

---

**From:** Victoria Mayor and Council  
**Sent:** September 11, 2024 12:41 PM  
**To:** Legislative Services email  
**Subject:** FW: Fairfield RD.1733 1735 1737

---

**From:** Deborah Lowry  
**Sent:** September 10, 2024 4:59 PM  
**To:** Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>  
**Subject:** Fairfield RD.1733 1735 1737

I realise this letter is sent late .I only just heard of the rezoning meeting for Thursday.  
This proposal is over the top.Could the developer ask for any more?  
All the variances should be tossed and the addition of another story is ridiculous..  
The unfortunate people living next to this monstrosity should be of utmost concern and the precedent set is disturbing. Is this really OUR Neighbourhood?  
Is anyone at City Hall listening? Not to mention the moral dilemma of tearing down 3 perfectly good houses that are part of the missing affordable rental market ,and tossing them in the land fill.I wish I could say I was shocked by this development however I am not.Time to stop and look around and listen .You can do better.

Deborah Lowry  
1829 Lillian Rd

1055 Pentrelew Place  
Victoria, BC

June 5, 2024

Mayor & City Council  
Victoria City Hall  
Victoria, BC

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed development at 1733-37 Fairfield Road by Aryze. As a working professional in the region raising a young family, I am keenly invested in improving the prosperity of our community so that my children, and other families' children, can one day afford to make the capital region their home. Projects such as this one represent the types of buildings we need to continue expanding the spectrum of homes to provide options for all levels of buyers – from first-time owners and young families to downsizing seniors looking to stay in their neighborhoods.

By providing townhomes and apartment-style homes, 1733-37 Fairfield enhances housing diversity in the Fairfield Gonzales neighborhood. With the region facing a severe housing shortage, this project provides a timely solution by offering a range of home types and sizes suitable for various demographics.

While additional density is always a controversial subject, I believe this to be a well-located and ideal site for increased density. Its proximity to shops, schools, parks, and public transportation reinforces the notion of a 'complete neighborhood,' allowing residents easy access to essential services and amenities. Moreover, the development aligns with the stated goals of the Official Community Plan, promoting residential intensification in well-connected, highly walkable, and bike-friendly areas.

The height of the proposed buildings is reasonable and could even be argued as too short – I believe six storeys should be the new minimum standard moving forward. As an architect and developer myself, I believe the design fits well within the neighborhood's scale. The design is aesthetically pleasing and incorporates a variety of community feedback, which is always a challenging objective given the subjective nature of design aesthetics. The long-term preservation of neighborhood greenspace through a density transfer agreement with the Abkhazi Garden is also an excellent agreement and should be celebrated.

In summary, the 1733-37 Fairfield Road project is a well-conceived development that addresses our desperate need for more housing, supports sustainable urban growth, and enhances the livability of our community. I urge the City Council to approve this project.

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely,  
Devon Skinner, Architect AIBC



Nick Blasko  
1334 Thurlow Rd.  
Victoria, BC  
V8S 1L6

June 10, 2024

To whom it may concern,

I am a longtime Fairfield resident and local Victoria business owner. I am writing today to express my support for Aryze Developments' plans for 1735 Fairfield Rd.

The multi-family project, as presented, is appropriate for the location and is an example of what, in my opinion, Fairfield needs more of.

Aryze has a proven track record of successful multi-scale developments that combine innovative land use with beautiful architectural design - a winning combination for our city and communities.

Sincerely,

Nick Blasko

---

**From:** shawn robins  
**Sent:** September 10, 2024 3:40 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** 1733- 1735 Fairfield Road

I am a Victoria resident and reside at 330 Roberson Street directly behind the proposed development. I have expressed my opposition to the development as proposed. While I am supportive of more housing I am concerned that the City and its planners have chosen to disregard public guidance as expressed in the OCP in their rush to create more housing at any cost. The proposed development offers no new affordable housing while stretching the limits of density. The proposed building removes any green space and is too tall. Three stories would be much more suitable. I also do not believe the proposed density swap with Abkhazi benefits the whole community. The proposed down zoning is simply greenwashing. Throughout all the community reviews Aryze have shown very little willingness to adjust their proposal in response to local residents concerns. I have little confidence that Council will be anymore responsive.

Shawn Robins  
Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Carl Coryell-Martin  
**Sent:** September 11, 2024 11:13 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Letter in support of 1735 Fairfield Road: Rezoning application

Hello Victoria Council:

I live nearby on Victoria Ave and my daughter attends Margaret Jenkins on Fairfield near the proposed building site, and I often find myself biking by this housing site. This is a great location for building more housing and I would love to live here myself, bring my parents here or have friends live closer in. The location is easily walkable to a complete set of services and is well connected to our bus and cycling networks.

Please approve the re-zoning application and allow this fantastic housing to be built and made available to people in our city.

Thank you kindly,

Carl Coryell-Martin

1174 Victoria Ave  
Victoria BC

---

**From:** S Green  
**Sent:** September 11, 2024 3:49 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Notice of Public Hearing September 12, 2024 re Input on Proposed Changes to 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Rd.  
**Attachments:** Beechwood Ave 1\_2024090.jpg; Beechwood Ave 2\_20240904.jpg; Lillian Rd 1\_20240904.jpg; Lillian Rd 2\_20240904.jpg; Fairfield 1\_20240907.jpg; Fairfield 2\_20240907.jpg; Fairfield at Beechwood\_20240910.jpg

Mayor & Council and City of Victoria Staff,

In response to the August 30, 2024 letter I received from the City of Victoria regarding the September 12, 2024 Public Hearing in relation to the proposed changes to 1733, 1735, and 1737 Fairfield Rd, I am resending my July 3, 2024 email to you for the purposes of the Hearing. I have embedded my original e-mail below, and have also included some random photos I recently took in the neighbourhood (Lillian Rd, Beechwood Ave, Fairfield Rd) to assist in setting some context in relation to traffic volume and parking. While inadequate parking is only one of the issues with the size, scope, height and density of the proposed development, it is still important to emphasize the critical need for a larger on site parking envelope to reduce the current strain on traffic volume and parking, and to plan for future development of the neighbouring Montague Court residential/commercial site.

From: **S Green** ·  
Date: Wed, 3 Jul 2024 at 12:56  
Subject: Feedback to Mayor & Council re Aryze Development Proposal at 1733, 1735, 1737 Fairfield Rd.  
To: <[pcarroll@victoria.ca](mailto:pcarroll@victoria.ca)>, <[mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca)>

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](https://www.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:** Alison Trembath  
**Sent:** September 12, 2024 10:21 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Object

We object to the proposed changes to 1733 Fairfield Road 1735 Fairfield Road and 1737 Fairfield Road. The density is too much for our neighborhood.

**1. Increased Density and Rezoning Concerns:**

- **Impact on Neighborhood Character:** The rezoning from R1-G to FRMD would significantly alter the character of the Traditional Residential Urban Place area, impacting the existing single-family residential environment with a four-storey multiple dwelling. This change will lead to increased traffic, congestion, and alterations to the neighborhood's aesthetic and livability.
- **Infrastructure Strain:** The proposed increase in density will put additional pressure on local infrastructure, including roadways, utilities, and public services, which is not be adequately prepared to handle the increased demand.

**2. Development Permit Variances:**

- **Setback Reductions:** The substantial reductions in front, rear, and side yard setbacks will affect the privacy and light access for adjacent properties, diminishing the quality of life for current residents.
- **Increased Site Coverage and Decreased Open Space:** The increase in site coverage to 65% and the reduction in open space to 23% are concerning as they will result in less green space and negatively impact community aesthetics and environmental benefits.
- **Parking and Bicycle Storage Issues:** The reduction in vehicle parking spaces from 40 to 23 will lead to inadequate parking for residents and visitors, causing overflow into nearby residential areas. Additionally, while the provision of long-term bicycle parking is commendable, the stacked format is not be practical for all residents.

**3. Overall Impact on the Community:**

- **Long-Term Effects:** Consideration should be given to the long-term effects of these changes on community cohesion, property values, and the overall living environment. Ensuring that development aligns with the broader goals of community growth and sustainability is crucial.

We object.

Alison and Toby Trembath

---

**From:** Jennifer Turner  
**Sent:** September 12, 2024 8:54 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Proposed changes to 1733,1735 & 1737 Fairfield Road.

Dear Sir/Madam, As owners of a property close to the proposed development on Fairfield Road we vigorously object to the proposed inappropriate development on Fairfield Road. The combination of the unacceptable setbacks and the reduction in parking spaces is deemed to be unacceptable. Anybody who lives on Fairfield Road is well aware of the parking congestion and the impact on surrounding streets and this is multiplied when there are sporting events carried out at the local park and sport facilities when parking in the area is even more difficult.

We do not need in this area yet another apartment development that ignores the community spirit and design that is so characteristic of the area. We have already suffered the Aryze development on the other side of the road which appears to be yet another cheap and inappropriate development on Fairfield Road.

It is unfair to inflict on this community such a development that ignores the quality of this neighbourhood and impacts so much on the surrounding neighbours.

The reduced setbacks will impact the adjoining properties and the development will be very close to Fairfield Road.

A car space for every unit should be acceptable - this will still mean that additional vehicles will need to park on the road.

Yours sincerely,  
Richard & Jennifer Turner

---

**From:** Robin Jones  
**Sent:** September 12, 2024 10:11 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** 1733-1737 Fairfield Rd

I live on Beechwood and am opposed to the possible variances for this project. They knew the size of the property when they bought it. These variances will virtually make the building fill to the property lines and impact all of its neighbours.

Regarding the parking - I have lived here 43 years and at present there are no street parking spots available. With the reduction in spots proposed they will now park on Beechwood. Also Fairfield Rd has become very busy making turning on to Fairfield difficult. So with the addition of those cars from the proposed project it will make it even more difficult. Lillian Rd is a very narrow Rd ( basically one way) and there is a bus stop where Lillian meets Fairfield Rd which often backs cars up on to Lillian.

If this project is approved I would request that the construction workers be required to park outside this neighbourhood. The developer should rent space for workers to park and bus them to the site. It has been done by other developers.

Robin Jones 234 Beechwood

---

**From:** Syreeta Wootton  
**Sent:** September 12, 2024 8:55 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings; Victoria Mayor and Council; Marianne Alto (Mayor)  
**Subject:** Regarding proposed building on Fairfield Road /Abkhazi bait and switch

To Mayor Alto and City Council,

This letter is to express my opposition to the proposed and continued destruction of our neighbourhoods, particularly Fairfield. I have lived in the Fairfield area for the last 44 years and find the disregard of both the Fairfield Association and the Gonzales Association concerns and the blatant ignoring of the people actually living in the area frustrating and frankly reprehensible. Under the guise of creating more homes for families and lower income /younger home owners, the Missing Middle Initiative, you have allowed perfectly good housing and green space to be torn down and appropriated and while lining the pockets of your developer friends who have then built \$750,000 + 1bed condo's. I don't know what you think you know about families and lower income people but they do not qualify for a mortgage of that amount. You are building a city for the rich, not for everyone.

I also want to ask about amenities and infrastructure. How will our already taxed and over worked teachers accommodate all the people who will be living in this new complex? Margaret Jenkins is at capacity and it seems many students at Oak Bay High have to take classes on line because the classes they require for graduating are full. Our sewer and rain water systems are also in danger, we haven't upgraded them since the 60's and as we have seen several times recently in Fairfield and Oak Bay have been overloaded due to breaking down or high rain water. Not to mention the state of our hospital and doctor situation, it's mind boggling that you think we can sustain a larger population, and as already established the housing being built is not for the Everyman /Everywoman.

I don't understand this new project and how you can be fooled once again by Aryze, who are not our friends, they want to destroy the character of the neighborhoods and infill all the gardens, which is why people want to live in Victoria in the first place. This bait and switch with Abkhazi Gardens is truly pathetic and so transparent. They aren't trying to save or help anyone except themselves.

I am not against densification, but i am against doing it the way the city has allowed. Protected trees being cut down, heritage houses being torn down, so much into the landfill, so much green space destroyed, perhaps we should encourage a backyard urban permaculture and bartering system, perhaps we should encourage more communal living situations or small lane way housing. By laying more concrete down we only create more of a flooding and environmental problem, with less places for the rain to be absorbed we should expect more flooding on an already taxed sewer system. Perhaps you should focus on developing the area between Shelbourne all the way to Mayfair /Uptown, it is land that is underused and in fact closer to town...

For once, do what you were hired to do, listen to the people who actually live in the neighbourhood.

Yours, a super frustrated and voter.

Syreeta Wootton