

Our property will be directly affected by this development. We will end up with units staring down into our back yard. When we bought our house 22 years ago we specifically found an area with reasonable privacy and purposely not near or backing onto large developments or apartments buildings.

I have spoken with a rep from the developer and made my concerns VERY clear prior to their plans being released, but our concerns have been 100% disregarded.

There is NO need for a an increase from the current height of 7.6 meters to for the height to 13.8 meters. I EMPLORE the city to stay with the currently height as we are currently zoned. I am not against the "missing middle" being addressed but am tired of developers purchasing lots and then saying the only way they can make money is to get these incredulous variances. I am also concerned that this is all happening so quickly?

My husband and I are opposed to the current plans. I would love to see neighbours concerns addressed. The height (huge impact into our property) on top of the increased density (deal they made with Abakazi Gardens) does not sit at all well with us.

Lastly, many of us were involved in helping with input and careful consideration into OUR community plan - to see the possibility of that being disregarded is extremely disheartening.

I am unable to attend the meeting scheduled on March 28 so this email is our "comments."

Sincerely, Joanna and Paul Betts  
334 Robertson Street

What are we thinking? Developers are rushing local decision makers into rash and knee jerk reactions to attempt to solve a growing housing shortage. They are changing the very nature of our liveable neighbourhood by eliminating green space and privacy and disrupting the quiet enjoyment of our established community. To what end? To maximize the profitability of the properties they have purchased. As a local resident for 40 years I am directly impacted if this proposed 4 storey structure is approved. The structure will loom over my home and garden. Does it need to be this height to provide a reasonable number of housing units? Does it merit transferring density from Abkhazi Garden purportedly to protect the property from future development? Will Abkhazi fail without the cash from Aryze? This development needs a serious reconsideration. As proposed it does not provide more affordable housing, it does not contribute to the liveability of the community and its residents and it only offers more disruption, cars and traffic and a lot less green space. If we must develop let's do it in a way that is consistent with the OCP which expresses the views of most residents. Take a hard look. I have and I am adamantly opposed to the development as proposed.

Shawn Robins

The other item which is important to add - the proposed 4 storey development will not only cause us to lose privacy at the back of our house, it will also change the amount of sunlight and length of time we can enjoy the sun.

Lastly, for now, I do not see how this will not negatively impact the value of our property. Any future buyer will surely need to consider what they are willing to pay to have all those units looking at the back of our house - yet another reason we chose this property.

Why can't the developer be reasonable and build something that meets the current allowable height.

PLEASE think about those of us who currently live in this neighbourhood, and consider us - developments need to conform with our neighbourhood plan and be considerate and respectful of who is impacted (which by their proposal it is evident they are not at all) - this CAN be done while providing more housing.

Sincerely,  
Joanna and Paul Betts  
334 Robertson Street

Sent from my iPhone with my "iThumbs" so please excuse typos!

> On Mar 14, 2022, at 10:48 PM, Joanna Betts [REDACTED] wrote:

>

> Our property will be directly affected by this development. We will end up with units staring down into our back yard. When we bought our house 22 years ago we specifically found an area with reasonable privacy and purposely not near or backing onto large developments or apartments buildings.

>

> I have spoken with a rep from the developer and made my concerns VERY clear prior to their plans being released, but our concerns have been 100% disregarded.

>

> There is NO need for a an increase from the current height of 7.6 meters to for the height to 13.8 meters. I EMPLORE the city to stay with the currently height as we are currently zoned. I am not against the "missing middle" being addressed but am tired of developers purchasing lots and then saying the only way they can make money is to get these incredulous variances. I am also concerned that this is all happening so quickly?

>

> My husband and I are opposed to the current plans. I would love to see neighbours concerns addressed. The height (huge impact into our property) on top of the increased density (deal they made with Abakazi Gardens) does not sit at all well with us.

>

> Lastly, many of us were involved in helping with input and careful consideration into OUR community plan - to see the possibility of that being disregarded is extremely disheartening.

>

> I am unable to attend the meeting scheduled on March 28 so this email is our "comments."

>

> Sincerely, Joanna and Paul Betts  
> 334 Robertson Street

>

Greetings,

As a former resident of Robertson Steet and current resident of Brooke Street, I want to voice my significant concerns about the proposed height of the proposed development at 1733 - 1737 Fairfield Road.

At a height of four stories, the proposed development (which requires an amendment to the Official Community Plan or nearly **double** the current zoning of 7.6 metres) will not only destroy the aesthetic of Fairfield's small-town community feel, it will also infringe upon the privacy of nearby residents, not to mention the deleterious effect it will have on the amount and length of sunlight nearby houses receive.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,  
Mike

Hello,

>

> We would like to express our opposition to the current building proposal at 1733-1737 Fairfield Rd. This proposal is not respecting current zoning and the proposed 4 story height will destroy many surrounding neighbours' ability to enjoy their properties and privacy. Density needs to occur in a respectful way for the neighbourhood. Developers need to stick within the current zoning requirements and height limitations. This proposal of "density transfer" is inappropriate. The city of Victoria does not have a policy for this nor a process in place. Density transfers are used in downtown cores and city centres not residential areas, and only in cities that have a clear existing policy and governance for this process. How can we allow someone to just make up new rules? Density transfers are used to protect heritage sites, but Abkhazi Gardens is not under threat. This is simply manipulation in order to maximize profit at the expense of the neighbourhood. We want to be supportive of appropriate densification, as clearly outlined by the neighbourhood plan and the rules for height and setbacks that are currently in place. Please help support our neighbourhood and protect us from uncontrolled over-development.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Catherine McCartney

Hello,

I am writing to express strong opposition to Aryze's building proposal at 1733-1737 Fairfield Rd. While I understand and support densification, development projects such as this need to be aligned with the Fairfield/Gonzales neighbourhood plan. The proposed 4-story structure is disrespectful in this regard, both to the plan and to the neighbours whose properties and privacy will be negatively impacted.

Moreover, the notion of using a 'density transfer' to justify the increased building height is inappropriate. Density transfers are typically used in core urban areas, not single family residential neighbourhoods. In addition, while these transfers have been used to protect heritage sites, Abkhazia Gardens is not under threat and the property's zoning 'asset' should not be allowed to be purchased and moved. There is no rationale or need for this with either of the involved properties, other than maximizing profits for Aryze.

Finally, to the best of my knowledge, the City of Victoria does not currently have any governing policy or process in place to allow for a density transfer. It would be crucial to have this in place prior to allowing this, or any other 'density transfer' proposal to move forward.

Please help support me and my many concerned neighbours of the Fairfield/Gonzales community by ensuring this development does not move forward as proposed.

Sincerely,  
Sean McCartney

Hi,

How do we go about getting city staff and council members to do a "site" visit to homes that will be negatively impacted by the proposed development? I feel strongly they need to visit our home to truly understand what is at stake for us.

I strongly feel the developments needs to fit with our community plan - which is not as old or as outdated as Aryze representatives have stated.

There IS a way to add housing into our neighbourhood which respects the housing needs ( which I might add are SEVERELY impacted by the likes of Airbnb's/short term rentals) and RESPECTS those of us who live and will be "neighbours" to a development.

Also, it would be worthwhile for city staff to visit the "comparable" buildings Aryze mentioned that they claimed set a precedence on Fairfield Road. I have photos of each. The one on Richmond and Fairfield I would argue is not comparable - it is a tasteful 3 story building. Next to it on Richmond is a large 3 story home. The home behind it was built within the last 7 years after a property was subdivided.

The other property is next to the Ross Bay Villa heritage site ( which is not a home) and only really impacted one large home behind it.

It is very important that CALCU and city staff and councillors do their own deep dive and NOT rely on the information/comparisons provided by the developer.

If the developer really "cared" about the neighbourhood then they would have incorporated feedback they collected from us - but instead we were deceived and given incredibly vague information about a project they knew more about than they disclosed.

Lastly, I am concerned about how "personal" relationships with members involved in project have with the mayor and how this impacts decision making. Perhaps Mayor Helps should be clear and disclose.

Sadly I do not feel confident that the best interests of ALL residents are being considered when architects, and perhaps certain developers, have blurred relationships directly with the mayor.

Sincerely,  
Joanna and Paul Betts  
334 Robertson Street

I can't believe a big developer can manipulate the city council and the FCP in its favour and we neighbours have no say!!

I get it, money talks, but YOU should listen to us, those who live here too.

What about the 3 story height limit, the requirements for parking spaces- or lack thereof, and the need for green space, and trees!!!! All 3 of those "rules" are being broken for the sale of ANOTHER 2-bedroom multiple ultra rich development.

This developer is NOT building affordable family homes, they are not NOT keeping those design is keeping with the heritage homes in the area AND they are making money hand over fist

STOP, look and listen to us and allow for input, honor the community plan- lower height (3story maximum) and stop stripping Fairfield of its character.

Sincerely,

Mully Jackson  
266 Robertson St  
Victoria  
V8S 3X5



Hi- For the last 22 years, I have owned my "forever" home on Robertson Street, 300 block, behind this proposed development.

I am writing to ask that you send this proposal back to Aryze for changes.  
I am totally opposed to this development going through as proposed.

- \* The building height is over 3 stories. It is 4 stories. Our Community Plan sets the height limitation at 3 stories along the Fairfield Road Corridor. We must keep buildings under this height.
  - \* The Density is too high for the project: Aryze is proposing a density "transfer". They are buying increased density for \$300,000 from Abkhazi Garden. How can this be? Can you now buy increased density, so you can build overriding the Community Plan? There is inherently something wrong with this process.
  - \* . Green Space: the building is too close to the road. The three large lots will be almost totally filled by the building and parking lot. All the trees and plants will be removed, leaving only a couple of trees at the back property line. This does not meet the standards for our neighbourhood.
  - \* To my eye, because of its size, the building is not attractive and does not fit into our Community. It's much larger than any home or apartment building in the area. Unfortunately, because it houses 19 condos, is 4 stories tall, fills 3 large lots, it will be similar to looking at a warehouse. This does not fit into our Community Plan.
  - \* This project might reduce our property values: we currently look out on 3 large lots containing 3 homes, with space between the homes, many bushes, lawns, gardens, trees and views of the sunset. If I were looking to purchase in this neighbourhood with the proposed building of 19 condos/4 stories high just across the way...I wouldn't.
- Please try to see this proposed building as we do, who will live behind or in front of it. It's just too large and too tall for our Community.

Please don't see me or my neighbours as NIMBYs. We have two other older, 3 story apartment complexes (not the Rhodo Condo) just next to the proposed development. They are not a visual or environmental issue: they are set back from the road, are 3 stories high and have lots of green space around them. They fit into our Community and into the lots they are built on.

I am not opposed to a multiple-housing option being built on the property. But, it needs to meet our Community Plan's guidelines and have more greenspace and trees, have more parking, not be this large or tall. It must ultimately add beauty to the surrounding community. This is what a Community Plan is all about.

Thank you for your time and service to our Community-  
Linda Maasch  
311 Robertson St.

I live in the 200 block of Beechwood Avenue and in general am in favour of the ongoing and proposed developments nearby (namely the 1 ongoing by Aryze, the LONG overdue one at Foul bay, and now the proposal at 1733-1737 Fairfield)

I used to live in James bay and later in Oak bay- before moving to Beechwood avenue

I loved the densification of James bay, in part made easy by loads of little shops, NOT JUST ONE PLAZA. Is there a hand-in-hand strategy the city is looking at to provide more convenience shops, small bakeries etc to this area. The Fairfield plaza is basically a nightmare from 8am til 8pm and I end up sadly driving up to red barn or to cook st or downtown- all a 40-60 minute walk from my house.

Is there anywhere I can be looking to see how the city is promoting things like Demitasse (oak bay), the Niagara grocer, Ambrosia in Fernwood, Tom Lees (oak bay), and countless others down in James bay)

Rebecca Lang

Dear Council,

Please don't approve this oversized apartment building project for its planned location.

- Its four story height is totally out of proportion to the surrounding neighbourhood
- 19 high-priced units is too dense
- A 22 space surface parking lot opening onto peaceful Beechwood is a dreadful idea: Beechwood has a high number of young children and pets that would be in danger of the increased traffic.
- The parking lot and outsized building would cover a lot of existing greenspace
- The donation to the Abkhazi Gardens can be recognized by swapping some more suitable location than the destructive Fairfield one
- There is no societal benefit included in the plan to assist low income residents
- The RHODO project has already damaged the neighbourhood with its elimination of green space and its visual encroachment on the neighbouring park and Fairfield Road

Too many values will be violated by this proposal. We worked on the Gonzales neighbourhood plan and it was approved by Council. What good is it if Council now just ignores it?

Thanks for your attention to this.

Victor Ivan Carlson  
118 Beechwood Avenue

I'm writing to you in reference to the proposed Aryze development at 1733/35/37 Fairfield Road.

I believe that there's a failure to appreciate the density in this neighbourhood already. I'm not sure where the data is collected to then determine that there is a lack of density, other than by considering legal suites and apartments, thereby assuming that every 'single family home' is in fact what it appears to be: a single family. The reality is that almost all homes in this neighbourhood are multi-family: whether they be students, single professionals, single mothers with children, or traditional 'families'. To pinpoint this neighbourhood as being low density and therefore deserving of more ugly architecture, more traffic, with zero benefit to the neighbourhood, when the surrounding area from which it is transferred (abkhazi) is of incredibly low density seems to be simply a corporate decision to maximize profits and leverage existing infrastructure; How much money or infrastructure has Aryze contributed toward Hollywood park, given that Rhodo sales will leverage the proximity of the park given that they've basically used it as the green space for new owners of Rhodo and will likely do the same with this new proposal?

As a city council, incredibly poor city planning decisions have been made to date and this will be yet another one if it is allowed to proceed.

I find it odd that the city permits landowners to tear down single family homes to construct new single family homes that are massive and don't increase density but do increase real estate prices (buy for 1.3 million, knock it down and build and sell a new home for a minimum of 2.5 million). And on the other hand, the mayor and council decry the lack of density. Why not only provide permits to new single family homes developed on residential zoned properties if they include secondary suites at minimum?! Otherwise, no, you can't knock it down. That will help lower real estate prices, encourage densification with new stock and be more aligned with what you claim is your desire.

The proposed development, apart from not adhering to bylaws and community plans and which requests variances, does absolutely nothing to enhance this neighbourhood. Apart from being a blight on the landscape like Rhodo (let's face it, it is juvenile architecture that is categorically unpleasant to look at), any new densification from which Aryze - which claims to be community focused but in reality is essentially simply saying that as their tag line, since in reality, they're sole concern is to generate profit - hopes to benefit, should include benefits to the neighbourhood. That could come in the form of retail spaces (think coffee shop, bakery, restaurant etc.) and or significant contributions to the improvement of the appearance, function and capacity of the neighbourhood.

Why would Aryze contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars to Abkhazi, if not to attempt to solidify their claim, and pressure the city to permit their continued efforts to maximize their profits and rob the neighbourhood of its aesthetic, appeal and family-focused environment (which, by the way, is the opposite of 'building community')?

Frankly, I have to say shame on you all for the weakness you've shown in your civic duties to date: you seem incapable to me to see beyond what you hope will be a positive legacy and listening to singular voices and being swayed by corporate dollars and revenue from construction permits and future tax revenue.

Paul Crossley

Dear Council,

As the current resident and owner of 1757 Fairfield Rd, I am extremely concerned and disappointed about the proposed development at 1733/1735/1737 Fairfield Rd.

Council has many tools at its disposal to improve the availability of affordable housing and I do not accept that this developer or the proposed additional development achieves your objective or the desires of this community or neighborhood. The neighborhood, with much disappointment accepted the Rhodo development and it is my belief that we have yet to see the full impact of that development given it is not yet complete and is not currently occupied. Immediately approving another development essentially across the street does not provide Council or the community the time and space to fully understand the impact of the development in a way that allows it to inform future approvals for the development of the Fairfield corridor. If we are interested in evidence-based decision making, which I certainly am, we need to ensure that we have the evidence through data and information gathering on the existing project, once fully occupied, for a period of a year or two before any of us can formulate concrete conclusions, positive or negative.

My questions for you related to the Rhodo development are:

1. What is the socio-economic profile of the owners for each of the units?
2. What was the average sale price of each unit?
3. How has this data and information been used to inform future development considerations?
4. Has this development achieved your strategic plan objectives and if so how, in concrete terms informed by evidence?
5. What community amenities has the development contributed as part of the development that are a positive impact on the local community and specifically the neighborhood?
6. What is the developer's profit margin on this development?

I have been paying attention to the housing availability and affordable issues in the City. I have read with interest some of the information released related to the "missing middle" as the City references. For context, we have 5 school age children and understand that the chance of them owning their own single-family dwelling is highly unlikely given current market conditions and escalation. We are not opposed to development or options, what we do expect is that each project considered has an impact that respects the local community or neighborhood and results in the achievement of shared goals, values and objectives. It is unclear to me if the 'missing middle' is a desire to have housing options that are in the "middle" of the current housing prices in Victoria or is a desire to have options that are affordable to middle income individuals and families. If the former, this development does nothing to improve accessibility to housing given that the average price is likely around \$1 million, if the latter this development will not achieve the objective as median income in Victoria was \$64,600 in 2018 (<https://www.capitaldaily.ca/news/income-inequality-victoria-one-percent-canada>) Yes, that's 4 years ago but it also doesn't reflect the impact of the pandemic and I suspect it hasn't moved materially higher for 2022. Even for two income households, I ask how this development will provide affordable options – unless of course you as Council willing to use the tools at your disposal to place a maximum sale price on each unit aligned with your definition of "missing middle". Is Council willing to, by way of by-laws, title charges, or other tools at its disposal place conditions on the developer and the

development to achieve its “missing middle” objectives? If not, I suggest this development is not aligned with your own strategic plan or the principles and objectives which are espoused within it.

I have reviewed Council’s strategic plan and the goals and suspect that there is a desire for developments to meet a variety of your strategic objectives and am requesting that you provide an evaluation of this new proposal’s alignment with your strategic objectives and how its development will advance them.

**Objective 1: Good Governance and Civic Engagement**

Your objective	My Response
There is clear, open and transparent two-way communication between the City and the public, with the ability for public input to effect change.	I am providing input and am not feeling like my or the neighborhoods input is being used to effect change
There is broad engagement with a diversity of participants conducted in a respectful and inclusive way	Seems like standard engagement on rezoning – put up signs, ask for community input and ignore so the developer can do what they want.
The community feels heard	Not this community, what are you going to do about it?
The City demonstrates regional leadership in transparency and open government initiatives	Well signs are up on the properties in question, not sure
There are clear, relevant measurable outcomes for each objective that Council measures and reports on	Where? I do not see evidence of this for this process or project.

**Objective 2: Reconciliation and Indigenous Relations**

Your objective	My Response
Deeper and more engagement with Songhees and Esquimalt Nations including with both hereditary and elected chiefs	Have they been engaged on this project or redevelopment of the Fairfield corridor writ large?
Increased awareness of and support for reconciliation and recognition of Indigenous sovereignty	How has this been achieved on this project?
City Council, staff and residents are more aware of Indigenous history, treaties, and leadership structures	Has the project understood the ancestral use of this land. Is there required interpretation and signage?
Increased community collaboration and capacity to do the work of reconciliation by harnessing existing expertise in our community	N/A
More Indigenous involvement and inclusion in all aspects of civic life, including economic development	Are they receiving economic development opportunities from redevelopment?

Talent acquisition programs and initiatives are in place that support the diversification of the City's workforce, including programs and initiatives that focus on Indigenous Peoples	Are developers required to contribute back to support this work through required contributions, endowed positions or other initiatives?
--	---

### Objective 3: Affordable Housing

Your objective	My Response
Decrease in number of people spending more than 30 per cent of income on housing	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Decrease in homelessness (Point-In-Time Count numbers go down)	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase the number of 'Missing Middle' housing units	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective? See earlier question on what the definition of 'missing middle' is
Increase number of co-op housing units	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in rental apartment and housing vacancy rate	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in percentage of Victoria residents who own their own homes	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective? Are the propose units only for sale or will they be rentable?
Victoria is seen as development friendly	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Neighbourhoods are diverse, accessible and affordable across all ages, incomes and abilities	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?

### Objective 4: Economic Inclusion

Your objective	My Response
Business owners feel that it's easy and rewarding to work with City Hall	N/A
Neighbourhood and village centres have thriving economies	Fairfield is already thriving, should this development be considered elsewhere in the city to achieve this objective for a neighborhood?
Low vacancy rate in downtown retail spaces is maintained	N/A
Employers can find enough qualified workers to fill available jobs	N/A
People who work in Victoria can afford to live in Victoria	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in number of businesses actively engaged in reducing GHGs (See Objective #6)	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in number of urban-agriculture related businesses	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Reduced use of food banks	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?

#### Objective 5: Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City

Your objective	My Response
Increase sense of belonging and participation in civic life among all demographic groups	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in number of people who feel safe and part of the community	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in number of people who have a family doctor and overall increase in the number of people working in the health and well-being professions	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in availability of free recreation options	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in people accessing nature	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in number of people who are more active, including increase in registrations in the City's recreational programs	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Clear improvement on mental health and addictions	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?



Increased local food security	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Fewer people are living below the poverty line and more people have access to a living wage	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in cultural literacy, deepening understanding and welcoming of diversity	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?

**Objective 6: Climate Leadership and Environmental Stewardship**

Your objective	My Response
The City is making measurable advances reducing community GHG emissions by 50 per cent from 2007 levels by 2030, and cutting the City of Victoria’s corporate emissions by 60 per cent by 2030	Are you setting targets for developers?
Citizens and businesses are empowered and inspired to take meaningful action to reduce carbon pollution	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Citizens and businesses are making measurable advances in community and business GHG reductions and a tangible movement to 100 per cent renewables to meet or exceed climate targets	Are you requiring developers to use energy efficiency targets with energy modelling and required sequestration strategies including embodied carbon targets, mass timber use and passive house envelopes?
There is a Zero Waste Strategy in place and we are making progress towards goals	Are you requiring developers to use deconstruction techniques and setting recycled building content use requirements?
There are optimized local compost solutions in place for both food and garden waste	N/A
Increase in tree canopy on public and private property	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?

## Objective 7: Sustainable Transportation

Your objective	My Response
Increase in residents using public transit, walking and cycling	Then why is a large parking surface part of the project consideration and rezoning request?
Decrease in number of collisions and fatalities on City streets	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective? Suggest that it will increase traffic on Fairfield with correlation to collision increase.
Decrease in transportation-related GHG emissions	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective? How will you know?
Fewer cars on the road and decrease in vehicle kilometres travelled	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective? How will you know?
Increase in car sharing	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Decrease in annual household spending on transportation	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in public and private EV charging stations	Will this be required as part of the development. Will the Fairfield corridor get increased and improved EV charging options?
New transportation services are available, including rapid transit, to and from Victoria, supported by first-mile and last-mile solutions, mobility-as-a service (MaaS) and a single payment platform	Are you going to request/require an increase in bus service as part of the proposed development?
There is a positive shift in public attitude towards sustainable transportation	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
There is a direct link between City transportation investments, policies, and services and the City's Climate Leadership goals	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Victoria is recognized as a global leader in multi-modal transportation	Well – its close to Richardson I guess.

**Objective 8: Strong, Liveable Neighbourhoods**

<b>Your objective</b>	<b>My Response</b>
Increase in number of opportunities for engagement with neighbourhoods	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
People feel listened to and consulted about what makes a neighbourhood distinctive	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in affordable housing in all neighbourhoods (See Objective #3)	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increased access to social determinants of health in all neighbourhoods	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
People feel that their neighbourhood is safe and walkable	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase number of people walking compared to other modes of getting around within neighbourhoods	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
Increase in the amount of green space in neighbourhoods	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?
All neighbourhoods are thriving, distinctive, appealing, viable and have amenities	Will this development achieve or help achieve the objective?

>>>>>>>

If this development is not

this is truly about providing affordable housing in a way that requires densification and multi-story and multi-unit developments, I would suggest that the Rhodo development is then evidence that the rationale for these developments is a false narrative and only used to prompt the interest of the developer and increase their profits.

Brian Jonker

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: June 11, 2022 9:08 AM  
To: Patrick Carroll <pcarroll@victoria.ca>  
Cc: Aryze Engagement <[REDACTED]>; Cathy Ray <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 1733-1737 Fairfield Road

Good morning,

I am sitting at my kitchen table at 1745 Fairfield Road on a Saturday morning. We live next door to the proposed 4-story development from 1733-1737 Fairfield Road.

First off, the early engagement representative from Aryze, Julian has been friendly. I even met with Chris, the lead designer(?) the other day and he was pleasant.

The fact is, if approved, a 4-story building will go where a single family dwelling once was. I am not adverse to higher density, but a four story building is out of scale for this neighborhood. Row houses? Duplexes?

The building will block much of our south facing sun based on Aryze's own projections. We choose this neighborhood for a reason in 2012. We choose this house for a reason and have adapted it since then for increased mobility to support my Multiple Sclerosis (MS).

What is being proposed does not fit. I understand economics, but the building needs to be scaled down. If it is not economical, then maybe this is the wrong place.

Please forward this to where it needs to go.

Rahul Ray  
1745 Fairfield Road

**From:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**To:** [Katie Lauriston](#); [Ayla Conklin](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 1733-1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** June 15, 2022 4:36:53 PM

---

Good day Katie/Ayla,

Please add this correspondence to this rezoning file to be attached to the COTW folder. I do note it is only addressed to me but says " Please forward this to where it needs to go." I can hold on this and have the resident confirm they mean forward to council.

Thanks!  
Patrick

-----Original Message-----

From: rahulray [REDACTED]  
Sent: June 11, 2022 9:08 AM  
To: Patrick Carroll <[pcarroll@victoria.ca](mailto:pcarroll@victoria.ca)>  
Cc: Aryze Engagement <[community@aryze.ca](mailto:community@aryze.ca)>; Cathy Ray [REDACTED]  
Subject: 1733-1737 Fairfield Road

Good morning,

I am sitting at my kitchen table at 1745 Fairfield Road on a Saturday morning. We live next door to the proposed 4-story development from 1733-1737 Fairfield Road.

First off, the early engagement representative from Aryze, Julian has been friendly. I even met with Chris, the lead designer(?) the other day and he was pleasant.

The fact is, if approved, a 4-story building will go where a single family dwelling once was. I am not adverse to higher density, but a four story building is out of scale for this neighborhood. Row houses? Duplexes?

The building will block much of our south facing sun based on Aryze's own projections. We choose this neighborhood for a reason in 2012. We choose this house for a reason and have adapted it since then for increased mobility to support my Multiple Sclerosis (MS).

What is being proposed does not fit. I understand economics, but the building needs to be scaled down. If it is not economical, then maybe this is the wrong place.

Please forward this to where it needs to go.

Rahul Ray  
1745 Fairfield Road

RE: Proposed development at 1733-1737 Fairfield Road  
Attachment: Level 4 Proposed Plan - Drawing A-104

Please note my objection to this proposed development, for the following reasons:

1. The density is too high - I must say that I consider the Density Rights Transfer from Abkhazi Gardens to be a scam, and maintain any reasonable person would, too.
2. There is no setback from Fairfield Road. Why not dig a hole and put the parking underground? Just go across the street and down the block to the "Rhodo" to see what "too close to the road" looks like.
3. The layout of the gerrymandered 3-bedroom unit on Level 4 is bizarre, to say the least. Just follow the dots from the elevator to the master bedroom (image attached), and you will be well on the way to completing your steps for the day. On the plus side, it's not everyday that an apartment layout will support the installation of a standard-length bowling alley (60 feet) in the northwest corridor ...

Thanks for hearing me out.

John Kell  
204 Memorial Crescent  
Victoria, BC

I respectfully request Victoria City Council reject the revised proposal to develop 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road. The revisions do not effectively address the main issues that were brought to the attention of the developer.

The height, mass and density far exceed what is reasonable in this area. The proposed density transfer provides no benefit to the city and is highly disruptive to our neighborhood. The four story apartment building design is not compatible with principles of family-focussed attainable housing or green space enhancement.

I am supportive of densification efforts in Gonzales that provide quality housing for families. In Traditional Residential areas I would like to see ground-oriented dwellings that are limited to two and a half story houseplexes, duplexes and townhouses with landscaped outdoor activity space.

Thank you,  
Janice Linton  
356 Robertson Street

I fully support the proposed developments at 1733/1735/1737 Fairfield Rd plus 1964 Fairfield/507 Foul Bay. I live at Rhodo, 1720 Fairfield Rd, in unit 104.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice my support for these much needed developments.

Kelly Galitzine



Mayor and Councillors,

I am a resident at 1689 Earle Street, and I was out of the country when the last public meeting was held to review a revised application by Aryze for a new development at 1733,1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road. I apologize for the lateness of this feedback, but I hope you will take it into your consideration of this proposal.

I participated in the process of reviewing the Aryze proposal for the Rhodo development, which is adjacent to Hollywood Park, and which is about 5 metres from one corner of my back yard.

I have to say that I am very disappointed and frustrated by this latest proposal by Aryze. It appears to me to closely resemble the Rhodo approach, where multiple “approvals” had been given by the City, prior to the wider review process open to the public. That included bypassing the formal guidance on setbacks on all four sides, height, density, and the removal of all but one tree from the two combined properties. In addition, City Council had approved a suggestion from the City only a few weeks prior to the submission, to apply a “transition” to any proposal for a new development immediately adjacent to a City park.

All of these exceptions, including ignoring the transition to the park, were approved by the City and by City Council. I saw no corresponding “give-and-take” from the developer. The result, which you can see today, is a cramped series of buildings, hard up against all boundaries, including the park, adding nothing to the Fairfield Road streetscape, and setting a bad example for future development.

I am again very disappointed and frustrated by this latest proposal by Aryze, which seems again to be getting approval for any and all requested exceptions to the formal guidance in place. The three storey Rhodo building height is now superseded by a four storey monster, which would dominate and overwhelm adjacent properties. Again, setbacks on all sides are minute, which would overwhelm the surrounding residences, trees will disappear, and parking will be aggravated even further than it is today.

Of particular concern is the convoluted undertaking by Aryze to “buy” increased density from another property, thereby increasing their original proposal for 19 units to 31 units, by way of adding a fourth floor to the building.

I understand and support increasing population density in the City of Victoria, but I strongly feel that support and guidance from the community has been overwhelmed by commercial developers.

Mayor and Councillors, I urge you to establish a balance between these two entities, thereby allowing density increases to be accompanied by minimizing negative impacts on our neighbourhoods, and ensuring the development of a vibrant environment which residents can enjoy and be proud of. I did not vote for companies like Aryze to determine the future of my neighbourhood.

Thank you for your attention,

Graham Whitehead  
1689 Earle Street,  
Victoria, BC, V8S 1N4

From: andrea kober [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2023 7:57 PM  
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
Subject: Re: 1733-37 Fairfield Rd

Hello,

I am writing about the above potential townhouse development, that will no doubt go through and construction will begin next spring/summer.

My concern is about parking. I live half a block away, in a rental townhouse, and the only parking I am able to access is street parking. We dont have driveways. When I moved here there was no problem with parking. There were enough spaces for the residents, their guests and even people who parked here because they were using Hollywood Park, up the street.

Since Rhodo was built last year, the parking has gotten out of hand. Often I come home and cannot find parking and end up circling till I find something further away. Those tenants in Rhodo are not supposed to park on our side of the street. They were given less parking spaces, with the hopes/intent that most people purchasing these townhomes would only have one car per family, or cycle everywhere. It is not the case. Most people have two cars. As I sit here, there are 10 cars from Rhode on the street, and I am sure their parking spots on the property are all filled up as well.

When 1733-37 will be built, there will be 20 odd parking spaces for 30 odd units. They will also be taking away around 6 street parking spaces near the vicinity. They claim there is enough parking for everyone. Well, they dont live here and experience what I do.

I am all for change. I am also a firm believer we need to use our cars less. I walk everywhere, and only use my car for work, when I have to carry heavy equipment to where I am going.

And at the same time I find this parking situation so frustrating. The developers dont really care, as most of them live in big homes with their own driveway and are oblivious to this situation.

If the new owners of these upcoming townhomes want to live there, they should be the ones committing to having only one car per unit, or have bicycles. If most come in with two cars, there will be no parking at all, and it will be a frustrating mess. This, will not make people give up their cars, btw. When Rhodo was built, I was told people know about the parking situation, and the people who will be attracted to living here will be cycles and people who care about the environment etc. Ha! Most of the second cars I see, are huge trucks and SUV's that are taking up 1.5 spaces.

I dont know if there is anything that can be done. I am venting, and I am also extremely frustrated. I am a senior, and doing my best. And I feel like I am going to be pushed out of my parking spot in no time.

Thanks for listening.  
Andrea

Dear Mayor and Council,

I continue to be amazed by the insatiable greed of Aryze Developments.

We have zoning for a reason. This council even changed the zoning of our neighbourhood (against the wishes of the people here) to make it easier for Aryze to make more money. And yet they keep coming for more concessions.

No more zoning "gifts" please. We all know each of the 31 proposed tiny units will be sold for over \$1M.

Thanks for your attention.

-----  
Michael Muret  
1987 Fairfield Road

Mayor and Council Members,

I read with trepidation about the “progress” of this proposal, which has now been increased by the developer from 3 stories to 4 stories.

This despite this developer’s lauding of Fairfield Road as all-three-storey buildings, back in the Rhodo fiasco.

Not content with taking the maximum number of variances for the three-storey plan, this developer has manipulated a switch of zoning with the Abkhazi Gardens to add a FOURTH storey to the new development.

This process is out of control. It is being manipulated by the developer, and unfortunately with the support of the City. Like other local residents (I live within 100 yards of this proposal), I am angry and frustrated that this kind of manipulation is allowed by the City. I am NOT against densification. I am against densification at whatever the cost.

It appears that the employees of the City of Victoria who work in the area of redevelopment are now completely redundant: the rules mean nothing any more. The department may as well be disbanded.

Mayor and Councillors, I urge you to reflect on who it is that you represent: is it the citizens of Victoria, or a handful of wealthy property developers?

Your performance is being closely watched by the voters of this City.

Graham Whitehead  
1689 Earle Street  
Victoria

The amended proposal for the development at 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Road does not address the main issues and adds even more unwarranted density and provides less parking. I trust City Council will consider the impact to our neighbourhood; and in so doing so rejects the proposal.

Aryze is proposing a looming four-story apartment building that is over 20 feet higher than the surrounding houses and will become the highest structure in all of Gonzales. There are no front or rear setbacks, no useable ground level outdoor space and minimal landscaping. The building is highly disruptive to the neighbourhood because of its height and mass, density, layout, appearance, number of units, parking and impact on the neighbor's privacy.

Aryze has not demonstrated any added community amenities to merit the proposed density transfer nor does it provide a convincing case that the receiver site is suitable. The developer has simply bought density from a third party to maximize profit and usurp city planning bylaws well beyond what should be considered reasonable for the site.

The requested density is far beyond what the site and neighborhood can accommodate. OCP amendments will be needed to increase the height beyond the three stories maximum required in a Traditional Neighbourhood designation (Section 6.1.5 and Map 23) and Floor Space ratio (FSR) from 1.1 to 1.77, as well as front/back/side setback variances.

I believe densification efforts in Gonzales should provide quality housing options for families. Any new development needs to be compatible with neighbors, have respectful front and rear yard distances, usable rear yards, access to outdoor open green space, consistent massing, adequate underground parking and consistent character. In other words, all infill buildings in Traditional Residential areas of Gonzales should be ground-oriented dwellings that are limited to two and a half story houseplexes, duplexes and townhouses.

Kevin Warren

As a close neighbor to this site, I am writing to express my concern about the revised proposal to develop 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road. The revisions do not address the main issues that were brought to the attention of the developer. The height, mass and density far exceed what is reasonable in this neighbourhood. It will be highly disruptive, both to close neighbours and the wider community, who use nearby parks, shopping and schools.

The proposed density transfer appears to benefit the developer with little benefit to the city, and a significant detriment to the Gonzales neighborhood. The developer has not demonstrated that the receiver site can accommodate this level of density, which is far beyond current OCP guidance and will require amendments. The four story apartment-style building design with no front or rear setbacks, no usable ground level outdoor space and paved outdoor areas with minimal landscaping, is not aligned with principles of family-focussed attainable housing or green space enhancement.

I am supportive of densification efforts in Gonzales that provide quality housing for families, are compatible with the character of our neighborhood, respectful of neighbors, and protect our greenspace. In Traditional Residential areas I would like to see ground-oriented dwellings that are limited to two and a half story houseplexes, duplexes and townhouses.

I respectfully request Victoria City Council reject the revised proposal.

Janice Linton  
356 Robertson Street

Hello,

Abkhazi Gardens is such a treasure. I hope you can protect it from being developed.

Pam Verhagen