

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition to the INCREASE to 4 storey building proposed for 1733,1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** June 11, 2024 12:37:49 PM

---

Dear Patrick,

First of all, I would like to state upfront that we are not anti-development.

However it is becoming increasingly clear that there is no integrity in the Aryze development proposed for the properties at 1733,1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road. We, The Ray Family, are the immediate next door neighbours, residing at 1745 Fairfield Road and have recently received a notice of an amendment to the development set to be constructed next to us. The developer came to our house multiple times and told us, to our faces, that this project was to be no more than 3 stories. He came back when it crept up to 3.5 stories. It was, at that time, when I confronted this discrepancy, and at that point when I point blank asked him if this was going to 4 stories and he said no, to my face. When I said that this project didn't look at all like what was initially proposed, he said that was not true and unfair to say. Well, I would like to say to you now, that this project is not what was presented to us, not what we agreed to be on board with and agreed we would not protest against. I tell you today, that sadly with this letter that Aryze has not come to us again to tell of us this new change to their plans, our goodwill is now gone.

As I mentioned, we live next door and this new proposed 4 storey project will dwarf our home. It will take our light. It will be built right up to the sidewalk which will in turn block our sight lines to get out of our driveway - a dangerous proposition for a young family with 3 small kids and a parent in a wheelchair. We live on a busy main street, with access to bus routes and close proximity to many desirable amenities. This is, of course, the place where density should live, but it needs to be done in the right manner that fits with the neighbourhood. This is by no means the project we were sold the 5 times the company came to our house about. They came to make sure we were on board. They came to promise things that we can no longer believe will be upheld. My father was killed by a flat bed truck a year ago across the street from his home on a quiet street. We live on a main street and as mentioned we have 3 small kids and my husband in a wheelchair. I fear for not just the construction phase of this sizeable project. I fear that the recommendations to uphold our sight lines and noise mitigation that were recommended by the City of Victoria will be disregarded. I fear that the height of this building is just the start of the dishonesty. Again, this was to be a 2.5 -3 storey project, not 4.

So, with all that being said, we would like to firmly request and very much appreciate **that you not pass this amendment.** We have no illusions that this letter will stop the project and that is not our intent. What we would like is for the project to be what we were originally sold, **a 2.5 -3 storey property** with character and aesthetic fit for our neighbourhood. We implore you to uphold this, to hold developers to be accountable for their promises and their words. These are the things we teach our children, to be someone of your word. The City of Victoria needs to hold them to this on our behalf. The integrity of Aryze is gone for us. We had heard this about Aryze. They develop at all costs. They promise things and then discard those promises when building starts. This begs the question, why bother with all the community engagement, the home visits, the community representatives making sure we were on board if all along the goal was to do something different?

Thank you for your time.

With warmest regards,

Cathy Ray

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield resident of beechwood  
**Date:** June 10, 2024 7:13:18 PM

---

Patrick,

I am a resident on Beechwood avenue (267 beechwood avenue to be exact).

I am fairly pro- density in neighbourhoods as a whole, but have one concern that seems to be lacking as far as being paired with building homes in what have been single family dwelling neighbourhoods.

I have lived in many other neighbourhoods of Victoria and although I LOVE my current neighbourhood, I have NEVER lived in a neighbourhood that has so few amenities! If this neighbourhood is attempting to become an urban village, is the city doing anything to encourage mixed used buildings?

I currently have to go to grocery stores outside my neighbourhood to get BASICS because the only grocery store within a half hour walk is Thrifties and it is on a daily basis sold out of BASIC items like milk!

Other neighbourhoods are easily live, walk because they have a variety of stores small and mid size. There is not even a convenience store within a 25 min walk from the Hollywood corners!

I am not sure if this is the venue for bringing this up but the development on Fairfield mentioned I expect will be trying to house up to 70-90 people? If 29 units? Where will these people getting their basics from? On average houses on my street have 2 minimum cars and 3 is normal, with 5 not being unheard of because every person in a household has to drive to get out of the neighbourhood!

The bus route is close but at peak times it is often full (I had a roommate for 10 years who had to get a car to get to the college and then to downtown for work because most days the bus would pass by full). Services and amenities are severely lacking in this neighbourhood!

To reiterate- I am NOT opposed to density... just wondering how to get a better balance for residents + amenities in this neighbourhood.

Rebecca Lang  
Resident 267 Beechwood Avenue

Business owner: Any Thyme Gardening  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Rezoning proposal No. 00821 (1733-1737 Fairfield Road)  
**Date:** June 11, 2024 3:45:36 PM

---

Hi Patrick,

This is regarding rezoning proposal No. 00821 (1733-1737 Fairfield Road). I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed development aimed at densifying our neighborhood. While I understand the need for urban development and growth, I firmly believe that any such development should be undertaken with careful consideration for the existing community and its residents. The proposed densification project, as it stands, raises significant concerns that I urge you to consider before making any decisions. Overall, we've been supportive of densification in Fairfield to-date, however, we feel the community has limitations of how much more it can accept, particularly with the surrounding infrastructure and services. We are seeing impacts of recent projects and decisions by the city which has had negative impacts on our neighbourhood which I don't feel the city has fully considered. As residents who has lived in Fairfield for 10+ years, we cherish the urban character of our community. We believe that the proposed project and densification could have detrimental effects on both the aesthetic appeal and quality of life in our neighbourhood.

We live very close to the proposed development at 1785 Fairfield Road and bike and walk along Fairfield Road daily. In recent years we have seen other developments and densification in the neighbourhood have a detrimental impact. The proposed densification could exacerbate existing issues such as traffic, parking shortages and overcrowded public services. Our neighborhood is already struggling to accommodate the needs of its current residents and adding 29 more housing units in such a condensed area without adequate infrastructure upgrades would only exacerbate these problems. What is the city's plan to support the already overcrowded infrastructure and services in the neighbourhood?

We have seen considerable changes to the traffic density and safety of Fairfield Road because of the increased densification and redirecting of traffic from other roads in the area. I use Fairfield Road for my bike commute daily (Richardson is out of my way) and we are concerned that this development will further saturate the neighbourhood and add to the issues we're seeing today. The closure of Richardson to local / bike traffic only along with other developments have put stress on Fairfield Road, which is a very narrow street with parking along both sides for the majority (Richardson is a wider street which makes one wonder why they would close it off as an option from downtown into Fairfield and push all the traffic to a narrow and busy Fairfield Road?). What action is the city going to take to reduce traffic on Fairfield Road and ensure safety on the street? Adding 29 residential units to a space where 4 currently exist is a considerable increase that will dramatically add to the number of vehicles driving and parking in the area. What is the plan to provide off-street parking for the 29 units, their residents, and guests?

Also, the height of this development poses a significant issue. The proposed 4-storey development would be significantly taller than the surrounding structures, well outside the norm for height and FSR in the neighborhood. This will have an impact on the look and feel of the residential neighbourhood and dramatically impact the sightlines and aesthetics. Instead of pursuing a one-size-

fits-all approach to development, I urge you to consider alternative solutions that prioritize the preservation of our neighborhood's unique character and the well-being of its residents. This could include exploring options for infill development that complement the existing architectural style and scale of our community, as well as investing in sustainable infrastructure improvements to support modest growth without sacrificing our quality of life.

I ask that you carefully weigh the potential consequences of the proposed densification project and to prioritize the long-term interests of our community in the decision. We want to ensure that our neighborhood remains a vibrant and desirable place to live for generations to come.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide local resident input and look forward to your response.

Regards,  
Jordan Semeschuk  
1785 Fairfield Road, Victoria.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Amendment to OCP Fairfield Road  
**Date:** June 12, 2024 2:19:53 PM

---

As a resident of Rhodo at 1720 Fairfield Road, I fully support amending the OCP Bylaw for the properties at 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield Road. I support the increased density and height! We desperately need this type of housing in beautiful Fairfield.

Thank you,  
Kelly Galitzine  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733-1737 Fairfield Rd  
**Date:** June 14, 2024 11:26:01 AM

---

Mr. Carroll-

I would like to add my thoughts and responses to this proposal from Aryze Developments. I have owned and lived in my home at 311 Robertson Street since 2000.

\*The proposal contravenes our Community Plan, that so many of my neighbours and myself worked on and developed.

\*It's too tall - 4 stories. The OCP and the Missing Middle plan call for 2-3 stories .

\*The Density is not acceptable. 1.79:1 floor space ration and not the OCP density of UP to 1:1.1 FSR.

\*The project has virtually no landscaping, trees, yard or land. This is a huge building with a parking lot that has no natural space around it. It replaces 3 homes that had yards, gardens, trees, and space for kids. This proposal has none of these.

\*This proposal does not add anything to improve our community. Conversely, it diminishes our community. The developers sacrifice natural space to put in more units, to make more profits for themselves.

**We should never support this building height, paving and building density, knowing that it sacrifices the land in the process.**

I ask that the City of Victoria not approve this building as presented. It's too dense, is 4 stories tall and contravenes our Official Community Plan that we the community wrote.

Thank you-  
Linda Maasch

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733-1737 Fairfield Rd Feedback  
**Date:** June 14, 2024 11:32:34 AM

---

Dear Patrick Carroll,

My family and I live in close proximity to the proposed development at 1733-1737 Fairfield Rd. On the whole, we are in support of this project. We feel it aligns well with the Provincial government direction for increasing housing, and recognize that Victoria needs to diversify the types of housing that is available to residents. With little in between a downtown condo or a single family home, we see this development as filling a much needed gap in our housing supply. Further, we appreciate, based on information that we've heard from the developers, that this development will not be using any natural gas fuels with a focus on electric, renewable fuels for the building.

Despite our support, we do have a couple of concerns with the development. Firstly, the vehicle access on Beechwood Ave is concerning and has the potential to lead to significantly increased vehicle traffic on our street. Already there is considerable vehicle congestion on this portion of Beechwood Ave. With many of our neighbours opting for more than one vehicle, the space on the road is already limited with the abundance of vehicles parked on the street. Adding 20+ new residents and their vehicles to this section of Beechwood will have a negative impact and we worry about the street safety of pedestrians and young children. If the Community Plan can be amended to allow this development to move forward, a second amendment to whatever piece of policy required to allow for parking access on Fairfield Rd would be appreciated.

Related to parking, we were disappointed to see that this development would not feature underground parking, but would have a paved parking surface on the ground level. We understand the cost implications of underground parking, however, surface level paved parking is a waste of valuable space and contributes to heat islands. Given our city's recent experience with extreme heat and the likelihood of experiencing similar heat events going forward, allowing a development that includes paved ground level parking would be disappointing.

Despite our concerns, which we hope will be addressed, we are in support of this development and the required Official Community Plan amendment to ensure this project can move forward.

Regards,

Miranda and Matthew Andrews  
321 Beechwood Ave



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733/1725/1737 Fairfield  
**Date:** June 16, 2024 10:08:35 AM

---

Love it! Keep building! Glad to see more density along the Fairfield corridor, hope to see similar closer to the Plaza. And some day... the Plaza itself getting a rebuild with residential? Would be great for the neighborhood.

Thanks!

Paul Ramsey  
1684 Chandler Ave

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733-1735 Fairfield Road Proposed Development: FEEDBACK  
**Date:** June 18, 2024 8:27:19 PM  
**Attachments:** [image1.png](#)

---

We are AGAINST the current proposed development, for the following reasons:

1) HEIGHT - IT IS TOO TALL

4 above ground floors will **tower** over existing homes.

Solution: maximum 3 floors (just like the Rhodo development a block away)

2) PARKING

The current plan has surface parking behind the building. This is adjacent to many back yards. The pollution and noise directly affecting adjacent properties is not acceptable.

Solution: underground parking ( just as the Rhodo Development has).

3) COMPLETE LOSS OF GREEN SPACE

Balance again needed.

Solution - underground parking so that back part of development is gardens, food source (communal veggies garden), trees, maybe even a water source. Current proposal is pretty much building and pavement.

Here is a photo of the Rhodo which is a block away from this proposed development - as you can see, there is virtually no greenspace ( more like “token” greenspace and lots of concrete).

To allow this type of development to continue when our climate is in a crisis seems untenable.





4) Building mechanicals/ vents etc on roof

Our understanding is some of the building “systems” will be on the roof which also poses noise issues to adjacent properties.

Solution: move to below ground (another reason for underground parking)

5) Loss of privacy and sunlight

These should be consideration to neighbouring properties. For some of us, access to sunlight in our homes is critical for health ( mental health/SAD) as is privacy. 4 floors will mean we will have at least one full floor and their back decks / windows staring directly into our homes and yards.

Solution: max 3 floors

**It is all about balance. We would love to see diverse housing and this CAN be done, it just needs to be reasonable and thoughtful in terms of the CURRENT surroundings.**

Comment: these 3 properties would be IDEAL for Missing Middle Housing providing 22 units ( 6 allowed on 2 of the lots and 10 on the corner if I remember the MMH numbers correctly).

I sincerely hope that council will read all letters sent when prior to this latest request for feedback.

Thank you for your consideration of our families concerns and feedback.

Joanna Betts

*Created and sent from my iPhone with my "iThumbs" so please excuse typos!*

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Proposal on 1733-1735-1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** June 19, 2024 9:30:57 AM

---

Hello Mr. Carroll,

I got a letter about your new proposal on Fairfield Road. I have almost nothing against this proposal. My only concern is that the street parking be considered. As a homeowner in the surrounding area, I don't want people to park in front of other residences. When designing this complex, I only ask that you have some sort of parking system for all of the residents in this new residential building. Whether that is through underground parking or some other method. Please also consider that the city may add bike paths in front of the building, in the coming years, making parking in front of the building nearly impossible. This is a family neighborhood and by adding such buildings we lose that sense of community.

Thanks for your consideration

Peter Meyer

Peter Meyer  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** June 23, 2024 6:30:19 PM

---

Hello Patrick/City Council,

I would like to comment on the proposed development at 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road.

I understand and support the need to increase the housing supply and to achieve more residential density in the Greater Victoria area, however, a four-story multi-unit residential building is too large for the proposed lot. There are no other residential buildings of that size in the area. A building of that size would have a significant negative impact on the owners of single-family homes beside and behind that location.

My family and I live at 350 Robertson Street. We enjoy time spent in the privacy of our backyard. We would certainly be negatively impacted by a four-story building going up in that location.

My neighbours and I also share concerns that this new development may negatively affect our property values and increase traffic on Fairfield Road.

With the privacy of the surrounding homes in mind, I believe a two to three-story building or a townhouse style complex built to the same height as the roofline of the existing homes on the subject properties, has the potential to be a reasonable compromise for all parties involved.

We currently view our home as our forever home. What ends up being built on those properties could have a big impact on how we feel about that.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jordan Anderson  
350 Robertson Street  
Victoria

**From:** [Alison Trembath](#)  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Aryze Proposal 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Rd.  
**Date:** July 3, 2024 12:52:50 PM

---

## **Objection to Proposal for Residential Intensification in Gonzales Neighbourhood**

I am writing to formally object to the proposal for residential intensification in the Gonzales neighbourhood, specifically regarding the plan to increase density beyond current zoning regulations and the associated impacts on parking capacity and neighborhood character.

- 1. Density Concerns:** The proposal seeks to exceed the allowable Floor Space Ratio (FSR) as defined in the Official Community Plan for Traditional Residential areas. While the proponents argue for the necessity of increased housing options, the significant increase in density to 1.73 FSR is not justified. This level of density is incompatible with the existing character of the neighbourhood, which predominantly features single-family homes. Such intensification could lead to overcrowding, strain on local infrastructure, and a loss of community ambiance that residents cherish.
- 2. Parking Capacity:** The Parking Capacity Study cited in the proposal indicates a peak demand that already exceeds available parking spaces in the vicinity. Despite assurances that there are currently vacant spaces during peak periods, the reality for local residents contradicts this claim. As a resident of the area, I can attest to the chronic shortage of parking, which is exacerbated by the proposal's intent to introduce additional housing units without adequate provisions for parking. This situation poses a direct inconvenience and safety risk to current residents, particularly concerning for families with young children.
- 3. Neighbourhood Character and Quality of Life:** Gonzales is valued for its tranquil atmosphere, green spaces, and accessibility to amenities such as parks and schools. The proposed increase in density and associated changes threaten to alter the neighborhood's character irreversibly. The removal of green spaces and the strain on local services diminishes the quality of life for existing residents and undermines the very reasons families choose to live in Gonzales.
- 4. Community Engagement and Trust:** The proposal fails to adequately address the concerns raised by the community regarding the impacts of increased density. Mayor Alto's recent remarks highlight a growing sentiment of frustration and distrust towards developers seeking significant amendments after initial approvals. The lack of consistency and reliability in project proposals erodes trust in the planning process and undermines the city's commitment to sustainable development.

## **Additional Objection: Parking Lot Access on Residential Streets**

I would also like to raise a specific concern regarding the proposal's plan to have the parking lot empty onto a quiet residential street rather than utilizing the main corridor which is better suited to handle increased traffic flow.

- 1. Traffic Management and Safety:** Directing parking lot access onto a quiet residential street raises significant concerns regarding traffic management and safety. Residential streets are typically designed to accommodate local traffic and pedestrian activity, not the influx of vehicles associated with commercial or high-density residential



developments. Introducing such traffic onto a quiet street not only disrupts the peaceful environment but also poses safety risks, especially for children playing and pedestrians.

2. **Impact on Neighborhood Tranquility:** Gonzales is cherished for its peaceful atmosphere and residential charm. Routing parking lot access onto a residential street undermines this tranquility by introducing noise, congestion, and potential safety hazards. Residents rely on these streets for their daily activities and recreational purposes, and the proposed traffic flow would disrupt their quality of life.
3. **Alternative Access Solutions:** The main corridor, Fairfield Road, is designed to handle higher traffic volumes and is more suitable for commercial and residential access. It provides safer conditions for vehicular movement and minimizes disruption to residential areas. Reconsidering the access point to utilize Fairfield Road would align with responsible urban planning principles and mitigate adverse impacts on neighborhood livability.

In conclusion, while acknowledging the need for responsible urban planning and housing diversity, the current proposal for residential intensification in Gonzales is unsuitable and detrimental to the well-being of the neighborhood. I urge the council to reconsider the proposal in light of its impact on density, parking, neighborhood character, and the overall quality of life for current residents.

In consideration of these concerns, I strongly urge the council to reassess the proposal's plan for parking lot access and prioritize solutions that preserve the residential character and safety of Gonzales.

Sincerely,  
Alison and Toby Trembath

July 3rd, 2024

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll; Victoria Mayor and Council](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback to Mayor & Council re Aryze Development Proposal at 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield Rd.  
**Date:** July 3, 2024 12:56:36 PM

---

Mayor and Council,

Our family resides on Beechwood Avenue, in close proximity to the proposed development at 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield Road. Our submission to you is in response to the letter we received from the City of Victoria this past June, requesting input on the development.

It is important that we highlight the fact that we are not opposed to increased housing and development in the area, including the site in question. We do, however, respectfully request that Council limit approval of any multi-unit residential building at that location to one with a design in height and density that is **consistent with the Official Community Plan**. This would result in a development that still increases housing while ensuring height and density aligns with the OCP and existing buildings in the neighborhood.

Our request of Council is based on the following considerations and overall rationale:

#### **The Official Community Plan (OCP)**

As stated in the "It's Your Neighbourhood" letter received from the City of Victoria, The Official Community Plan (OCP) currently identifies the property within the Traditional Residential urban place designation, which supports residential uses that include the missing middle housing, ground-oriented multi-unit, attached, duplex, and single detached dwelling buildings, with heights generally ranging from two to three storeys. For this urban place designation, the OCP supports a density of up to approximately 1:1.1 FSR. The current proposal far exceeds that with an application for an overall density of 1.79:1 FSR.

It should be noted that the original Working Group for the Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan included Ryan Goodman from Aryze Developments. The plan included *Key Moves #1 to Add housing that fits the neighbourhood character ... and spoke to limiting apartment/townhomes up to 3 storeys along Fairfield Road between St. Charles and Foul Bay Road.*

It also included *Key Move # 4 - Celebrate Neighbourhood Heritage* commenting that "Many places in the neighbourhood have strong heritage value, and there is a desire to protect the historic character of special homes and streets. This plan seeks to conserve the special historic character of Gonzales by: Encouraging new types of housing, such as a main house + suite + garden suite, for new heritage designated properties."

The main point we want to emphasize here is to limit height and density as intended in the OCP, and not to disregard a community plan the developer was directly involved in.

Mayor and Council should be aware that concerns regarding height and density and

the importance of the OCP dates back two years as documented in the March 28, 2022 CALUC Meeting Report, amongst others. Those concerns were communicated to Aryze when their proposal called for tearing down three (3) homes to construct six (6) townhomes and thirteen (13) condos, for a total of nineteen (19) new housing units. Despite community concerns and feedback, Aryze responded by authoring their August 21, 2023 Application Brief stating "... *we have received valuable feedback from the community ...*" (p.2) but increased both height and density by proposing to build thirty (30) units consisting of six (6) townhomes and twenty-four (24) apartments. An increase of eleven (11) additional units, despite concerns and feedback from community members who are personally impacted by the proposed changes. This constitutes an even further departure from both the spirit and intent of the OCP.

### **Meeting the Objectives of the Missing Middle Initiative**

While we realize that the goal of the missing middle initiative is not "Affordable Housing", caution should be taken in terms of buying into a narrative that new developments should disregard current zoning and Official Community Plans by overtly increasing height and density to achieve the missing middle objectives. More specifically, the caution relates to proposed outcomes vs realized outcomes. Case in point, when the Rhodo was built by Aryze on Fairfield Road, the housing "crisis" and "missing middle" narrative was also very present. Fast forward to today when two townhouses in the Rhodo are listed for sale as follows:

[REALTOR.CA](#) (as of July 2, 2024)

**MLS #967978**

**\$1,549,000**

**118-1720 Fairfield Rd. (RHODO by Aryze)**

3 bedroom Townhome

Property Taxes \$4,769

Maintenance Fees \$675 Monthly

The current rate for a 5-year fixed rate mortgage amortized over 25 years is 4.74%. With a \$309,980 (20%) downpayment, the monthly mortgage payment calculates to **\$7,029/month**. When strata fees and property taxes are included, the monthly cost for the \$1,549,000 property further increases to **\$8,101/month**.

**MLS #965263**

**\$1,200,000**

**112-1720 Fairfield Rd. (RHODO by Aryze)**

2 bedroom Townhome

Property Taxes \$3,679

Maintenance Fees \$440 Monthly

The current rate for a 5-year fixed rate mortgage amortized over 25 years at 4.74%. With a \$240,000 (20%) downpayment, the monthly mortgage payment calculates to **\$5442/month**. When strata fees and property taxes are included, the monthly cost for the \$1,200,000 property further increases to **\$6,188/month**.

The purpose of these examples is simply to illustrate that densification does not, by default, meet the objectives of the missing middle. We mention this within the context that the missing middle seeks to provide opportunities for housing in areas where purchasing a single family residential house may not be financially feasible for middle income earners. In our neighbourhood, single family older homes have sold for \$1.2 to \$1.4 million, many of which have secondary suites to provide additional income. Newer townhomes, however, have cost as much or more in some cases (an MLS listing on June 15, 2024 showed another Townhouse in the Rhodo for sale at \$1,750,000). In the first example provided above, it does not sound reasonable that middle income earners are able to pay **\$8,101 per month** for a mortgage and related costs.

We would also like to add that a homeowner who lives next door to the Rhodo, advised that some units were purchased by people outside of Victoria who bought them as secondary investment properties. If this is the case, it demonstrates there are no certainties in regard to who actually purchases new properties. This is not to suggest they should not be built, but highlights the importance of keeping things in perspective within the context that higher, denser multi-unit residential structures are not guaranteed to meet the objectives of the missing middle, nor are they necessarily justified in overriding Official Community Plans as they are distinctly a for profit business venture, not below market or lower income housing initiatives. There is nothing wrong with being in a for profit business, but such developments need to be kept in perspective.

### **Impact on Traffic Volume and Parking**

It is important for the Mayor and Council to be aware that the volume of traffic and related parking on Fairfield, Beechwood, and Lillian continues to be impacted by development and other factors. On Beechwood specifically, the majority of homes have secondary suites and tenants, which normally results in the entire street lined up with parked cars at various times of the day, weekends, and most notably in the evenings. This also occurs during the day on Lillian Road due to businesses located near Wildwood. This, combined with the fact that Lillian is a narrow road that runs east/west and only permits parking on one side of the roadway, adds to the parking congestion.

To further aggravate the current parking situation, people who visit Hollywood Park for baseball games, tennis, and other activities are frequently unable to park on Fairfield Road resulting in an overflow of parking on Lillian and Beechwood. This will be further complicated by the proposed development which, unlike the Rhodo: a) will not have any underground parking; b) includes a plan with very limited above ground parking with fewer spaces than living units, and c) is designed such that on site parking access/egress is on Beechwood which is a residential side street. Parking for the Rhodo is accessed from Fairfield Road, but not the proposed development.

It should also be noted that the north end of Beechwood has a narrower roadway where the driveway for the proposed development will be located. The location of the driveway, narrow roadway, and limited street parking will further aggravate the overall parking congestion on Lillian and Beechwood. Additionally, the number of parking spaces is not only limited for the proposed development site, it fails to take into account the potential for more than one car per

family, in addition to volume from visitors, deliveries etc.

The higher the volume of occupancy and visitation at the proposed development site, the more congested parking will be on Beechwood, Lillian, and Fairfield Rd. While it's admirable that the development will have numerous places for bicycle parking, the fact is that area residents, tenants and those attending the local businesses primarily operate vehicles, and many of our local homeowners are driving electric cars which will be the future for vehicular transportation.

It is also critical to take into consideration the fact that Montague Court is a large mixed residential commercial property that borders Fairfield, Beechwood, and Lillian. It is a large site across from the proposed development that, in due course, will be completely redeveloped similar to the proposed development by Aryze, and this will significantly increase the volume of traffic, parking and overall activity in the area. It is very important that Council is aware of this as the future redevelopment of Montague Court will also have a significant impact on the area.

In addition to parking, traffic volume is also a consideration as increased density and height for the proposed development will result in increased vehicular traffic in the area which is already exacerbated due to the closure of Richardson at Foul Bay Rd. More specifically, traffic volume westbound from McNeill Avenue in Oak Bay is unable to continue westbound onto Richardson and have to reroute south or north on Foul Bay Road. Those who proceed southbound drive to Fairfield Road, turn right and pass by the elementary school, then proceed westbound on Fairfield Road towards the city. This has increased the volume of traffic on Fairfield Road, especially during workday hours and when Margaret Jenkins elementary school is in session.

Additionally, traffic from Oak Bay that choose to turn right off McNeill Avenue to proceed northbound on Foul Bay Road can no longer turn left on Quamicham Rd (the site of another Aryze Development). That road closure has also increased traffic volume in both directions on Foul Bay Road which has also added to increased traffic on Fairfield Road.

Overall traffic volume is a significant consideration in this area as there is a large amount of homes with families, children, and seniors, in addition to Margaret Jenkins Elementary School, Glengarry Hospital, Hollywood Park, and Fairfield Plaza, all of which are in close proximity.

### **Ensuring a Balanced Approach to Development in Fairfield/Gonzales**

A May 13, 2022 Times Colonist article by Andrew Duffy commented on the *goal of the missing-middle housing program and the importance of ensuring new developments **suit the character of neighbourhoods and preserve heritage.*** While development is important and more housing is needed, it is also important for Council to ensure that land-use procedures and Official Community Plans are aligned. This can be accomplished by considering both the present and the future through decisions that strike a balance between development and community overall well-being. More specifically, Community Plans seek input and are authored for a reason, they seek to ensure new

developments in residential family oriented neighborhoods are reasonable in size and scope, limit impact on vehicular traffic, sewer, garbage, energy draw, carbon emissions, and overall balance (mass, height, general form, parking, greenspace, privacy of neighbouring homes, consistency with the neighbourhood).

Concerns regarding the height and density of the proposed development, are not dissimilar to those expressed by the community in relation to 349 Kipling and 1400 Fairfield in relation to Rezoning Application No. 00702 and Development Permit with Variances Application 000555 (Fairfield). That development did not proceed when staff and Council considered the nature and character of the existing housing and Community Plan.

The proposed development for 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield Road is a similar situation in that there are no four (4) storey multi-unit residential developments in the immediate neighbourhood, nor does the Community Plan support them. The original plan for 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield Road was to tear down the three existing residential homes to build nineteen (19) units. We were part of a local community group that were supportive of increased density through the construction of townhomes (similar to the Rhodo). In 2022 we made Aryze (Matthew Jardine and Ryan Goodman) aware that we supported a new development of townhouses at the site in question but stressed the importance of limiting overall height and density in a manner consistent with the OCP. That support has not wavered but we do not support the current design and proposal.

### **Concluding Remarks**

In closing, providing input and asking questions in an effort to ensure a balanced approach to local development is both reasonable and necessary and should be encouraged. Everyone should have a voice through a process that is mutually respectful of the opinions of all involved, that is why Official Community Plans are developed.

Whenever our family has been involved with community discussions regarding input on developments there is often a lot of judgment and shaming from individuals outside the community who use the term NIMBY in an effort to silence local tax paying citizens who have paid mortgages for 20, 30, and even 40 years in order to raise families in Victoria neighborhoods. Being in favour of reasonable and prudent development that aligns with Community Plans is both normal and encouraged, it is not Nimbyism.

We'd like to thank the Mayor, Council, and staff at the City of Victoria for the opportunity to provide input and we remain hopeful that our input will be given consideration. Our neighborhood is not opposed to development, we just ask for a balanced approach that takes into consideration the interests of all stakeholders, including the local community who are directly impacted.

Thank you,  
David Green  
266 Beechwood Avenue

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** July 3, 2024 3:06:30 PM

---

Regarding development at 1733, 1755 and 1737 Fairfield Road

Dear Mr. Carroll

I am opposed to the 4 storey residential building proposed for this site for many reasons.

This proposal has nothing to benefit and will only be to the detriment of the Gonzales Beach neighbourhood. It brings more people and cars into the neighbourhood without contributing anything. No shops, no progressive energy proposals, no life, nothing. It is like resource extraction, move in, decimate the area, make money, move on.

On top of this, it is a shockingly poor building, not in the slightest in keeping with the neighbourhood. So many opportunities for this site and the developer has only managed something reminiscent of the sterile buildings of the 1960's with a dash of office block stuck on. As well, the site is entirely built over with only tiny patches of greenery in total contrast to the rest of the neighbourhood.

When the City began proposals for the Community Plan, the discussions were about allowing a variety of developments that would enhance the neighbourhood for the existing inhabitants as well as bring new housing. This development is only about housing and will impact very negatively on our neighbourhood. There are existing interesting and useful small shops close by that benefit from being outside the Fairfield strip mall and, as I understood the Community Plan, the point was to promote developments that included a variety of uses.

It is understandable that the city wishes to deter car ownership but simply reducing off road car parking at this point in time is not workable. More cars will be parking on the local roads and this is a big problem for everyone, children and cyclists in particular. I regularly cycle on Fairfield Road and, as it is narrow and without a cycle path, parked cars are a major hazard.

The building should:

- be a maximum of 3 stories
- have more green space
- include more parking, preferably underground

- include retail / business space.

There is nothing about this building that says Community. We will have to live with this poor building looming over our homes for the rest of our time here. The developer must do better.

Regards

Stephen Brown  
310 Robertson Street



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield Road Proposed Development  
**Date:** July 4, 2024 2:20:02 PM

---

Dear sir,

I have not been able to access this development online.

From information I've received by mail and the meetings I have attended my understanding is this is now a 31 unit development with 22 parking spaces and 1 Modo car share on the street.

1. Parking is already an issue in this area as many of the houses already have suites, and 2 of the old houses on Beechwood Avenue are triplexes.

At least 4 street parking spots on the 300 block of Beechwood will disappear for the sidewalk widening and 3 minute parking zone for the development.

2. The initial plan was for 19 units in March of 2022 with 22 parking spots.

3. March 2023 the plan was 30 units and 22 parking spots. The dirty deal between City Hall, Aryze Developments, and The Land Conservancy(TLC) seemed to enable this addition.

Who knew that the zoning had never been changed on Abkhazi Garden, and a \$300,000 "gift" (bribe) to the TLC to help them with their debts could add on another 11 suites!

Double insult to me as I had donated money to buy Abkhazi Gardens from being developed into townhouses in 2000!

4. October 2023 another suite added to the development for a total of 31. One modo car share spot added to the already crowded street parking.

5. The home at 1745 Fairfield Road is totally overwhelmed by this development, and they will get little to no sunlight. This family has a suite in their house. The spouse has a disability. The house is set up for this family to live in.

I am not anti development, and was quite happy with the 19 homes in the initial plan other than the fact that the facade of the building looked like a bunker, and did not fit into the neighbourhood. The Cottages across Beechwood are heritage, and surely an architect/developer could do better.

How many renters will be displaced when the 3 houses are torn down? I'd say at least 5.

None of these "homes" are for rent, or lower-middle income to buy. It is all for huge profits. How does this help the Missing Middle?

Shame on City of Victoria if this development goes through as planned.

Mary Sutton,  
251 Beechwood Avenue, Victoria B.C. V8S 3W6  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed Development - 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** July 5, 2024 9:39:35 AM

---

Patrick, thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

The amended proposals for the development at 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Road add even more unwarranted density and provide less parking. I trust City Council will consider the impact to our neighbourhood; and in so doing so reject 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, no greenspace 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. It does not comply with the OCP and 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 1.79, 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. Victoria could give families more choice to live in something other than a condo.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Warren  
356 Robertson Street

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Development - 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** July 5, 2024 10:51:48 AM

---


Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed development at 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road. As a close neighbor to this site, I have followed the application process closely over the past two years and have provided previous feedback to the City of Victoria and the developers expressing concern about the height and density. I am aware that many of my neighbors have communicated the same concerns. Every revision by the developer seems to propose an even higher level densification for this site and disregard previous feedback on a range of issues.

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 requirements. 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 very supportive of densification efforts for this site and elsewhere in Gonzales that provide quality housing for families that is compatible with the character of our neighborhood, respectful of neighbors, and protects 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.

The height, mass and density proposed for 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road far exceeds 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. I respectfully request Victoria City Council reject the revised proposal for this site.

Janice Linton  
356 Robertson Street  
[REDACTED]

**From:**   
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1733,1735,1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** July 5, 2024 11:06:35 AM

---

Dear Mr. Carroll,

I reside at 327 Beechwood Ave, directly behind the proposed development at the above address. I have several concerns regarding the proposed development, the most pressing are as follows:

1. Height -

The 4 story design will be very imposing on my property. The fourth story looks down into my private patio and will severely compromise my privacy.

The height of the building will also block the light coming into the property, affecting the garden and plants on my lot. My wellbeing will also be affected by the shadow of this building.

There are already 4 apartment/condominium developments in this 2 - 3 block area, but at this time they have been held to 3 stories, which makes them more compatible with the height of the existing buildings. I do not think that this OCP bylaw amendment will bring any benefit to anyone other than the developer (See point below).

2. Density -

An additional 29 units will be 9.7 units per lot, far and away above what has been intended for this neighbourhood. I use units per lot rather than the FSR as this provides more clarity to someone who is not a developer. The notion of the trade of density to "save Abkazi gardens" is laughable, as is the notion that "this will provide housing for the missing middle". The condos in the Rhodo at 1712 - 1720 are already reselling for more than the "missing middle" can afford. I have two adult children with young families who are no longer able to live in Victoria. Much to their and my dismay, homeownership for them is unreachable here. Yes, the city does need to increase density, and is currently doing so with buildings going up everywhere. Fairfield Road however, is shouldering too much of the density without any additional infrastructure to support it.

3. Traffic -

The Rhodo development at 1712 - 1720 Fairfield Ave has just been completed on the opposite

side of Fairfield Road within the block and has had a very unfavourable effect on the traffic in the area. It is no longer safe to make a left turn onto Fairfield Road from Beechwood Ave or 1 block south from Lillian Road. The parking on Beechwood Ave has already been overwhelmed. 29 additional units will bring 29 - 58 additional cars to this block which is unacceptable. Traffic congestion along Fairfield Road is severe.

#### 4. Property Value -

My realtor tells me this development will decrease my property value.

In summary -

I am of the opinion that this area of Fairfield Ave already has enough multiunit housing, however, if it must be, then I would like to see a development that remains at 3 stories or below and with density that conforms to the current community plan. As well, I would like to see at least one parking spot per unit. The parking along Fairfield Ave and Beechwood Ave is already so maxed out that it is difficult for the residents of and the visitors to Beechwood Ave to find parking. We are already at a place where there is a need to consider installing a traffic light at Beechwood Ave and Fairfield Ave, or decreasing the speed limit to 30 km on Fairfield Road to increase safety at these already dangerous intersections (Beechwood Ave and Lillian St).

With Respect,

Liza (Elizabeth) Pelzer  
327 Beechwood Ave  
Victoria, BC  
V8S 3W8

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Public hearing for 1733-1737 Fairfield rd  
**Date:** July 5, 2024 8:12:15 PM

---

Hello,

Please see our feedback below for the proposal for 1733-1737 Fairfield rd

Our family, me, my husband and our toddler, live at 1734 Fairfield Rd; directly across the street from the proposed development of 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road into a multi-residential building consisting of 29 units with a height of four stories. We have concerns about this development not only as neighbors that will be directly affected and impacted but also as members of the community.

The first concern that we have is that Aryze Developments is constantly developing housing with the promise that there will be affordable housing in these developments but without following through with this promise. We are more than supportive of an increase in our housing stock in Victoria and in all communities within Greater Victoria. However, we are concerned, especially with Aryze's history, that these projects and the units built will be out of range for middle income families and will be priced well out of any affordable price range and, if they are rented out, their rents will be unaffordable as well. The *Rhodo* which was developed by Aryze and is down the street from our house on Fairfield has three units that have gone up for sale in the past month with prices of up to of \$1.7 million. This is of course of out range for any middle income family to afford so my question for the Council is what are you actually doing to help increase the affordable housing stock in Victoria and address this "missing middle"? Will you hold these developers to the promises they made? We are not talking about subsidized housing but affordable housing so families can live in all neighborhoods of Greater Victoria comfortably without their rent being 70% of their income or so that purchasing a house is only a pipe dream. We have little confidence that Aryze will follow through on the promise of affordable units so when are they going to be held responsible for breaking this promise multiple times?

Another concern we have is of course parking. We rent the top floor of our house and have three tenants, most of the houses in our block of Fairfield also have multiple tenants. In the meeting that was held late last year Aryze's response to the question about parking was that it is not their responsibility where trades park. This is not acceptable, it is their responsibility to come up a with a reasonable plan so that everyone has access to parking including the homeowners, renter and the trades workers. Aryze needs to take more responsibility to be a good neighbor as this will affect many people on this block including renters, homeowners, people who have

caregivers who visit daily, people who have home businesses etc. It is the Council's responsibility to hold developers like Arzye to the standard that they promised when these projects are proposed, how many times are these promises going to be broken before the Council decides to do anything about it?

Furthermore, if the community plan is amended to accommodate the proposed Arzye development of 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road we would like to know whether that amendment affects or applies to other properties in the community. Can you please clarify whether this amendment has broader application throughout the community.

Thank you

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Re: 1733,1735, & 1737 Fairfield Road Project  
**Date:** July 6, 2024 6:55:49 AM

---

On Jul 5, 2024, at 10:15 AM, David Wilks [REDACTED] wrote:

On Jul 4, 2024, at 9:51 AM, David Wilks [REDACTED] wrote:

Hello Mr. Carroll,

We received a notice from the city seeking input on this project.

We would like to advise that we are opposed to 4 story apartments being situated in single family neighbourhoods. That will result in loss of privacy for neighbours; parking issues; more vehicle congestion on Fairfield Road making it less safe for everyone, more emissions, less green space and will these units be affordable.

Also, we are not supportive of the up zoning of all Victoria neighbourhoods for 4, 6 and larger apartment buildings as proposed in the community plan survey. This proposal is even higher than the density that is legislated by the NDP government. Victoria's density in 2021 was 4,722, seventh highest in the country. With Victoria's population in 2023 being close to 100,000, the density is over 5,100. Victoria seems to be doing more than its fair share in accommodating population increases in the CRD and BC. Increased density has not helped downtown businesses or ended the chaos on the downtown streets. This up zoning will increase land costs. Also, what about infrastructure, parks, recreation centres- one for over 100,000 people, schools, loss of tree canopy and health care.

It just seems we are going to pave over what makes Victoria a great place to live!

Thank you.  
David Wilks and Linda Park



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Development - 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road  
**Date:** July 6, 2024 11:06:20 AM

---

This note is in response to the latest proposed development for 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road. If this development goes through, I would be a neighbour (living at 417 St. Charles St.)

I find that the proposed development far exceeds the limits noted in the Official Community Plan (OCP), and I question why such a development proposal is being considered.

Given that the OCP states two to three storeys for a development in a Traditional urban space (and four storeys is being proposed), and that the OCP also states an FSR of 1:1.1 (but a much denser 1.79:1 is being proposed), I think that the development proposal should have been rejected right away. Why are proposals that far exceed the OCP even being entertained?

I think that we will also find (and are currently finding out) that these types of new developments are not supporting missing middle housing. I.e. the developers are not selling the new units at a cost that the "missing middle" can afford.

Needless to say, I strongly oppose this current proposal and I hope that such concerns are taken into account this time around.

Thank you.

Michelle Crompton  
417 St. Charles St.  
[REDACTED]

July 6, 2024

Dear Mr Carroll,

Please consider our feedback to DENY changing the Traditional Residential urban plan designation for properties at 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road.

Our reasons follow:

**Social Impact/Accessibility**-The proposed change in urban plan designation does not help alleviate the need for affordable housing or address other social issues that most city councillors made election issues. In addition, the building would be near a school but not accessible for most families. The long term affect is that when fewer families reside in a catchment area, schools close. Neighbourhoods loose the energy and vitality of students using the playgrounds. Vandalism follows..

**Tourism**-A four story building is completely out of place in our neighbourhood. If each unit is 12 feet high or more and the facade has a modern design this big building will disrupt the charm that visitors expect as they tour historic Gonzales Fairfield.

**Precedent**-Approving the proposed changes will result in other developers expecting carte blanche to erect building four stories and more. The downtown is changing from Victoria to Condoria. Dont let that trend extend to pictuesque neighbourhoods that tourists see in advertisements..

**Parking 1**-Since the original proposal the number of parking stalls has been decreased but one Modo stall added. One of us is a Modo member who bought a car because the demand for Modo bookings in Gonzales Fairfield exceeds availability. One Modo at the 4 story development would not change the residents' perceived need for cars.

**Parking 2**-We live near the apartments at Fairfield and Lillian where there are only a few parking stalls. Almost every day renters and their visitors block our driveway. There is going to be an increase in parking bylaw offenses throughout our neighbourhood if large multi-family residences are constructed without a parking space designated for each dwelling.

**Stormwater**-Problems already exist with perimeter drain overload in Gonzales, Fairfield. Changing the existing 3 permeable yards to a four story block of concrete surfaces will increase storm water flowing to adjacent properties.

**Sewage**-A four story building housing more people equals more crap in the same sewers that serviced three homes.

**Finally**, the proposed trading scheme with the Abakazi Gardens is ludicrous. If Aryze Developments is granted approval to build their four stories on partly imaginary land, we'd like to pay our property tax invoices with imaginary money. (LOL)

Sincere Regards

Maureen Eley-Round and Leon Sinclair  
Owner residents of 267 Wildwood Ave.  
Phone [REDACTED]

**Subject:** 1964 Fairfield Road and 507 Foul Bay Road  
**Date:** June 14, 2024 8:42:16 AM

---

Hi Patrick,

I'm writing to express my support for the OCP amendment of the noted address (Abkazi Gardens). My family and I live at 501 Foul Bay Road and regularly visit the gardens. It's always busy, well used and appreciated by the community.

While I am typically in favour of higher density land-use in the City, I am happy to see the reduction in density for this site and change in permitted land-use.

I've cc'd my wife Meghan Walker who is also in support.

Thanks,  
Colin

**Colin Harper**

Principal | Architect AIBC

COLIN HARPER ARCHITECT

██████████

██████████

**To:** [REDACTED]

[Patrick Carroll](#)

**Subject:**

Zoning Fairfield and Foul Bay Roads

**Date:**

June 11, 2024 2:28:32 PM

---

Dear Mr. Carroll.

We just received your letter about the rezoning of 1964 Fairfield Road and 507 Foul Bay Road (Abkhazi Garden). Actually we were surprised to receive it as we had thought it was all settled quite awhile ago. Anyway, we certainly hope it can be left as the beautiful garden and other features for the public and members to enjoy for many years to come. I volunteered there many years ago and attended the council meeting when it was first saved as a green space or park. While the property is greatly enjoyed by residents of Victoria, it also attracts visitors and tourists from out-of-town to our city. We have seen several bus loads of tour groups come to see the Garden over the years.

As Victoria becomes more built up and populated, the need for more greenspaces such as this one should certainly be part of the Official Plan. Greenspaces can help to promote good health and are the "lungs" of our city. We hope the city encourages builders to provide more green space around their structures than some projects around here do. Perhaps an increase in setbacks is possible for the future.

Yours truly

Joyce Harrison

Adrian Harrison

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1964 Fairfield Road and 507 Foul Bay Road  
**Date:** June 14, 2024 9:13:33 AM

---

Dear Mr. Carroll,

We are writing to express our support for the proposed Official Community Plan amendment, for the above-noted addresses, to change the urban place designation from Traditional Residential to Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks and Open Spaces.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Shan Marcus and Jacqueline Pierce  
2007 Romney Road

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Note for clarification re Abkhazi  
**Date:** June 16, 2024 10:45:07 AM

---

The new site-specific zone limiting use and density for Abkhazi Gardens would allow additional floor area for a future accessory building. File is associated with REZ00821. I cannot find anything about future accessory buildings and the regulations that would apply. The gardens back onto the private rear yards of many homes and I would like assurance as to the permitted maximum height and setbacks from property lines of accessory buildings that could be permitted. In normal residential development rear yards are back to back and a minimum of 30 feet rear yard is expected and therefore adjacent residential buildings would be a further 30 feet distant and sheds etc would have a separate height limitation and setback requirements.

The gardens have been good neighbours however the proposed composting facility is immediately adjacent to my rear garden area where I have seating. Composting does take place already and only occasionally have I experienced odours from this composting. I would like assurance that composting facilities will not be expanded and that steps are taken in accordance with recommendations given in \_

### Controlling Composting Odors - BioCycle

<https://www.biocycle.net/controlling-composting-odors/#:~:text=Composting%20is%20never%20odor%2Dfree.,odors%20are%20going%20to%20form.>  
There has been a BC Government review - chrome-extension://oemmnadbldboiebfnladdacbfmadadm/[https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/air-land-water/air/reports-pub/odour\\_mgt\\_final\\_june13\\_05.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/air-land-water/air/reports-pub/odour_mgt_final_june13_05.pdf)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Rezoning No. 00845  
**Date:** June 23, 2024 4:41:39 PM

---

Good day,

My properties are neighbors to the proposed rezoning of 1964 Fairfield Rd and 507 Foul Bay Road.

We support this rezoning strongly as that oasis of nature is so important to us. Q

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** Rezoning No.00845  
**Date:** June 23, 2024 5:25:39 PM

---

Hello Patrick, We totally agree with proposed rezoning amendment.  
How could anyone want to risk losing or changing such an iconic property that attracts so many local and visiting people year round to Abkhazi Gardens.  
Clive and Anne Sawdon  
361 Foul Bay Road  
[REDACTED]



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Patrick Carroll](#)  
**Subject:** 1964 Fairfield Rd  
**Date:** July 1, 2024 12:29:04 PM

---

To: Patrick Carroll, Senior Planner,  
City of Victoria  
July 1, 2024

Dear Patrick,

As close neighbours to the Abkhazi Garden, we're writing in support of the proposed zoning change for the property. The neighbourhood and the volunteer community have worked hard to keep this garden open to the public for many years. Rezoning and placing the garden in the protection of Parks will hopefully preserve this historic site for continued public use through the future.

Thank you,  
Virginia and Jeff Errick  
615 Foul Bay Rd

Sent from my iPad