Lacey Maxwell

From: Patrick Skillings

Sent: November 6, 2017 4:12 PM To: Victoria Mayor and Council Subject: 750 Pemberton Rezoning

Dear Mayor and Council,

- > I write briefly to commend the proponents of the low density development of 750 Pemberton. Many of you might remember my meetings with you concerning the planning department's abrupt change of zoning after the present owner's purchase of the property.
- > Subsequently they have worked long and felicitously with the local neighbourhood to uphold Rockland's historical housing standards to add 3 new appropriate homes to the landscape. They have effectively saved a late 1800's heritage structure and the affordable rentals it entails and worked hard to accommodate all neighbours concerned.
- > This would be a fine residential addition to Rockland and Victoria.
- > Yours sincerely
- > Patrick Skillings

Ian C. Chard c/o 820C Pemberton Road VICTORIA, B. C. V8S 3R4

RECEIVED NOV 0 7 2017

November 7, 2017

Mayor and Council City of Victoria 1 Centennial Square Victoria, B. C. V8W 1P6

Rezoning Application #00545: 750 Pemberton Road Developments Nov 9, 2017

Members of our family have owned and resided at 820 Pemberton Road for over forty years.

We are pleased to advise that we support the rezoning and Heritage Designation described in your notice dated October 26, 2017.

We have discussed the proposal with the developer and consultants on several occasions in the past year and a half, and admire the project which remains consistent with many of the older designs found on Pemberton Road and neighbouring Streets.

Yours very truly,

Ian Chard and Anne Sanderson

Owners

Subject: 750 Pemberton Road Rezoning Proposal

We are the property owners of the 2 bungalows backing onto the heritage building and meadows at 750 Pemberton Road in the Rockland neighbourhood. Our addresses are 744 Pemberton Road and 730 Pemberton Road. We were recently advised that a rezoning application for Pemberton Meadows was made to increase the density on the site. We drafted this letter to register our objections with Council to this proposal.

The property was purchased, and changed hands September 1, 2015 from relatives of the previous owner for approx. \$2.4 M. The new owners immediately canvassed the current tenants, and a few weeks later the surrounding neighbors, to advise they bought the property with the intention of rezoning and redeveloping the existing green space for single and duplex strata housing. This application is pure speculation and prompted several directly affected neighbors to organize to oppose the rezoning. The following is our reasons why Council should reject this rezoning application.

1. This property was rezoned to increase density significantly a few years ago The property was rezoned several years ago to permit the previous owner to operate transient housing rental accommodations. City Council permitted this rezoning to allow the owner to generate increased revenues for ongoing and longterm maintenance of the heritage building and grounds. This rezoning had a rational purpose in that it provided much needed affordable housing. This spot rezoning created the *T-22 Zone Pemberton Transient Accommodation* **Zone** with very specific requirements. One of the rezoning requirements specified in T-22 is that "the area for the new zone have a minimum of 5,380 M2"; which is the area of the site. Because the site currently contains 9 rental units; we believe this a significant requirement, which should continue as the green space on this property is a much needed neighbourhood amenity. The proposal to add 4 more housing units to the site advocates for more single family housing which increases density again from 9 to 13. Visitor parking will have to park on an already crowded public street.

2. Removal of Much Needed Green Space

When we learned of plans to once again rezone the property the first question we asked ourselves was: *Would this proposed rezoning improve or detract from the site and neighbourhood*? For several reasons we believe the proposal will do more harm than good to the Rockland neighbourhood and City of Victoria tourism. Our primary concern is that it removes active green space from a neighbourhood deficient in active green space. As you are aware the Rockland neighbourhood Plan identifies lack of park space as a significant deficit for the Rockland community. While there are two Institutional Use green spaces properties in the neighbourhood they do not fulfill the recreational needs of "neighbourhood" that the Pemberton Meadows space does. We need places where children can play.

3. Densification

The proposed development would increase the population density on this site for the second time forever removing the "estate character" of this area of the neighbourhood. As you are aware a key objective of the Rockland Community Plan is to preserve the estate nature of the neighbourhood and this objective is an essential part of the Rockland Neighbourhood Association Constitution.

The green space proposed for removal is so very integral to the heritage building setting, as well as, the recreational needs of the tenants. In our opinion, and that of our neighbors, the current density of 9 dwelling units on the site, is high enough. Several neighbours believe the community has already supported its fair share of *densification* and that Rockland will soon exceed the 2,000-population growth densification anticipated in the OCP (20,000 people / 10 communities). Any additional density severely compromises the *estate* character of the neighbourhood and is inconsistent with several provisions in the Official Community Plan.

4. Accommodating Tax Payers Rather Than Speculators

If you drive though our neighbourhood, currently on the Victoria Sightseeing Tour bus route, you will see that we have upgraded and maintained our properties to a high standard. This is because we believe we are secure in maintaining our property investments and will not see the further desecration of the older properties and green space in the neighbourhood. We hope and trust that elected officials will allow us to continue to enjoy the estate character of our neighbourhood as described in the *Official Community Plan*.

We understand maintaining an "estate character" has a cost. The Rockland Neighbourhood is taxed in accordance with the highest classification of property assessment in Victoria because the lots are large and setbacks significant. We pay annually for our estate character. Any increase in density that erodes the estate character of a neighbourhood should result in a reduction in the mill rate applied in that neighbourhood. Our privacy is an important byproduct protected by the estate character nomenclature and it is our preference to keep it the way it is. We believe it is in the best interests of the City of Victoria to stop the slow destruction of the unique characteristics of heritage neighborhoods through speculative spot rezoning.

5. Enhance the Green Space Rather Than Destroy It

We enjoy watching tenants and their extended families using the lovely gardens at the south meadow of the property for picnics, weddings, and birthday parties. Some of the residents enjoy planting their own gardens, as well as sharing in the maintenance of the flowerbeds at the front of the Heritage house. These activities are very complementary to the heritage mansion setting and should continue. Both existing tenants and homeowners in the immediate vicinity selected their residences with the belief this property would retain the estate character of the heritage setting. We would encourage and support more trees planted in the south meadow to ensure the diversity and survival of the Garry Oak ecosystem, not fewer. This property, together with our properties, hosts an environment rich in many species of birds, insects and wildlife. All of these components are important and should remain off limits to redevelopment to enable all to continue to enjoy the natural beauty of our surroundings. We believe protecting the green space at

Pemberton Meadows is paramount to the future enjoyment of property, privacy and lifestyle and that of the tenants and tourists.

It is ironic that City Councils in many capital cities in Canada are seeking to achieve equity in the distribution of green space in their cities by acquiring more. By using *Reserve Fund* revenues, accumulated through their *Provincial Planning Acts* these municipalities are able to acquire additional green space in inner city neighbourhoods deficient in green space. The Rockland neighbourhood however has been experiencing quite the opposite trend. In addition to the replacement of valued older residences, the displacement of invaluable and unique natural ecosystems is a very disconcerting trend to observe for long-term taxpayers. City Council should be expanding and supporting the treasures that older neighbourhoods possess whenever possible.

6. Common Sense Should Prevail

Of course the big question is why?? Why would someone purchase a beautiful property with solid rental revenues and within days of taking possession hire architects to redevelop the green space? Why would a purchaser speculate that City Council would rezone the property once again, just to increase the density of the property? We believe the answers are self-evident.

7. This Type of Housing Does Not Fulfill A Public Need

We have attached two recent articles the Times Colonist (3/10/2015) one which reports on page A-3 the results of a very recent study of the Victoria housing market. It states there is "an oversupply of high-income market ownership housing...." the same form of housing proposed in the rezoning densification scheme.

A second article on Page A11 has the title "Garry Oaks need preservation on a wide scale" a position we advocate. Please read these articles and we are confidant you will agree that the 750 Pemberton Road rezoning proposal does nothing to support the Official Community Plan and indeed is in direct conflict with the stated policy to preserve the estate character of the Rockland neighbourhood and important vistas. It also does not fulfill any altruistic public need. Pemberton Meadows is too important an ecosystem and neighbourhood recreational focal point to destroy for a few more single-family dwelling units.

8. Blasting Damage

Perhaps most important to the welfare of the immediate neighbours is the impact of the rock blasting that is scheduled to occur to accommodate foundations for the new housing units. Who will be left to rectify any damage to tree roots and existing foundations? All the property owns in the immediate vicinity of this proposal are retired and cannot afford to finance repairs that may occur from blasting. We cannot afford to hire lawyers to pursue insurance claims which we understand from the literature may be an outcome.

As the approval authority charged with protecting property owners -- *Is it the City's intention to cover costs of any damage?* Are existing home owners expected to pay for damages to trees that will likely suffer a slow death over several years?

We implore you to respect the decision of the past City Council and leave the density as it is; to protect this sensitive green space of which we have so little in this neighbourhood; to protect the way of life: open spaces, sightlines and privacy currently enjoyed by tenants and owners alike, and respect our neighbourhood community planning and community constitutional values. Do not allow the rezoning process to proceed.

Thank you very much in advance for your attention to this matter.

sincerely,

Debbie and Lawrence Bortoluzzi
730 Pemberton Road

Doris Schuh 744 Pemberton Road

Pamela Martin

From: Larry Elford Sent: Larry Elford Tuesday, November 07, 2017 8:10 AM

To: Leanne Taylor; Public Hearings

Subject: Proposed Development of 750 Pemberton Road

I am unable to attend the council meeting reviewing the redevelopment of 750 Pemberton Rd, but would like to express my views concerning the proposal.

I agree with the proposal presented at the Rockland Neighbourhood Association meeting held on August 25, 2016 with the exception of the provisions made for parking in the development. As I understand it, the developer is planning to add three additional strata units plus adding one extra suite in the carriage house, for a total of 12 rental units, but with only 8 parking stalls. There is no provision for the remaining 4 units or the 3 proposed strata units, for those with two vehicles, for car sharing vehicles or visitors.

Any vehicles beyond the eight allowed for in the parking area, will have to park on Pemberton Road. No consideration is being given to the neighbours who will have these vehicles parked along the street. With the narrow street, it becomes very difficult to turn safely onto Pemberton from Angus or Rockland when cars are parked close to these intersections, something that we experience whenever events take place at Government House and which will surely take place should additional parking not be provided at Pemberton Meadows.

At the present time, there is little congestion on Pemberton between Angus Road and Rockland Avenue due to the large single family residential lots and the additional parking available at 750 Pemberton (currently 14 parking stalls for 11 units) and at 753 Pemberton (7 parking spots for 5 units).

One only needs to look at the parking congestion at the portion of Pemberton closest to Fort Street where the townhouse complexes and apartments do not have sufficient parking. Cars are parked on both sides of the road only allowing one car to pass at a single time, often making a turn onto Pemberton from Fort Street unsafe.

I spoke to one of the owners of 906 Pemberton Road, which has 2 units in the main heritage house and 4 townhouses. They have parking for the owners as well as having 4 visitor spots. Seeing that 750 Pemberton is one of the last large properties in Rockland up for redevelopment, I would like to see the parking provisions revisited to allow for more parking off-street.

Larry Elford Resident-owner of 777 Pemberton Rd Victoria