, spray foam insulation, wiring, glass, stucco..oh and a home entertainment truck with all if it's equipment, elevator etc
(a cradle-to-grave - extraction of raw material to make the product,making the product,transportation of the product from whatever country to the site, ...and the product itself - the disposition at end of life. Heavy transportation equipment used for all of these products.

Can the city provide data on carbon emission for each product proposed? I think not.

The CRD warned that **allowable space in our landfill may be seriously impacted** soon? A plethora of new homes generates massive consumption, and waste products.

Lisa Helps stated that climate change is an emergency - We are not addressing the "emergency" as an emergency. We are lightly pecking rather than immediately and voraciously attacking.....

I agree: **Climate change/Carbon Emission IS an Emergency.**

Re: construction of new homes - is there anywhere in the world that has successfully solved this problem? I would love to read a success story- truly - I am not being facetious.

The development beside my house and the “future development” at 902 Foul Bay are symbolic examples of business as usual - and knowing what we know now, that’s unacceptable.

I do not support the development plan for 902 Foul Bay Road, nor will I support future developments until there is a plan to:

1. ensure that the homes are “affordable” (and please define what affordable is using a current benchmarks and future benchmarks- ie how will you determine what is affordable)...and how do you control who may buy a place (a retiring couple from Alberta or a tax paying essential worker for example)
2. track carbon emission data for each project built and severe penalties/closure if it fails to meet the accepted target
4. provide a data driven plan for our little piece of the planet to attack consumption/habits/entitlement mindset to take bold steps in mitigating Carbon Emission.

sincerely,

Cheryl Shoji..🌞...🧩.....> [REDACTED]
1968 Fairfield Place, Victoria, BC

There is NO Planet B.

[REDACTED]
by Dr. Seuss (1971) ** DR Seuss knew the future in 1971 that future is now.

watch: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Deidre Matheson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 11:52 AM
To: Public Hearings
Cc: Deidre Matheson
Subject: 902 Foul Bay September 22, 2022 Public hearing

Good morning.

I am writing to express my support for the MM housing development proposed for 902 Foul Bay (by Aryze).

There are a number of reasons I believe the City should support this project:

- The need for MM housing in Victoria continues. Although it is not affordable to all, it is affordable to more people and families who cannot afford a SFH in Victoria. Many couples make more than \$100k/year, and the units are affordable to them.
- units offered at below market will allow middle income residents an opportunity to buy in the neighbourhood.
- Reduced parking - there are many families and individuals who do not drive or own a car for a number of reasons.
- Being on a main bike route, close to transit, biking and walking distance to local elementary, middle and high school make this an ideal location for families.
- The house is gone, therefore the options are to densify with more affordable housing, or, build 2 or 3 large SFH that will only be affordable for a few.

I hope you will approve this project.

Thank you,
Deidre Matheson

[REDACTED]

From: Daphne Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2022 9:24 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road

Dear Mayor and Council.

Re: 902 Foul Bay Road

Neighbourhood

The Redfern neighbourhood of Fairfield/Gonzales is a folksy and rustic community more akin to the working class and island living than the bourgeois. A street scan reveals DIY maintenance projects and food gardens rather than pretentious manicured landscapes and workspaces of licensed contractors. Clothing hangs on a makeshift line to dry in one front yard. Children's bikes lean on raised flower beds and a low ramp for a wheelchair at another. Sunflowers and wildflowers pepper the ground throughout the neighbourhood in late summer. The demographic is the type that gets displaced when neighbourhoods upscale beyond the means of long-standing residents - who move to communities with longer commutes. Unfortunately, some of these residents are seniors on fixed incomes who are in danger of getting outpriced, thus relocating away from hospitals and diagnostic services when they need them most.

Zoning and Affordability

The property is zoned for single-family housing. Whether a townhouse or an SFH is built here, neither housing type will be affordable/attainable to most Victoria residents when wealthy inbound professionals and retirees arrive every day from other provinces. The developer claims the project will promote trickle-down economics, and those new townhomes will open rentals up for the less wealthy. However, the gentrification of middle-class neighbourhoods such as Fairfield/Gonzales proves the opposite occurs. Studies have shown that prosperity trickles up, thus only benefitting the rich.

Designation and Covenant

The park-like assembly of several Garry oaks and other mature trees at 902 Foul Bay, a corner lot, is a striking centrepiece of the neighbourhood. The property is protected by a triple Heritage Designation for:

1. The heritage house (burned to the ground under suspicious circumstances).
2. Land and trees.
3. Stonewall

And a conservation covenant for the land (inhabited by many 100-year-old bylaw-protected trees).

There was clearly a desire by prior occupants at 902 Foul Bay to protect the urban tree canopy. And while the B.C. government rightfully amended the Land Title Act in 1978 to declare racist covenants (excluded non-white families) void, a conservation covenant is a tool which helps protect biodiverse areas against rapid development.

Undoubtedly, a world where human lives are put before the lives of all other species results in dire consequences.

Housing Crisis

The assumption that the logical solution is for a profiteer to build million-dollar townhomes will solve a housing crisis leaves a significant gap in logic. There's no difference between the settler-colonists of yesterday commodifying nature for profit and this new era of market-driven fundamentalists. The developer has a history of preaching to dissolve rules of zoning to undermine colonial attitudes, only to carry on with colonial concepts of private property ownership. This could be viewed as exploitation.

Biodiversity and Sprawl

As of 2008, more people live in cities than in the countryside for the first time in human history. Researchers say there are two paths forward. One is toward the gradual decay of the fragile relationship between humans and the rest of the natural world; the other is the rise of nature-rich cities. New research has suggested that instead of warring against sprawl, planners and environmentalists should recognize how green spaces of private properties in a city can provide the affordability and sustainability we need. Conserving the mature tree canopy in Victoria is more essential than ever for combating the city's climate crisis and biodiversity loss. For example, a raven or an owl cannot nest in a 10ft tall replacement tree. These birds vanish. Additionally, the community gets nothing for unlocking the property rights at 902 Foul Bay or any affordability for this middle-class neighbourhood.

Supporters

If supporters of the 902 Foul Bay proposal (requesting extreme variances for increased height and hardscaping) genuinely wanted to protect against urban sprawl, they would join the petition to the Mayor and Council of the City of Langford for a tree protection bylaw. Of the region's 13 municipalities, Langford is the only one not to have a tree protection bylaw.

Climate Crisis

Scientists predict that the 6th mass extinction is well underway, causing irreversible damage to Earth. Over the next few decades, vast portions of the planet will be rendered uninhabitable by millions of climate refugees escaping storms and fire. It is time to design our way back into nature.

Reconciliation

With the adjustments to the proposal, the property owner, developer, architect, and landscape architect behind the 902 Foul Bay proposal have the potential to add densification, maintain the mature tree canopy as a community amenity, and win back the trust of the neighbourhoods in which they operate.

Daphne Thomas
Gonzales/Fairfield

From: Fiona Hunter [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 8:33 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Development at 902 Foul Bay Road

This is a written submission with respect to the above noted proposed development.

While I have some concerns about the reduction of bicycle parking and vehicle parking, I am in favour of this development. In my view, higher density is a necessary part of our future. European countries and the UK have had high density in their cities for decades/centuries. While I enjoy the space of my single family home in a lovely part of town, I know that it is a luxury that many cannot afford.

Fiona Hunter, B.A., L.L.B., L.L.M., T.E.P.
Partner

HORNE COUPAR LLP
LAWYERS + NOTARIES



Victoria (Main) Office:
Suite 300, 612 View
Street
Victoria, BC V8W 1J5
Canada

**Oak Bay (Satellite)
Office:**
302 – 2250 Oak Bay
Avenue
Victoria, BC V8R 1G5
Canada

This email is confidential and may be privileged. It is for the use of the named recipient(s) only. Confidentiality and privilege are not lost by this email having been sent to the wrong person. If you are not an intended recipient of this email please notify us immediately, delete it from your computer system and do not copy or disclose its contents to anyone. Any use of this email by an unintended recipient is prohibited. Thank you.

[REDACTED]

From: Rae Ann Toovey [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 12:02 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay

Hello,

We are writing in regards to the development proposal for 902 Foul Bay Road.

To be clear, we are **opposed** to the development as currently proposed.

Concerns in summary:

- Safety for pedestrians and all vehicles: Redfern, Quamichan and Foul Bay, parking
- Building footprint is too large for the property - removal of green-space and downloading to limited shared spaces
- Density as it pertains to the increase in traffic, road parking and surrounding infrastructure
- Aryze treatment of our shared neighbourhood - rewarding bad behaviour

Safety: Redfern as a direct result of policies from the City of Victoria has become increasingly dangerous. This has been a result of not requiring parking off street for infill and the increase of traffic; pedestrians specifically, but also for vehicle operators of all types, the roadway is increasingly hazardous to navigate. Despite more than a decade of inquiry and broaching this subject with the City of Victoria, including insinuations that sidewalks were being considered, nothing has happened except policies to cram more parked cars on the street and increase traffic. Further as a result of the inexplicable change at the Richardson and Foul Bay Quamichan and the intersection at Foul Bay have become increasingly dangerous as cars and bikes accelerate off of Foul Bay and down Quamichan. The development as proposed will exponentially exasperate these issues with a large increase in traffic and many more vehicles parked on the Redfern and Quamichan. Line of sight from parked vehicles for all who navigate Redfern is already a significant safety hazard. As well, for larger vehicles, service busses and ambulances, often the space between parked vehicles is insufficient to navigate the street.

Density, and roadscape: It is clear by the proposal that the intent is to download parking, green-space use and traffic safety to burden the neighbourhood. In order to maximize that number of units to sell the developer would have the neighbourhood to accept burdens to neighbourhood safety, limited public green-space. We see little attempts to by the developer to accept responsibility for the burdens they would rather foist on others, for their benefit. As an example we understand they are requesting reduced short term bicycle storage on site. They won't even commit to the thin veneer of vehicle management like providing sufficient short term bike storage. In the end though we all know, this density will bring many more cars, trucks, etc., far more than the plan has parking for. The developer clearly expects the neighbourhood to accept this burden to safely and ease of use public infrastructure as it benefits them.

Building Footprint: It's hard to fathom how the large footprint of buildings proposed and the exceptions being requested for this property by the developer fits in any way to the commitments of the City of Victoria to the environment, green-space and preserving the quality of neighbourhoods in these regards. As a young family we know how important it is for families to have health green-spaces at their residence, tree canopy for heatwaves, safe spaces to play and streets for movement. We know relying on the limited shared parks exclusively is not prudent as the last years have proven, given the damage and violence that has been invited to these spaces. We know there will be many from our neighbourhood highlighting these issues in detail, so we will defer further detail in our objections on these grounds.

Aryze and their actions: It hard to image a City accepting the poor treatment by a developer towards a neighbourhood they hope to work with, in such a way as to reward them with that neighbourhoods capital. The numerous exceptions that Aryze requests in their proposal imposes on that capital, in the density a neighbourhood can absorb and infrastructure it can sustainably and safely support. The developer has been specifically adversarial to our neighbourhood; misrepresentations, lies, threats, legal harassment and public campaigns to disparage our neighbourhood, these are the discussions that are prevalent by our neighbours in dealing with Aryze. Rewarding such behaviour by any developers by

granting exceptions, for their enrichment, at the expense of any neighbourhoods capital, safety, wellbeing, is tantamount to encouraging such further behaviour in the future. We ask that you carefully consider what behaviour you are condoning and encouraging.

We support a thoughtful development of this property, one that supports density above a single family dwelling, one that provides true value to the new neighbours we look to welcome and balances our neighbourhoods capacity to sustain safety and wellbeing. However, this proposal does not strike that balance and does not attempt to, beyond a bit of shallow window dressing. We understand that alternatives for a still greatly increased density development have been raised with the developer by neighbours to strike a better balance, preserve a bit of our diminished road safety and green-space, however any meaningful compromises have been summarily dismissed. This development as proposed will not help affordability, as buys will simply raising/paying for the increased price per square foot of property that will be a result of the developer benefiting from the requested exceptions. The new buyers get less property for their \$, less long term value and flexibility for their investment. We hope counsel will respect our neighbourhood, respect building limitations as they are already outlined, respect the infrastructure and safety of our neighbourhood and reject this development proposal.

Thank you,
R&J Andrews
Brighton

[REDACTED]

From: M.A and Steve [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 1:46 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Rd. Zoning Reg. Bylaw, Amend. (No. 1280)- No. 22-063)

I am all for re-densifying but NOT over-densifying on one lot! The size of this proposed complex is much too large for the lot and area. The height alone does not fit in with the character of the neighbourhood. A smaller complex would eliminate the necessity of the contractor's proposal to remove mature tree canopies which have become important to our air quality, light and shade. As well, a smaller complex (or possibly houses with secondary suites) would be completed in a much shorter time frame and therefore available sooner. i.e. Gonzales /Foul Bay

A large complex will not only block natural light, destroy the privacy of those nearby but will also increase noise, traffic and pollution from vehicles, yes vehicles, coming and going. There is already added traffic in the area since Richardson and McNeil has been blocked off. Redfern is a narrow street with no sidewalks, which is where the access would be. Undoubtedly there would be more vehicles parking on the street. Therefore would also make this street dangerous for those walking/cycling (including children) as it is a walking corridor.

Just because the house is no longer there to be protected, heritage designation does not mean the trees (especially), gate and wall should not be protected. I oppose this amendment being changed .

Please go back to the drawing board on this development.
M. Cotton
Cowichan street

Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: Markus Kellerhals [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 1:46 PM
To: Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: letter in support of proposed 902 Foul Bay rezoning

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed rezoning of 902 Foul Bay Road that would allow the proposed 18 unit townhouse development there to proceed.

Since mid-rise and high-rise developments would be inappropriate for most locations in Victoria's established neighbourhoods this sort of low-rise infill is exactly what Victoria needs to be promoting to continue building a green and affordable city.

While no market-based housing in Victoria will be truly affordable, the proposed units will be far more affordable than the alternative, which will undoubtedly be 4 single houses built to the maximum allowable size under existing zoning. The families living in these new compact units will have a far smaller environmental impact than the alternative of 4 over-sized single-family homes.

Family friendly alternatives filling the gap between incredibly expensive single-family homes and undersized condos are desperately needed in Victoria.

Thank you for consideration of my views,

Markus Kellerhals
1322 Clover Avenue, Victoria

[REDACTED]

From: Martin Lovelace [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 11:07 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road

I wish to register my objection to the form of Aryze's proposal. Like their Rhodo project, the plan would require clear cutting the protected trees on the site. Contrary to Aryze's spin this development will probably not create affordable housing for local people but will certainly maximize corporate profit at the expense of the environment (large mature trees create heat mitigation), and the neighbourhood (traffic increase and on-street parking).

A smaller scale development which takes a more thoughtful approach to building in ways that do the least harm to the environment would be perfectly acceptable. Densification is a good thing but this brutish proposal is way out of scale for the site.

Martin Lovelace
1903 Brighton Avenue, Victoria

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 12:19 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: 902 Foul Bay

From: Natasha Eichenlaub [REDACTED]
Sent: September 22, 2022 11:11 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: 902 Foul Bay

I am in support of this development! Please vote yes.
Thanks,
Natasha Eichenlaub
City of Victoria resident

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 12:19 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: 902 Foul Bay development proposal

From: Nick Judson [REDACTED]
Sent: September 22, 2022 10:57 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Subject: 902 Foul Bay development proposal

Dear Mayor & Council,

I would like to take a moment to voice my support for the proposed development at 902 Foul Bay. As a resident of Cowichan Street, I would much prefer to see a higher-density development than high-priced single-family dwellings. I'm sure the benefits of increased (but still 'low') density are fresh in your minds from the ongoing missing-middle discussions, and I would argue those benefits justify this proposal. Having heard many of the arguments against this project, I find myself reminding neighbours that:

- 'Saving the trees' simply means shifting the environment impacts to other greenfield development areas (where more pristine environments will be developed). I would argue this is already a higher environmental impact, ignoring the further impact of longer commutes, sprawl, new service installations etc.
- Cowichan street already has at least one example of similar/higher density. Next door to me is 990A/B, which until recently has housed 10 residents (2 families of 5). In my 12 years of living next door, I have not experienced, nor have I heard any of my neighbours complain about, any issues relating to this. 990A/B is a spot zoned duplex on a normal-sized city lot, which I believe may be even more dense than the proposal.
- While everyone seems to have a different definition of 'affordable' housing, I believe that increasing supply is the only mechanism by which Victoria will improve affordability. There are many studies showing this and I'm sure you're aware of many of them.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.

Nick Judson
986 Cowichan Street

[REDACTED]

From: Paul Watson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 9:34 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road

Hello:

Although this proposed development is not going to dramatically negatively affect me, I am philosophically opposed to changing a single family zoned residential lot to a multiple dwelling zone allowing 18 townhouses in this neighbourhood. Higher density is more suited to zones already designated as such.

For this reason I am opposed to this development in its current form.

Paul Watson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad

[REDACTED]

From: Shelley Trenouth [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2022 12:29 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: 902 Foul Bay Road Zoning Bylaw and Development Permit
Attachments: 902 Foul Bay Road.docx

Hello,

Please find attached my written comments for the public hearing scheduled for Sept. 22/22 to review the applications for a Zoning Regulation Bylaw Amendment and Development Permit with Variances Application for 902 Foul Bay Road.

As an adjacent neighbor (910 Foul Bay Road) to the proposed project, I believe that my interest is of particular relevance. Should you require anything further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Shelley Trenouth
[REDACTED]

TO: Victoria City Council (publichearings@victoria.ca)
RE: 902 Foul Bay Road
Zoning Regulation Bylaw, Amendment Bylaw (No. 1280) - No. 22-063
Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00192
DATE: September 21, 2002

My name is Shelley Trenouth and our address is 910 Foul Bay Road. As adjacent neighbours to the proposed project, it is not surprising that we have great interest in what is approved for that site. But more than just our proximity, our comments are driven by a genuine concern for the safety, health and quality of life for the entire community, including the residents of the final project.

Roadway safety is very much predicated on volume of vehicular, bike and pedestrian traffic, speed, availability of parking, existence of sidewalks, air quality, etc. The proposed project violates each and every one of these factors.

With many roads closed to vehicles and re-directed traffic flow now in place in East Fairfield, Gonzales and Rockland, there has been a dramatic increase in traffic in our area. This, along with the absence of sidewalks and the congested road parking due to insufficient on-site parking, all contribute to the inevitability of serious pedestrian/bike/car accidents.

Air quality is already very poor due to the exhaust fumes from diesel buses, half-tons, full tons and tandem trucks. The congestion at the Foul Bay and Richardson intersection results in long line ups of vehicles at a standstill, idling their engines and spewing even more exhaust fumes. This development would assuredly trigger addition traffic from residents, visitors, delivery vans, service vehicles, etc. The transportation management measures proposed by the developer are marginal at best and would have minimal impact on the congestion. For both safety and health reasons, it is imperative that traffic and air quality studies be re-done at times of the day when the highest traffic volume occurs to get an accurate measure of current conditions.

Should the zoning amendment pass as written, which would be regrettable, the developer is still requesting multiple variances. Variances are requested for height (which negatively impacts privacy and available sunlight to neighbouring properties) and ALL setback minimums. This is particularly disturbing given the primary reason why setback requirements exist is for privacy and to ensure better ventilation for cleaner air, better sound insulation from street noise and better landscaping opportunities to allow for trees to provide effective environmental cleansing. In addition to these variances, the developer also requests permission to reduce both vehicle and bicycle parking requirements, again exacerbating an already unacceptable condition.

As you know, a variance application is a mechanism to circumvent undue hardship that may be caused by the strict application of the bylaw (presuming, of course, that the hardship is not self-created). The following is a clip from the City of Victoria website regarding the Board of Variance:

“..... the Board may deny the variance request if it feels that the proposed variance would substantially affect the use and enjoyment of a neighboring property, harm the natural environment or defeat the purpose of the Zoning Regulation Bylaw.”

Firstly, no “undue hardships” are created for the developer by the bylaw. Indeed, hardships are created for others if the variances allowed. Secondly, the sheer number of variance requests is a loud signal that the proposed development is clearly unsuitable for the site. Thirdly, the variances requested *DO affect the use and enjoyment of a neighboring property,*

ARE harmful to the natural environment and WOULD unquestionably defeat the purpose of the Zoning Regulation Bylaw. This flagrant disregard for bylaws written to protect the community, is nothing more than a money grab to maximize profits for the developer at the expense of the neighbourhood; the neighbourhood that pays the price forever for a developer who merely moves on to the next project. If these exceptions are allowed, does it create a precedent to be applied to future projects for this developer; does it open the door for other developers to expect the same leniency; would individual citizens enjoy the same extent of bylaw exceptions for their construction projects; do residents have no voice in protecting the essence of their communities ???

We ask that both the Zoning Regulation Bylaw Amendment and the Development Permit be denied and that the new zoning bylaw be revised to allow no more than four single family dwellings plus one garden suite per unit. These changes still respect the desire for densification, allow for sufficient on-site parking, and, more importantly, provide safer and healthier living environment.

I realize that many of you have decided not to run in the upcoming election and these decisions may be some of the last acts of your tenure. Don't let your legacy be that you have allowed the thin edge of the wedge to open the doors for this and future developments to destroy the neighbourhood communities that make Victoria the great city it is!

Shelley Trenouth

