

ATTACHMENT H

Dear Mayor and Council,

Over the years, I have seen City Staff recommend development proposals which were, in my opinion, not suitable for the respective site, not appropriate for the neighbourhood, or simply, badly planned and poorly received by the neighbourhood. It remains a mystery to me, how many of these proposals ever gained recommendations from City Staff.

It has occurred to me that the obvious strategy of City Planning Staff was to bend every rule to recommend those projects. They were so accommodating and appreciative of many development proposals that they appeared to be enablers rather than gatekeepers.

Now, I see that the City Planning Staff has made another decision, this one on the rezoning application for 1737 Rockland.

Finally, City Staff has met a developer whose ideas cannot be made to somehow fit even their easy-going tolerance for bending zoning rules and their very liberal and forgiving interpretation of the Official Community Plan.

And, after months of deliberation, they have recommended that you NOT accept this proposal. They have recommend that you decline this project.

By all accounts, there is no need to continue with this development proposal. The developer has shown a complete disregard for other opinions along every step of the process, from cutting down trees without permits, meeting with neighbours and discussions with the community land-use committee. The proposal just stayed the same. Even City Staff cannot recommend this proposal.

In the final analysis, the proposal has no obvious benefits to the community and the developers have shown no flexibility whatsoever.

Please decline this development proposal.

Thank you.

Don Cal
1059 Pentrelew Place
Victoria, B.C.

Hello Mayor and Council,

Thank-you for taking the time to read my email. This note is regarding Rezoning Application No. 00755 for 1737 Rockland (which abuts my property at 1720 Lyman Duff Lane). It is on the agenda for the Committee of the Whole meeting on Thursday October 28th, 2021.

My thoughts on this application are as follows (not a full list, but condensed to key points):

- This is a **suitable property for a panhandle development**.
- It is unfortunate that the current proposal does not respect the existing zoning that is in place to guide this type of development. It **significantly exceeds every key metric associated with the existing zoning** for an R1-A panhandle subdivision, including:
 - # of dwellings
 - Site area (m2)
 - Site coverage (%)
 - Height
 - Storeys
 - Setbacks
 - Accessory building size
- There is a **perfect recent comparable** for this development which occurred right next door at 1745 Rockland between 2013-2017. That property was also a heritage home being subdivided for a panhandle development, and the original proposal was also quite overreaching. For this reason it was met with opposition by neighbours and City Council, resulting in a contentious 4-year dispute that ultimately ended with the developer downsizing the proposal to align with panhandle zoning. That development subsequently led to the construction of 3 panhandle-friendly homes which recently sold for ~\$2.5 million each, **proof that a development that respects the panhandle zoning can be completed in a manner that is profitable for the developer and acceptable for the neighbourhood and the City**. To repeat the failed initial approach shows contempt by the developer for his neighbours, the zoning, as well as City Staff and Council.
- I feel strongly that **there is no compelling reason for Council to allow this rezoning** for the reasons noted above. Having said that, I would be quite supportive of a proposal that respected the existing zoning.

Best regards,

Dave McWalter
1720 Lyman Duff Lane

Dear Mayor & Council- As residents who live on Rockland kitty corner from 1737 we are opposed to the development of this panhandle property as currently proposed because of the number of new buildings, their site coverage, height of the new buildings, lack of adequate setbacks and proposed removal of existing trees. Thank you. Jan & Janice Drent 1720 Rockland

Jan and Janice Drent

[i](#)

Good Day Mayor and Council

We write with regards to the proposed rezoning and development at 1737 Rockland Ave which will be reviewed at the Committee of Whole on October 28, 2021. We live adjacent to this proposed development; we are concerned about the impact this will have on mature protected trees on our property and our privacy. We are very pleased that city staff have submitted a detailed report recommending that this development proposal be declined. The good work done by your the city staff concludes that this proposed development exceeds every key metric associated with the existing zoning for an R1-A panhandle subdivision, including:

- # of dwellings
- Site area (m2)
- Site coverage (%)
- Height
- Storeys
- Setbacks
- Accessory building size

Many thanks in advance for taking the time to review this proposal and arriving at the right decision; please follow the lead of your city staff and decline this proposed development.

Sincerely
Kim and Judy Carlton

Dear Mayor and Council,

As a resident of Richmond Avenue living close to the property of 1737 Rockland I would like to express my strong objections to the current proposal.

While the site is suitable for development, this plan exceeds the existing zoning for an R1-A panhandle subdivision in numerous ways: the setbacks, the number of dwellings, the density of buildings, the number of storeys. It would be to the detriment of the neighbourhood to have such an oversized set of buildings constructed in such a small space.

In addition, in order for this to go ahead, all existing trees will be removed. Note should be taken of the fact that in December 2109 the developer arranged to have clearcutting of numerous mature trees on this property, an act which was recognized as a bylaw infraction. If one was in doubt ,this clarifies the fact that he has no regard for the spectacular natural environment of our neighbourhood and seeks only to raze and build.

I trust that council will recognize that the neighbours in this area are naturally seeking to maintain the balance of development and natural beauty of Rockland and therefore will support our position and reject this proposal as unequivocally inappropriate.

With thanks,
Sue Wynne-Hughes
926 Richmond Ave.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to you again to express my opposition to the proposed development at 1737 Rockland Avenue. This is Agenda item F.2 for the meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

The current proposal ignores the existing R1-A zoning panhandle subdivision regulations. How can a developer ignore the existing regulations for the size of the dwellings, the site area, site coverage, height, number of stories and setbacks and expect the neighbors not to oppose his plan? Why would council entertain this proposal when it will have a detrimental impact to the adjoining properties and the lives of the neighbors? I live at 1740 Lyman Duff Lane directly adjacent to a new development at 928 Richmond. It took nearly four years of opposition by Rockland residents and a one time denial of the development by council, before the developer altered the proposal to adhere with panhandle zoning regulations. There are now three single story homes on the property. A tastefully done infill that fits and enhances the neighbourhood. This is the model that should be adopted for 1737 Rockland. Please reject the development as proposed. It is not a fit for the community and it would have a huge negative impact on the adjoining neighbors.

Sincerely,

Vince Bennett

Dear Mayor and Members of Council

We write again in relation to the proposed development at 1737 Rockland Ave. Upon reviewing the applicant's revised submission, we were disheartened to see that the concerns outlined in our previous email, as well as many of the concerns expressed by Council and Staff during the Committee of the Whole meeting in October 2021, have not been adequately addressed.

As noted in our previous email to Council, our home is directly adjacent to the proposed development at 1737 Rockland Ave. Our home is located at 3-928 Richmond Ave – we are the "East Neighbour" identified on page 7 of the applicant's May 25, 2022 letter to the Mayor and Councillors. Although the applicant has revised the east setback to adhere with policy, the variances requested in terms of overall building height and number of storeys remain significant issues that, despite the assertions of the applicant, continue to have a considerable impact on our privacy.

The applicant asserts on page 7 of their May 25, 2022 letter to the Mayor and Councillors that a) the east elevation faces our garage and b) our rear yard is obscured by a large tree. The implication is that the east side of our property is a sheltered, low utility area so a slightly larger setback should be sufficient to address any privacy concerns and therefore variances with respect to height and number of storeys should be conceded. We would like to point out the following to Council:

- The east elevation does not face our garage – this is factually inaccurate. It faces our master bedroom windows, our master bathroom window, and side yard.
- The tree the applicant references does not obscure all of our rear yard. It is located in the south east corner and, while it does provide some privacy, the entirety of our side yard would still be visible from a two-storey home.

Assuming that the applicant worked with Staff to revise their proposal, we are very surprised at the lack of basic diligence done to support their proposal and also the perceived lack of value that the applicant continues to place on our privacy, despite neighbours', Council's, and Staff's prior feedback. While we understand and expect that development in the area will occur, and are philosophically not opposed to development occurring at 1737 Rockland Ave, we certainly expect Council will require the applicant to make much greater efforts to consider the surrounding context and their development's impact on adjacent properties.

As always, thank you for your consideration and best regards,

Jennifer and Chris Thomson

December 22, 2022

Mayor and Members of Council – City of Victoria

Re: Revised Development Application for 1737 Rockland Ave

We are the owners of the home immediately NE of the proposed development and in particular Strata Building B. We have reviewed the latest revision of this application and it still does not adhere to Schedule H – Panhandle Lot Regulations that our strata had to adhere to.

The specific concerns that we continue to have and have not been addressed in this latest revision are:

- The setback for building B is still 1.5m from the North property line where only 4 m is allowed in Schedule H.
- On page 8 of the revision letter it states that there is 11.3 between building B and the existing north neighbour's home (the front of our home). The majority of this distance is due to the fact that our home was built according to the Schedule H setback regulations.
- The height as viewed from our property is difficult to determine and appears to be 2 stories on the application. It is definitely far more than the allowed 5m as per Schedule H.
- On review of the entire application we note variances in size, height and setback with respect to most of the Schedule H Panhandle Regulations. We believe 1737 Rockland should be held to these regulations as was our development.

Hopefully you will take into consideration our comments when reviewing this application at your meetings.

Thank you for attention to this matter.

George Dundas
Grant Townsend
1 – 928 Richmond Ave
Victoria, BC V8S 3Z3

June 15, 2022

Mayor and Members of Council – City of Victoria

Re: Revised Development Application for 1737 Rockland Ave

We are the owners of the home immediately NE of the proposed development and in particular Strata Building B. We have reviewed the revised application and how it will affect our home. As well, we have reviewed Schedule H – Panhandle Lot Regulations as they relate to this development.

The specific concerns that we have are:

- The setback for building B is still 1.5m from the North property line where only 4 m is allowed in Schedule H.
- On page 3 of the revision letter it states that there is 11.3 (10.4 before) between building B and the existing north neighbour's home (our home). The majority of this distance is due to the fact that our home was built according to the Schedule H setback regulations.
- The height as viewed from our property is difficult to determine and appears to be 2 stories on the application. It is definitely far more than the allowed 5m as per Schedule H.
- On review of the entire application we note variances with respect to most of the Schedule H Panhandle Regulations. We believe 1737 Rockland should be held to these regulations as was our development.

Hopefully you will take into consideration our comments when reviewing this application at your meetings.

Thank you for attention to this matter.

George Dundas
Grant Townsend
1 – 928 Richmond Ave
Victoria, BC V8S 3Z3