

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Thomas Lacey [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 7, 2024 12:12 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** 1733 - 1735 Fairfield Road Development

I am writing to have on record our disapproval of the above development. The proposed structure is way too large for the location and is in no way in keeping with the surrounding residences.

I don't see how this development is going to address a housing shortage when there is already a lack of affordable rentals. In addition, the unit pricing is likely going to be \$1M+ which in no way can be considered affordable housing for most families. The lack of parking and small size of the units will not be suitable to families and will likely be used for short term rentals by investors.

In summary, the development does absolutely nothing to address what the city is really lacking.

Thomas Lacey  
1823 Fairfield Road  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Kathy Phasey [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 8, 2024 6:52 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield

We, Nicolaas Oegema and Kathy Phasey, owners of 1788 Fairfield Road, object to changes to the OCP bylaw for increased density at Fairfield and Beechwood.

Furthermore we wish to go on record as objecting to the proposed changes to the above site plan to reduce setbacks. The setbacks are already too slim.

This contractor should not be allowed to continue to ask for variances for reduced setbacks, site coverage and open site coverage. The city continues to allow Aryze changes and sets a precedent..

Parking is already experiencing pressures in the 1700 block of Fairfield. 4 houses, two with numerous vehicles, share 1 parking space. There is not enough parking designated for this project even with the initially proposed 40 spaces in our opinion.

Yours truly

Nicolaas Oegema and Kathy Phasey

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Garrett Stanners [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 9, 2024 12:13 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Development permit #00204

To whom it may concern,

We live within eyesight of the proposed development at 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road and are vehemently opposed to many of the variances requested by the developer. We have three daughters, and bought our home over a decade ago with a goal of raising our family in a primarily single family home neighbourhood. The thought of a four storey building overlooking our backyard is crushing. While we can appreciate the need for more housing, the plan to eliminate the privacy of adjacent homes seems severely shortsighted. A few towers downtown, nestled amongst other towers could easily surpass the density that would otherwise permanently alter Fairfield Road passing through the Fairfield and Gonzales neighbourhoods.

If the units are exclusively low-priced bachelor units, then a variance on parking stalls might be worthy of consideration. However, if the units could accommodate two adults, then 23 parking stalls for potentially 58 vehicle owners appears absurd. We regularly have visitors to Glengarry Hospital parking in front of our home and neighbours' homes, which we overlook, because we assume it is typically someone visiting a hospitalized family member. If the units are priced closer to \$700K, it would be reasonable to expect that the demographic that can afford such a cost would necessarily need a well-remunerated job, which might likely be the sort of person that drives a car. What proportion of people making over \$100K/year take the bus? It is not unreasonable to expect the residents at the proposed development may also have contractors, house cleaners, friends and family paying visits, which begs the question, where will they park? Doubling the number of families from three to six would have a noticeable impact; increasing it to 29 over the same land area is preposterous. Reducing setbacks 0.5M from the property line sounds like downtown. Decreasing the open site space to 23% seems diametrically opposed to the City of Victoria's goals of protecting the canopy, addressing climate change and looking to the future with the environment as a priority.

A two storey building, perhaps even a 2½ storey development would greatly increase the density of the neighbourhood without dramatically altering the sense of community in our neighbourhood. We have a community plan, is it unreasonable to respect it?

Regards,

G Stanners i

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** September 10, 2024 9:14 AM  
**To:** Legislative Services email  
**Subject:** FW:

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 9, 2024 9:01 AM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:**

Dear Mayor Alto and Council Members:

re: 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road

The setback requests and 65% lot coverage from 40% for this project seem more suitable for our downtown business district, rather than for a residential area. With the new multi-plex across the street on Fairfield, (very little green space) this is going to create a narrowing, tunnel-like effect to an already busy road. With all the traffic channelled onto Fairfield, due to the closure of Richardson, Fairfield already has cost the city extra expenses due to installation of traffic lights and extra driving time and pollution. Please don't turn it into echoing valley of traffic noise.

Yours truly

Joyce Harrison 357 Irving Road

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Janice Linton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 10, 2024 2:00 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Cc:** Patrick Carroll  
**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed Development - 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road

As a close neighbor to 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Road, I have submitted feedback to the City of Victoria a number of times over the past two years expressing concern about this development, especially the height and density. I am aware that many of my neighbors have communicated similar concerns. Please see my response to the July consultation below. Aryze has continually disregarded community input. I am disappointed that it is taking the City so long to reject this project. I am very concerned that this proposal will pave the way for uncontrolled condo development in Fairfield and Gonzales. I trust City Council will consider the near and long term impact to our neighbourhood; and in doing so reject the proposed bylaw changes and Aryze's proposal.

Janice Linton  
356 Robertson Street

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Janice Linton [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Fri, Jul 5, 2024 at 10:51 AM  
**Subject:** Proposed Development - 1733, 1735 and 1737 Fairfield Road  
**To:** [REDACTED]

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:** Kevin Warren [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September 10, 2024 10:42 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Cc:** Patrick Carroll  
**Subject:** Proposed Development - 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Road

Multiple submissions for the development at 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Road over the last two years have continually tried to reduce any city planning and zoning requirements, and disregard community concerns and input. I trust the City Council will consider the impact to our neighbourhood; and in 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. The proposal is requesting significant OCP amendments to increase the height beyond the three stories maximum required in a Traditional Neighbourhood designation and as well site coverage, open space, parking and front/back/side setback variances. The building is highly disruptive to the neighbourhood because of its height and mass, density, layout, appearance, number of units, lack of 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.

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 should give families more choice to live in something other than a condo.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Warren  
356 Robertson Street