

At last Mr. Mari of Aryze is showing his true colours, abandoning any pretence of building affordable housing or husbanding the environment. Not content with cutting down 28 trees, he now proposes to eliminate the planned green roofs and to put concrete over an area that would have had a permeable gravel surface, thus completing the environmental despoliation of this site. And I see children will be deprived of a play area. I hope that Council will now take a principled stand on his proposal, something it declined to do in the first instance. It is not too late for the City of Victoria to purchase this land from the developer and turn it into a much-needed City park.

Finally, I implore all members of Council to read one of Douglas W. Tallamy's books. *The Nature of Oaks* would be a good start. And for good measure, read Robin Wall Kimmerer's *Braiding Sweetgrass*, if you haven't already.

Barbara Abercrombie
1657 Richardson St.

Dear Mayor & Council

I'm writing to ask council to reconsider the approval the proposed changes to the configuration of 901 Foul Bay.

When appealing to the council of the day, one the the main selling features of this project was the affordability component, which has now been removed, along with the amenities component.

I share a long border with this property, which makes the removal of the carport roof structure a concern to me. The residents cars will be parking along my back fence, which is close to my house. The roofs would have shielded us, to some extent, from both the noise and pollution.

Also, the the idea that 18 units will only own 14 vehicles is laughable...the streets are already clogged with parked cars, and this will just add to the problem.

This project needs to be revisited.

Regards,
Carole Davidson
1946 Hawes Rd
Victoria BC

Good day council & mayor,

It has come to my attention that the developer for 902 Foul Bay Road wishes to jettison all the affordability aspects of his original proposal. Some of the green aspects are no longer included (green roofs).

At this point the council must defend the central aspect of meaningful development to provide affordable housing wherever possible. To remove the 4 affordable units for whatever reason (interest rates have risen since March of this year) is to abandon the core reason this council was elected.

Apologies but the density approved for this project makes for a successful financial development. To ask for more reduction in public amenities is objectionable. The idea should be to provide good attractive housing rather than guaranteeing a healthy profit for the developer.

Respectfully and sincerely

Patrick Skillings
#402 - 2119 Oak Bay Ave
Victoria BC

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to express my concern about the changes that Aryze is requesting to its permit application to develop the property at 902 Foul Bay Road.

Some more eloquent than myself will have meticulously detailed the resistance to the changes Aryze is submitting. So, I will be brief in my opposition:

1) The rising cost of construction cannot price out affordable housing. This perpetuates the housing crisis. The Missing Middle will not be able to afford these homes. This is now all about a developer's profit. Everyone is feeling the pain of pricing across all sectors. This proposal was approved with caveats for affordability in place. You can't let goalposts continually be moved to satisfy the margins of private companies. The market will eventually stabilize - this is a financially tough moment in time. However, if you let these amendments pass, then you would have lost the affordability aspect forever.

2) Those beautiful, mature and irreplaceable-in-our-lifetime trees are going to be chopped down to make way for rich folks getting richer. I wish that environmentally sensitive development wasn't an oxymoron when it comes to Victoria. It's abhorrent that we are in a climate crisis and trees are not being protected. As elected officials, we citizens rely on your stewardship of this special fauna and flora. Please think about the natural habitats for those who don't have a voice and for generations beyond yourselves.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Bronwen Sharpe
1523 Regents Place, Victoria BC.

November 15, 2023

To Mayor and Council,

Our city needs housing, affordable housing.

Aryse has made an application to drop the affordable units from this proposed development. I understand that when a developer builds an apartment downtown they are required to provide affordable housing. Given the size of this development and the city's need, Aryse should be required to continue to provide these affordable units.

I gather the bike shed and other green aspects of the development are also being dropped. I was given to understand that the bike area was to support use of bikes - linked to the Richardson Street bike corridor and reduce the need for cars.

If you drive down the 900 block of Redfern Street you will see that it is already lined with cars. This is because our street provides additional housing beyond the single family dwelling designation: 3 garden homes, several secondary suites / co- living , and a group home for persons with abilities (staff cars) and a new house on a panhandle lot.

Aryse is not providing adequate parking for this site. If this development (small apartment 5+ units by definition) is built, the new occupants' cars will choke the surrounding streets intersections, and I fear, render them impassable for fire trucks and other wide emergency vehicles. We should not forget that the original home on this site burned to the ground. Why are we allowing Redfern Street to become congested to the point that our safety is compromised while reducing promised supports for cycling?

Lastly, I had the opportunity to watch Aryse's representative present to the mayor and council. His body language was respectful, he was polite and a good listener. I was surprised by this given the way he and Aryse have communicated with my neighbours concerning the course this development - awfulizing our community in social media saying we live in a e.g. "gated community" - I suppose inferring we are keeping people out **despite** the numerous rentals on our street. Aryse also wrote a letter concerning their need to remove the covenant, pointing out that any legal opposition could be met with legal opposition and efforts to assign associated legal costs. We were shocked and taken aback by this letter. Why would they not offer mediation or information sessions? Most felt bullied and too intimidated to respond.

In my experience people who behave this way only respond to power. I ask the mayor and council to use your power, see through the polite presentation, and to keep this developer accountable to provide affordable homes, promote cycling and uncompromised street accessibility to safety vehicles.

Respectfully,

Drew Smith

989 Redfern Street
Victoria, BC

My understanding is that council will hear an amendment to the Development Permit Application from Aryze for 902 Foul Bay Road tomorrow, November 16th.

I strongly oppose this amendment, which I understand will remove all affordability components for the project and not be required to provide any amenities. Recall, that In a December 07, 2020 the developer, Aryze represented a development permit application for 902 Foul Bay as an **"Affordable Home Ownership Project"** (AHOP) under BC Housing, where the average cost per unit was to be \$720,000 with a 5% downpayment. Aryze used this representation to gain support from the surrounding local community and city staff.

Subsequently, in a June 2021 letter to council Aryze amended their application stating that it was abandoning the AHOP BC Housing element include four home to fall under the Capital Regional District's price restrictive resale program whereby the homes are sold between 15% - 25% below market in perpetuity. After a lengthy public hearing, the previous council approved this application largely because of the affordability component.

In his current letter to Council, Mr. Mari of Aryze is stating that because of interest rate hikes and increased costs of construction the already approved development is no longer as economically viable if it includes affordable units and a requirement to provide amenities to the City. When council approved the project in September 2022, mortgage rates had already risen from 2.95 % to 5.45% and construction costs had already risen sharply. I see this as a means to increase their profit margin, now that the Public Consultation is over. It is not up to council or the citizens of Victoria to help this developer or any other developer for that matter to amend approved development proposals because the economic conditions have changed according to them. As stated, interest rates and construction costs increase where already know by them at the time the proposal was approved. Let alone the impact of abandoning their stated commitment to providing a percentage of their development to affordable housing. If they feel it is not longer economically viable, then they can simply abandon the project. I spent 40 years in the information Systems field and as you can imagine multi-million dollar projects would have a very long timeline before it may or may not be approved by the client. Economic conditions are constantly evolving and it is up to the organization to factor this into their proposals at the time of submission.

This council should not allow this developer/applicant to circumvent the lawful process by amending its application post approval, without any further public input, to remove all of the very aspects they employed to persuade council to approve it.

Further, I would like to submit that going forward when any Development Proposal has been approved by Council and the Developer in question subsequently submits an amendment as in this example, that Public Consultation is reopened before any subsequent amendment is even considered for approval.

Regards,

David Thomas
362 Foul Bay Road, Victoria V8S 4G8

Dear Mayor and Counsellors,

I read with dismay that, yet again, the developer of the proposed rebuilding at 902 Foul Bay Road is asking for yet more amendments to his original proposal. These amendments are not minor in nature. I find this most disturbing – it appears the developer is not satisfied with making extensive use of the development process to maximise his profits, but is now proposing to change the entire fundamentals of the project.

This proposal was “sold” on the basis of affordability. His request is now to remove all aspects of affordability to ensure he can make a profit.

Furthermore, he wants to bypass any and all public feedback to this request. This, from a proposal which gathered a great deal of public feedback and debate the first time through.

Factors such as the proposal to decrease the number of parking spaces by almost 50%, in an area already suffering from parking problems even before adding all the proposed new residences to the area, is most troubling.

I strongly recommend Mayor and Council against allowing this request, which is a kick in the teeth not just for local residents, but for all citizens of the City of Victoria. The project approval was originally granted because of its affordability components. Removal of those would not only establish a deep mistrust of the City by its residents in conducting its duties but would also call into question the entire affordability approach that was established.

The message would be that the City is not capable of handling the process it has recently committed to.

Graham Whitehead
1689 Earle Street
Victoria, V8S 1N4

I am disappointed, but not surprised that Aryze has done another “pivot” on the 902 Foul Bay project. My hope is that council will see through this latest maneuver and that you will not allow him to “pivot” from the commitment that was made to this neighbourhood and the city.

Based on a proven track record, neighbours had concerns that the 902 Foul Bay project would not end up as promised. Another Aryze project, Rhodo, was held out as being a development that would be “attainable for young families.” After a significant amount of back and forth with the city (including Aryze promising a >\$100,000 contribution to the Victoria Affordable Housing Fund, and then taking it back), Aryze arrived at the final proposal.

- In 2020, Rhodo units were priced at an average of \$929,000 + GST (if you remove the two tiny “affordable” units). According to the Victoria Real Estate Board, the benchmark price for a townhouse in Victoria proper in December 2020 was \$704,000.
- The highest-priced unit was priced at \$1.5 Million.
- The two promised “affordable” units were priced at \$790/square foot). Affordable? - No. Just smaller.
- “NIMBYs” were blamed for the high pricing.

902 Foul Bay Timeline

- Between July 2018 and fall 2019, the developer had preliminary conversations with BC Housing (AHOP-Affordable Home Ownership Program) about an “affordable” townhouse project; however, he did **not** provide the requested (necessary) material to AHOP, and he did **not** pursue the idea beyond the initial conversations.
- In 2020, the developer **did** begin promoting the development as an AHOP project, spoke with media, had CALUC meetings, and applied to the city for **extra density based on the need to make the development 100% AHOP (affordable).**
- In articles and social media, the developer made several claims about the project including there would be no down payment required, units would sell at a discounted price, and when participants sold the unit, they would only pay AHOP 10% of the selling price (Black Press - June 2020).
- During the CALUC meetings, Mr. Mari was questioned repeatedly on pricing. He was adamant that the units would sell for \$725,000 with a 5% downpayment. The 5% downpayment was always required under the program, but Mr. had been providing incorrect information to the public that there was no down payment required (this meeting was recorded).

▪ In June 2021, the developer informed the city that he would need to “pivot” from an “affordable” proposal to an “attainable” one (we suspected this would happen). Instead, the developer promised *four units that would fall under the CRD’s restrictive resale program whereby the homes are sold between 15% - 25% below market in perpetuity. The developer cited the following reasons for the “pivot”:*

▪ **“Lack of direction from AHOP” (*the developer did not pursue the plan beyond some preliminary conversations in 2019- this has been confirmed with AHOP*).**

▪ The 2020 election (***no conceivable impact on the project whatsoever***).

▪ The length of approval times (***likely reasons for delays include misinformation being provided at the CALUC, staff having to request changes repeatedly, the developer’s acrimonious litigation with neighbours to remove a restrictive covenant***).

▪ Offsite improvements (***there were little to none***).

▪ Now we have arrived at “the need to abandon the requirement to provide any affordability and to not provide any amenities to the city, such as sidewalks nor contribute to the affordable housing fund.”

▪ Mr. Mari states that interest rate hikes and increased costs of construction the already approved development is no longer as economically viable (**when council approved the project in September 2022, mortgage rates had already risen from 2.95 % to 5.45% and construction costs had already risen**)

Mr. Mari created animosity and pitted neighbours against each other with his claims that those who were opposed to the Aryze 902 Foul Bay project were NIMBYs and “against affordable housing.” The truth is, as stated previously, many of us were certain that what was being promised would not materialize. Mr. Mari has been very influential in the Missing Middle process, and it seems likely that he knew that the latest amendments to Missing Middle requirements were coming. If not, he has the most impeccable timing.

I would like to ask that you not allow him to change the project at this point; however, I feel it’s a foregone conclusion that you will.

Lynn Phillips

Please, pay attention to this case of throwing away all community values and going boldly for the profit alone. First the number of trees to be taken out was way too many originally, so that climate change will increase very much. The trees there had protected the site and people from the 2021 heat dome. This development was passed because he had promised features of community values and housing. Now those are all gone.

I ask that you do not reward totally traitor actions. Can you see how development features promised need to be kept? What's the point of approving needs for the city, if they are not kept? We all know that developers want profit; however, this outrageous action ultimately means such confusion that the lack of workers for the industries will grow greater and the city may end limping along without prosperity.

Mary Doody Jones

Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my concern about Aryze's proposed changes for 902 Foul Bay. Over the past several years there was tremendous community opposition to this project regarding the loss of 18 bylaw-protected trees, inadequate on-site parking, the height of structures, loss of light and of privacy, etc. not to mention the burning down of the registered heritage home which stood there for 100 years. Victoria council's approval of this project was buoyed by the developer's claims of providing 4 affordable units (two 1-bedroom units and two 3-bedroom units), bike storage, green roofs, and improvements to surrounding City property and infrastructure, including sidewalks where none currently exist. Now at the '11th hour' Aryze is requesting exemption from some of those commitments.

"We propose that the playground area becomes more of a quiet relaxing space with some seating rather than programmed play structures."

I wonder how the 902 residents are going to police the "quiet" when the children of 18 families have such a limited access to outdoor space and the nearest park is 5 blocks away.

"We also propose that the green roofs are removed from above the two 1-bedroom homes in the western block of the project. . . . Considering the site as a whole, we consider that the permeable pavers and the reduction of concrete (see below) will perform as well as the previous design with respect to stormwater management and reduced heat island effect".

The developer's previous submissions employed the promise of a green roof to offset the loss of so many mature trees. It was the only aspect of the plan that I found interesting, from a landscaping perspective—I have a certificate in landscape design. The green roof would also have provided some visual respite for neighbours to the north on Hawes Crescent. The rest of the landscape plan with small shrubs and forbs in the peripheral pathway, is in my opinion too ambitious for a site with 18 families and their pets.

Aryze has also abandoned the Affordable Home Ownership Plan which had garnered much support from City Council and potential buyers. AHOP qualification had been the developer's claim for needing extra density. Rising costs of materials, labour, etc. will likely tip the costs of units over a million dollars, from the previous cited \$900,000/unit. It bears reminding council that the former 'affordable' claim, may still be lingering in your minds as a favourable aspect. It is no longer is affordable. Consider also the effect of rising interest rates (doubled in the past year) on the ability of families to qualify for mortgages on such expensive townhouses.

I implore Council to reject Aryze's request. This is a market-priced development site, like all others—not "affordable housing". The City should assert all improvements and amenities, such as sidewalks, as originally proposed, or preferably reject the project entirely.

Thank you for listening,

Monique Genton
1947 Brighton Ave
Victoria BC

I wish to object to Aryze's attempt to renege on the affordability and amenity components of its approved building project at 902 Foul Bay Road. This was always an instance of overbuilding on a small site with the destruction of many protected trees; now the new version even does away with promised green roofs. Aryze should be held to the requirements of the original approved proposal. If they do not find it worth their while to build then let them walk away. Once again it's apparent that private developers do not have the interests of the community at heart. We will never achieve affordable housing if we have to provide for profit to developers.

Martin Lovelace
1903 Brighton Avenue
Victoria

Honourable Mayor & Council:

The following video was made as a submission to the last Council for the public hearing for the development project.

I thought it would provide some helpful background information for consideration of the application to amend the development proposal.

Thank you

Peter J. Nadler



[902 Foul Bay Background For COTW](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=902FoulBayBackgroundForCOTW)
[youtube.com](https://www.youtube.com)

Peter J. Nadler

**1947 Brighton Ave., Victoria BC Canada,
V8S 2E1**

Hello there,

As a neighbour of the pending development at 902 Foul Bay Road, I was disappointed, though not entirely surprised that the approved application was amended recently. I understand it goes before council on Nov 16h, and I do hope that the City of Victoria keeps the principles in mind that were the basis for their original approval of this long sought after project.

For the record, I am not opposed to the development, but I, like many others, voiced my concerns based on what was proposed, and supported the outcome - we need more housing.

I work in the development and facilities world, and I know that Aryze's bottom line is simply to turn the biggest profit possible - they've burned through a massive amount of resources based on the time to get this to approval stage and I really hope that the City does not relax the affordability and community amenities (parking, etc) in order to appease the pressure they are feeling - this is a generational project that will impact my street (Redfern St) for the lifetime of me living here - I would like it done with utmost integrity and consideration for all stakeholder- not just ones out to make huge economic returns.

Please feel free to contact me with any additional comments or questions. I am always open to learn more about the development process (as I am NOT a developer!)

Regards,

Darren Douglas
981 Redfern Street

Hi there

I have heard that the development at 902 Foul Bay is not adhering to the development proposal that was approved and is no longer providing affordable housing units as agreed upon.

It is upsetting to hear that this developer is allowed to amend and change the agreed upon development plan. There has been a lot of public input into the development and it appears that all of the concerns raised are now being ignored. The proposed changes do impact this neighbourhood, and set a precedent for future developments.

I appreciate the need for more housing, and for "affordable" housing. I support the missing middle concept and gentle densification. The development at 902 Foul Bay is not "gentle densification" in keeping with the neighbourhood, and it is not "affordable" housing.

Please review and reject the proposed amendments to the 902 Foul Bay development.

Thank you

Daphne Wass

954 Bank Street

Honourable Mayor and Councillors:

Re: 902 Foul Bay Amended Development Permit Application

In a December 07, 2020 development permit application for 902 Foul Bay the developer, Aryze represented a as an "**Affordable Home Ownership Project**" (AHOP) under BC Housing, where the average cost per unit was to be \$720,000 with a 5% downpayment. Aryze used this representation to gain support from the surrounding local community and city staff.

Subsequently, in a June 2021 letter to council Aryze amended their application stating that it was abandoning the AHOP BC Housing element. It stated:

"..... we are pivoting the project to include four homes (22%) to fall under the Capital Regional District's price restrictive resale program whereby the homes are sold between 15% - 25% below market in perpetuity."

and

"The two 1-bedroom units will sell for \$360,000 and the two 3-bedroom units for \$640,000."

Mr. Mari of Aryze used the "**affordability**" component to rally public support and to negatively characterize critics (with the assistance of members of Homes For Living, a lobby group he helped create) as those who are opposed to "affordable housing."

After a lengthy public hearing the previous council approved this application largely **because of the affordability** component.

On September 28, 2023 the developer filed notice that it intended to amend its application.

The amendments include.

- To **abandon** the requirement to provide any **affordable units** (by cancelling the restrictive covenant that would have secured the affordability aspect in perpetuity)
- To not provide any amenities to the city, such as sidewalks nor contribute to the affordable housing fund.

Apparently Aryze advised potential buyers, that it now estimates the sale prices of the units to be approximately \$1,000 to \$1,1000 per square foot. Most of the 18 units are three bedrooms and the average unit is 1,150 square feet. Therefore the projected cost to purchasers will exceed \$1million dollars plus applicable taxes. That is a far cry from the \$ 720,000 Aryze initially promised when the development was a BC Housing AHOP and the \$640,000 "below market affordable units" that the City council had approved.

In his current letter to Council, Mr. Mari is stating that because of interest rate hikes and increased costs of construction the already approved development is no longer as economically viable if it includes affordable units and a requirement to provide amenities to the City. When

council approved the project in September 2022, mortgage rates had already risen from 2.95 % to 5.45% and construction costs had already risen sharply.

Furthermore, Aryze states that Missing Middle projects now have less of a burden. Mr. Mari of Aryze was on the advisory panel for the creation of Missing Middle Housing Initiative. He knew the criteria and could have altered the development proposal to fit within these guidelines. Now Aryze appears to want the best of both worlds: to retroactively benefit from a change in the development rules without meeting the new requirements. The citizens of Victoria no longer have any input, as the public hearing process was completed.

This council ought not allow this developer/applicant to circumvent the lawful process by amending its application post approval, without any further public input, to remove all of the very aspects they employed to persuade council to approve it. We are in a housing affordability crisis and the majority of this council were elected on a platform of providing affordable housing. Please do not permit the applicant to abandon the affordability component and requirement to provide amenities to the neighbourhood, which would make a mockery of the development process. Send a message to the developers that they need to have respect for lawful procedure.

Respectfully

Peter J. Nadler

I am aware that Aryze Developments is seeking amendments to its approved development permit that would enable them to abandon their commitments to provide affordable housing and community amenities on their 902 Foul Bay project. This was a very contentious development approval process and was only finally approved by council due to the affordability and other commitments. To enable this developer to walk away from its commitments to community and affordability is to make a mockery of the democratic process. If this proceeds as proposed by this shameless developer shame on council. If the developer cannot proceed as already agreed let them walk away. Enough bowing to developers self interest.

Shawn and April Robins
330 Robertson Street

RE: RE 902 FOUL BAY AMENDED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

MAYOR AND ALL COUNCILLORS,

Aryze has made major changes to their previous application for development at 902 Foul Bay Rd.. That application went to public hearing before it was assessed by council and approved on the facts supplied. I stress the changes that the reductions/"amendments" Aryze are now requesting are major, not merely cosmetic, although even their 'cosmetic' undertaking has been withdrawn. The major undertakings that they are looking to dispense with conflict with both the ethics and rational that were the underpinnings of their previous application – no 4 houses at preferential prices to be "15 to 20" percent below market to help lower income applicants , no 'affordable' housing programme, the new pricing programme seems to be more than 30% higher than that on the extant application that posited the price at about \$700,00 and no contribution to the city expenses such as sidewalks etc. that were in the submitted application. Almost all of the extra costs being used as an excuse by Aryze for their "amendment" were known to them or could have been anticipated when the application was approved.

I urge the council to exercise good governance and public fairness and reject these substantive "amendments" requested by Aryze.

**Respectfully yours,
Adrian Science**

November 15th, 2023.

Dear Mayor and Council,

Amend an agreement

The major commercial supporter of the Missing Middle Housing Initiative is now using the provisions of the MMHI and market conditions to seek an amendment on the development that Aryze was awarded to develop 902 Foul Bay Road.

Reasons for Amendment: Costs

In the City's Executive Summary, Aryze seeks to eliminate at least two provisions that were crucial to the accepted development and stand out for me.

- 1) eliminate affordable units, and
- 2) eliminate any community amenities.

MMHI is a tool to eliminate affordable housing

Is it not ironic that the MMHI is now being used as a tool to eliminate affordable housing?

Financial Reasons provided by Independent Financial Auditor

We won't know any facts about the market conditions and how they affect Aryze. We have only their request. To properly decide this 'trust issue' the City should hire an independent financial auditor, to be paid for by Aryze Development, to determine the costs, gross income and profit to Aryze based on the two scenarios in question: at the time the agreement was sought and reached; and under the current market conditions with the increased costs of labour, materials, and finances.

Mulligan

When a golfer gets a mulligan, a second shot without counting it, he is supported by the other players. Aryze Developments wants a mulligan - a second chance to do it over again, without concern about the first one. The City is being asked to subsidize Aryze.

City Staff's Reason to recommend acceptance of the Amendment

Fear by the City Staff that the proposal may not be built. This is clearly stated in Option 2 on page 4: "Council may choose to not support the request to remove the housing agreement and covenant which could result in all 18 units proposed not being constructed." In short, the City bases their approval on fear of the market. This is an acknowledgement of weakness, a losing hand in any negotiation.

The City's Position is at a dangerous crossroads

If the City agrees to this amendment, how many others will seek this remedy over time, without hard reasons, because of market volatility, unforeseen costs or simply because they believe that they hold the

upper hand? An independent financial auditor is one path to stem the tide of frivolous requests. Another suggestion is to trust the market. Land has more value than the City places on it. All developers seek land that is undervalued and then, change its purpose through zoning change to create wealth.

Are Affordable Housing and Community Amenities a worthwhile goal in Development

The market place has many solutions for this request. Arzye can sell the property. It can allow the development proposal to lapse. It can come up with an entirely new proposal and go through the entire process again. But, they should also know that affordable housing is important to the City of Victoria, and that no development will proceed without it. Then, and only then, will affordable housing be built.

If you don't want affordable housing, support Arzye's request for this amendment.

The other developers will get the message. Secondly, if you make the decision to support the Amendment the MMHI continue to wither on the vine. The City has already backed down on including affordability in the MMHI, as all developers know. Lastly, by continuing to subsidize developers by eliminating their costs when proposals are initially made, or in this case, thereafter, the City is creating a moral hazard that will make it impossible to accomplish the City's stated goals of working towards affordability and marketplace diversity in housing.

Why is Arzye coming back to the City instead of relying on the market?

Your collective decision on this amendment will frame all Developers knowledge about the City's position when negotiating Land Use Decisions. Please make the right one.

Your sincerely,

Don Cal

1059 Pentrelew Place

Victoria BC

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

It has come to our attention that Aryze has made application to the City to amend their development application for 902 Foul Bay Road to, among other things, remove the “affordable units” and not provide the required amenities to the City.

You’ll recall that the public input on this project was extensive and many, many community members were opposed to it. In the end, it seemed that Council approved the project in large part because of the “remaining” 4 affordable units. We say “remaining” because of course the original application involved the AHOP under BC Housing, with supposedly all units being “affordable.”

I gather the developer is tying their application in part to the Missing Middle Initiative (another proposal with many, many community members opposed), which passed after the 902 Foul Bay Rd. proposal. We say “in part” because they wish to benefit from the new development rules that came along with the MMI but without having to meet the attendant requirements; e.g., to provide City amenities.

This council was elected in large part based on promises to provide affordable housing. **We strongly urge you to reject Aryze’s application to change the 902 Foul Bay Rd. development project.**

Regards,
Elizabeth Peddie and Dermot McCann
1923 Runnymede Avenue, Victoria