

October 10, 2017

Re: REZ00525, 1201 Fort Street/1050 Pentrelew Place  
CALUC Community Meeting, September 12, 2017

Dear Mayor and Council:

Approximately 85 neighbours attended this second CALUC Meeting, and by far the majority spoke out against the revised proposal brought forward by Abstract Developments.

It would not be exaggerating to say that people were distraught that the proponent had paid so little attention to the concerns expressed at the first CALUC Meeting. The new proposal appeared to have largely ignored the significant revisions requested in council's motion at the April 6/17 CotW, specifically

- a. Massing, height, .... and setbacks of buildings with attention to the look and feel of buildings A and B from the point of view of Pentrelew Place,
- c. Removal of roof decks on the townhouse units,
- e. more breathing room, less wall-like feel ... to the townhouses.

Further, there was annoyance that minor expressions of interest (for example, the pathway) expressed in "neighbourhood consultations" had been hijacked to become bargaining chips to justify the mass and height of all of the buildings.

The project remains essentially the same. In some ways, it is even larger than the original proposal, as it now entails 94 units rather than the 91 originally proposed.

While building B has been reduced by one storey and a more sensitive transition to the lower density of the south has been somewhat accommodated in the revised plan, the overall massing remains the same, with an FSR of 1.39:1, slightly more than the 1.379:1 originally proposed. The total floor area is slightly larger than the originally proposed at 10,810sq m., now at 10,888 sq. m.

The project is no less dense. The massing is no less than originally proposed. The issue of height has not been addressed in Tower A, which remains at six storeys and 21.42 meters. It is important to note that the OCP seems to allow for up to six storeys in strategic locations, but there has been no discussion of the strategic value of this site. Are six storeys appropriate along entire corridors? Is a bus route the sole criteria of "strategic"?

Of equal, if not greater exasperation for the neighbours, is the townhouse height along Pentrelew, where, although the unit number has dropped, the height has increased consistently. From 10.23 m. to 10.86 m. in Building C; from 10.74 m. to 11.42 m. in Building C and from 10.73 m. to 11.34 m. in Building D. The completely reasonable concern of residents is that they do not feel there is a sensitive transition from the west side of Pentrelew to the east. The current R1-B zoning allows for 7.6 m. and the consensus is that an abrupt 50% increase of this to 11+ meters is too much. The neighbours think the current plan offers a wall-like feel of town houses with minimal front yard setbacks looming directly across the street from the one and two storey homes of the R1-B zoning.

Contrary to the CotW motion, the roof top decks of the original proposal have morphed into third floor terraces with the same potential for overlook to the condo to the north and continue to pave the way for other intrusive decks in future development.

It was generally expressed that the development as proposed does not address the objectives of OCP DPA 7B (Heritage Corridors), to

- 4 (a) improve the pedestrian experience
- (b) conserve the features and characteristics of this area
- (c) achieve a more cohesive design, and enhance appearance ... responsive to its historic context through sensitive and innovative interventions.

Blasting, soil disruption and drainage are problems, including the potential for damages to adjacent and historic properties farther away. Perhaps the blasting should be overseen by a professional engineer, as in West Vancouver, where this appears to have significantly reduced property damage. The issue of blasting and the survival of the few remaining protected trees was again raised, and a blasting plan that takes them into consideration was promised. The neighbours received assurance that storm water management will be addressed on site and it is important that this be followed up with diligence.

While an affordable housing component has now been promised, there was displeasure that it did not specifically address additional housing in the immediate neighborhood.

Again, the traffic impact of a vehicular influx from 90+ home owners was raised. This development is considered to be a precursor of development along the Fort Street corridor, yet the question of the cumulative effect of density has not been adequately considered. The City's claim that the traffic on Fort Street is decreasing was greeted with skepticism.

There remains considerable anger that significant trees, Sequoia, Beech and English Oak, with historic attributes will be destroyed to accommodate the proposed density. In this latest proposal, yet another iconic Garry Oak is being removed.

This proposal received criticism equal to the first. As one contributor summarized, “There are no benefits or major enhancements in this plan, and the quiet liveable community would be changed forever.” Another asked what compromises Abstract had made for the community. Another said, “We don’t want more tweaks, but a total re-think.” And yet another: “You have externalized the cost to the community and internalized the benefits for yourself.”

There was negligible neighbourhood support for the project Abstract Developments currently proposes. In view of the fact work on Rockland’s LAP was slated to begin this fall, now is clearly not the time to be considering such extraordinary deviations from the existing zoning.

Sincerely,

Janet Simpson, President

**NOTES FROM CALUC MEETING TO DISCUSS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT  
1201 FORT STREET (formerly the Truth Centre)**

7:30 pm, 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2017, Grace Lutheran Church, Fort Street

**Bob June** (Chair, Rockland Neighbourhood Association Land Use Committee) welcomed those present, and thanked them for coming. He noted that input from renters as well as owners was most welcome, and apologized for the fact that the Feedback Form only mentioned owners and not renters – this will be corrected. He briefly explained that this meeting was part of the CALUC process that all proposals have to go through when there is an application for rezoning. This is the second CALUC meeting for this property, as the initial application was sent back to the proponent by the Council's Committee of the Whole (CotW) after review. Because some changes were made, the revised proposal must be put before this CALUC community meeting before it can go back to the CotW for review. The purpose of the meeting is to facilitate dialogue between the applicant and the community, within the context of the Official Community Plan (OCP) and the Rockland Neighbourhood Plan. The meeting should focus on Land Use, rather than other things (e.g. paint colour).

Notes from this meeting will be submitted by the Rockland Neighbourhood Association (RNA) to the City, and the RNA will also submit a letter with its comments on the proposal. After the revised proposal has been reviewed by the CotW, it may be sent back to the applicant for further revision, or it may go forward to the City Council, at which time a Public Hearing will be held. (Videos of previous CotW and Council meetings are available on the City's website.)

Bob introduced **Mike Miller** from Abstract, and noted that **Alec Johnson**, Senior Planner from the City Planning Dept., was present to answer questions.

**Mike Miller** (CEO of Abstract) introduced his team, including the architects, landscape architect, and arborist. He explained that Abstract had been contacted by a realtor about the property in 2015, and signed a contract for the purchase of the property in 2016. He noted that this is the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting with members of the community, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> CALUC meeting.

**Greg Damant** (Cascadia Architects) gave a presentation of the proposal, focusing on the changes which had been made in the revisions to the proposal made in response to the feedback received from the community and the CotW in April. He noted that the things that remained the same were: working within the context of the OCP; valuing the trees on the site and trying to work around them; blending the allowable FSR across the site, pushing the higher density to the north; and keeping the 'pathway' across the site for people walking to and from downtown.

The significant changes were listed as:

- Number of townhouses reduced from 12 to 10;
- The townhouses have been given a more "Arts and Crafts" look (compared with previous design which was similar to the townhouses on Carberry Gardens);
- The 6-storey condo building has been pushed further north and re-shaped – it therefore has more of a presence on Fort Street;



- The second condo building, previously 5-storeys, has been reduced to 4-storeys, and these are stepped back at the southern end;
- The multi-unit buildings will now be faced in brick;
- The re-arrangement involves taking down one more mature tree, though many new trees will be planted (this is a requirement resulting from taking down existing trees);
- The natural water flow patterns will be maintained.
- Enhanced lighting will maintain the walkway as safe and pleasant at night.

#### QUESTIONS/COMMENTS/ANSWERS:

##### **Pat Kidd (1025 Moss)**

- Q: The catastrophic floods in Houston remind us what happens if we cover the ground in concrete. With climate change, we can expect major water events, and the water table will shift, making flooding of basements more likely.
- A: (Scott Murdoch - Landscape architect) We have a water management plan in place. We will have 2 ft. of absorbent soil, and the rain garden will take water from the roofing. We will be in compliance with the City's guidelines on this. We will also be using permeable pavement in places in order to protect the trees.

##### **Anna Cal (1059 Pentrelew)**

- Q: There will be cosmetic changes – are they enforceable? At Black and White it was approved looking one way; it is being built looking another way.
- A: They are enforceable. At Black and White the development permit expired – changes were made under a new permit.
- Q: Was there a community meeting for the new permit?
- A: No - because there were no variances, no community input was required for the change in appearance.
- Q: The 4-storey building will be higher than average 4-storey buildings in the area – why?
- A: We are building with 9 ft ceilings rather than the old standard 8 ft ceilings – it is the market standard, it is more liveable, gracious and certainly more saleable.
- Q: The 'revised' townhouses are taller than those in the original plan – why?
- A: (Kathleen from Zebra) They are higher because of the changed design of the roof to pick up on the more traditional rooflines in the Rockland neighbourhood.
- Q: If the buildings were – say -20% lower would the trees on the property suffer at all?
- A: No.
- Q: We have a 3-D model of the project. Why doesn't Abstract provide this?
- A: Because we don't do 3-D models at this stage.

##### **Barry Mayhew (1149 Rockland Avenue)**

- Q: Parking is an important issue. How many units will there be and how many parking spaces?

A: There will be 94 units, and 121 parking spaces, giving a ratio of 1.28.

**Ian Sutton (3-1262 Rockland Avenue)**

Q: Would like to know more about affordable housing in relation to this project.

A: (Sam Ganong) Abstract has made a commitment to affordable housing, and will provide 10 units of affordable housing in Victoria (not on this site) before this project is completed. These will have capped rents.

Q: Since you will be planting new trees, do you have a plan for watering?

A: There will be an irrigation system, plus 2 feet of soil. There will be some trees on the roof deck.

Q: Is there a maintenance plan for new trees?

A: (Mike Miller) If new trees that have been planted as part of the tree replacement requirements do not survive, then they have to be replaced. The City of Victoria requires a landscape bond for two years.

**Chris Douglas (1025 Pentrelew Place)**

Comment: The project is no smaller than before, as our comments had requested. There have been no substantive changes in response to comments. We have prepared a comparison sheet (circulated and attached) with respect to height, scale and setbacks which shows that there have been minimal changes and several issues have been made worse rather than better. For 18 months, the neighbours and members of the community have asked Mike Miller for a smaller project. This asking included a petition letter.

Q: Did Mike Miller actually read the letter submitted that had 300 signatures?

A: Yes

Q: What are the three words in Abstract's mission statement?

A: Passion, Quality, Integrity

Comment: Does this strike you as integrity that you don't listen to over 300 neighbours who ask over and over for a smaller development? (Clapping.) Greed does not go with Integrity.

[Speaker told that such personal attacks are not appropriate.]

**Don Cal (1059 Pentrelew)**

Q: How long is the commitment to 10 affordable units?

A: In perpetuity. If we do not keep the commitment, there is a penalty. It's written in perpetuity as a housing agreement; the agreement has not been drafted yet. The units must be at this site or at another site or there is cash in lieu.

Q: What happens if you or your company are no longer here. How do you guarantee your commitment? Why not have the affordable units on site? This would ensure the affordable housing is paid for.

A: The voluntary contribution of the affordable housing document has not been drafted, nor have the details been worked out, but the intent has been put forward and is being



negotiated by Abstract and city staff. The city will have this in writing before it approves the project.

Q: How many trees will be in planters?

A: Five

Q: The rest of the trees will be planted in about two feet of soil – how many will be planted this way?

A: All of them.

Q: How tall can trees grow in 2 ft soil?

A: As tall as it can. It varies.

Q: Another 2-acre in Rockland site has 10 townhouses on it and has plenty of trees. Why are you trying to put 90+ units on this space? Why are you doing this when many people around the development think it should be smaller? Why not 35 units? (Clapping)

A: This is a large site – almost 2 acres. We are using the existing zoning in the OCP, but working with a “blended FSR” of 1.39:1. If we were using the density we are using at the Black & White development, that would give us 300+ units on this site, so we have reduced density substantially. Our proposals are in conformity with the OCP.

**Helena Kadlec (1190 View Street)**

Q: I am concerned about traffic flow and lack of parking in the area. Has a study been done?

A: We have looked at 11 similar buildings (one with 244 units/262 parking stalls), and have found that parking is adequate.

Q: What about traffic going to and from downtown – will the City think more about this?

A: (City planner) The transportation planners have looked at this, and they feel that it is not a problem and there is no need for a traffic impact assessment. The City has been monitoring traffic on Fort Street and found that it is decreasing. (Laughter!)

**Jamie Hall (1024 Pentrelew)**

Comment: I know Mike Miller and do not think his integrity should be questioned. This is an appropriate site for increased density.

**Gordon McAllister (1301 Rockland Avenue) (2 threads in Gordon’s comments are identified by number below)**

Q: (1) There is a lot of confusion about what the OCP allows and what the Neighbourhood Plan would allow. There is the overarching Official Community Plan but we have yet to do the local area plan that provides a vision for what’s appropriate in the village. We should be focusing on the Neighbourhood Plan. There is a Rockland Neighbourhood Plan that is 30 years old. A new Local Area Plan should be updated before a development such as this takes place. We have been asking for a new Plan for 15 years. The development wants to make a change to the OCP but it ignores the Rockland Plan (old as it is).

(2) The city has said that the move to high density will preserve Victoria’s traditional single-family neighbourhoods “untouched and intact”. That is, land that is zoned R1-A

and R1-B. We understand the benefits of density concentrations, but the land in question is an "R1-A" and R1-B" area.

Comment: (from RNA for clarification): The question is: How are we moving ahead (1) when we don't have a local area plan and (2) when the city has said a neighbourhood such as Rockland should remain intact.

A: (from RNA) Unfortunately, the local area plan was not done in advance of the current development. The point is very well taken – it would be nice to have completed a local plan that was part of the legislated process. Unfortunately, we're working now in an environment that isn't that way. A local area plan for Rockland will be developed soon – everyone is strongly encouraged to contribute its development.

Comment (from Gordon): The way to design an administrative system is from the top down and include links to every subsystem. We haven't done this. Furthermore, the system is being developed sequentially for different parts of the city – this makes no sense.

Comment (from RNA) You're right. However, today we're constrained to work within system currently in place.

**Nancy McGregor (103-1070 Moss Street)**

Q: Acknowledgement of meeting being held on Songhees and Esquimalt land. Concerned about *affordable housing*, especially as 55% of Rockland residents are renters. I do not consider it appropriate to have the affordable housing component of this housing elsewhere. What would it cost to have it on site?

Q: Also concerned about *trees*, and the fact this is a "Heritage corridor". The Sequoia trees you want to take down are as old as the City itself and were brought and planted by Mr. Green (in the 1860s). There are only 12 Sequoias in Rockland, and the two at 1201 Fort are healthy. You also want to take down Tree #0042, which is the second oldest Garry Oak. These trees are of historic value, and the first Governor General planted some of these trees. Buildings A and B wipe out part of the urban forest – why don't you consider the importance of these trees? In your early proposal, you say you were trying to preserve the forest but because of the city's input you decided you really have to build closer to Fort Street and therefore you have to cut down the second largest Gary Oak – I find it incredible that you reached this decision. I think you're ignoring your neighbour's opposition to the size of this development and you're redirecting attention to where the development occurs. In the process, you will destroy trees that are historical and significant. Why doesn't it occur to you that the trees are more important than your unaffordable condominiums?

Q: Having underground parking also necessitates the cutting down of trees. We're facing global warming. With this happening, does it seem reasonable to cut down the existing forest and put in parking for over 100 cars? (Clapping)

A: We have looked carefully at the placement and health of the trees on site. The primary clusters of trees at the North East and North-West corners of the site will be kept. We are aware that we cannot build on the critical root zone. We cannot develop the core of the site without removing the Sequoias.

A: Re. affordable housing – this is not a fixed part of the process. The agreement <to provide affordable housing> has not been finalized, there is no foregone conclusion of this



voluntary process and it's not part of the rezoning mechanism. The prices of the units on the site will be approx. \$450-500 K for a one-bedroom (700 sq. ft.); \$550-600 K for a two bedroom; \$800-900 K for two-bedroom plus den; prices have not been set for the townhouses.

**Lynnette Kissoon (1025 Pentrelew Place)**

Comment: Jamie Hall did not explain his relationship with Mike Miller. And calling people out on their statements is not disrespectful.

Q: How many trees were removed for the construction of the Black & White building?

A: No trees were removed. Ok - One tree was removed from the site.

Comment: (audience) And seven boulevard trees were removed.

Q: With respect to Black and White you said the development permit expired and with the new permit a new design came about. I understand you have a development permit already for 1201 Fort Street. As of January 2017, is it correct that you have a development or a demolition permit?

A: That is incorrect.

Q: The blasting for the Black & White building was for two levels of parking, and was very disturbing for those in the vicinity, even on Pentrelew. The warning whistles were not properly used. How many people will be affected by the blasting at 1201 Fort?

A: The blasting contractor is required to contact everyone within a set radius, and we can request that they contact others who are concerned.

Comment: (1) The blasting will impact the condition of homes in the vicinity and the health of the members in the neighbourhood.

(2) We see the Abstract proposals in various forms, but we never see them in the community context, which is a problem. Are you building to fit into the community or is it just your own community you're developing? (clapping)

**Laura-Beth Trail (102-1220 Fort Street)**

Q: Also concerned about blasting. When the condo building at Fort and Pentrelew was constructed, much damage was done to the foundation of our building.

A: The blasting contractor will deal with any damage done, and has to cover the cost of any damage (has insurance). Abstract has done about 75 projects since 1994, approximately 15 of which involved blasting, and has never had any problem with blasting damage. (There have been some claims, but Abstract's contractor was found not to be at fault.)

**Bob June (1310 Manor Road)**

Q: What about Heritage buildings in the enlarged geographic area? Because of the heritage nature of their building, can they be included in the pre-blasting survey?

A: Not officially. However, if those who are concerned reach out to our office we have a specific file that documents these anomalies and we're happy to put forward a letter of undertaking that will involve them at the time of blasting.

**Sally Hamilton (1020 Pentrelew)**

**Statement:** I have been a resident of 1020 Pentrelew for 46 years. I am not opposed to the development of the former Truth Centre, even though we face several years of disruption from construction. However, I continue to protest this project's scale, mass, height, lack of setbacks, disregard for heritage design, reduction of green space and tree canopy. We must address conservation issues, and the proposed development is not consistent with what has been in the neighbourhood for at least 100 years, and this is not reasonable. There are *no* benefits or major enhancements in this plan, and the quiet liveable community will be forever changed. This is in direct contrast to the OCP Strategic directions, 21.24.4, for Rockland that states, "Continue to conserve the historic architectural and landscape character of the neighbourhood". Abstract has used the OCP guidelines very selectively. Specifically, Pentrelew Place has a 'Traditional Residential' designation which states (6.1.5.) "Ground oriented buildings up to 2 storeys (duplexes), multi-unit building up to 3 storeys" – yet Building B is planned for 4 storeys. Is this the beginning of escalating development throughout Rockland? The developer was aware of the zoning when he purchased the property – why should he circumvent the rules? Mayor Helps has said that we have the OCP for a reason. Let it continue to be our guide. (clapping)

**Chris Barnes (808 St. Charles Street)**

**Comment:** We all know what Rockland is and that it has an important heritage value – the applause and the 300 signatures, etc. represent the view of the population of Rockland. This area has heritage value within the city of Victoria. This proposal is an abomination and completely out of character. The first CALUC meeting was a catastrophe, the venue was inadequate, people were locked out of the meeting, and some had to go home because it was so cold. That meeting worked only partially. At this second CALUC meeting the city has requested that the developer address the concerns raised. You have addressed some points, but they are only cosmetic. The real issues of massing, scale, height, etc. have not changed much since the original proposal was presented. The applicant has not addressed the central issues raised repeatedly by the community and the City, and has not made adequate changes. It is clear from the applause that these are important issues for the community concerned – this is too big a project for a very special place. You've gambled that you can change the zoning to get the return on your investment you want. You think do this by coming to these meetings and saying 94 units is great for Rockland – but it just isn't. (clapping)

**Comment:** (Bob) Is it fair to say you're addressing me on this and you'd like what you have to say reflected in the synopsis sent to council?

**Comment:** (Chris) When one writes up a summary of a meeting like this there are many points that range from small to moderate to more significant. There is a danger that we'll miss the central issue that the project is too big.

**Comment:** (Bob) I'll try to do this in the synopsis – first reflect the global view then include the various concerns.



**Kam Lidder (1252 Wilspencer)**

Q: You will be blasting in Garry Oak meadows, which may cause damage to the trees?

A: (Landscape) We have had success with this in previous projects.

Q: Were you asked to look at retaining the Sequoias?

A: There was no option to keep the Sequoias.

Q: The original proposal included two large buildings, and the revised proposal also includes two large buildings. They may be architecturally better than the originals, but what are the compromises you have made for the community?

A: The fundamentals have stayed the same. We are concerned about trees and that sets the parameter for development. The OCP notes where additional density is needed, and we are using that guideline. We are only allowed to bring traffic in and out on Fort Street, and we have not put a multi-storey building on Pentrelew. We have tried to push the density further north towards Fort, and have reduced the height of the southern condo building. We have many constraints and we have to arrive at a balance.

Comment: You haven't taken our issue of a family-friendly environment on board. You are putting affordable housing elsewhere, which is not satisfactory. Which community are you building for? Some of your purchasers will be 'downsizers' (60%), and about 40% will be people from elsewhere or people who will rent out their property.

Q: You are asking to rezone a church property to residential with considerable density. Why are you not able to redesign this project to respond to our needs for affordability, etc.?

A: We are providing units of from 700 sq. ft. to 1,300 sq. ft., so we are providing many housing types.

**Gerry Houlden (405-1220 Fort) (family name indistinct)**

Comment: I live on Fort, right opposite 1201, and I am totally opposed to a 6-storey building. This is not acceptable to people in the area, it is uncharacteristic, it is out of the roofline on the street, and it is adding far too much density to the area. (clapping)

**Ian Sutton (3-1262 Rockland Avenue)**

Q: Will there be an opportunity for feedback after the affordable housing agreement is made?

A: No. This is something that is negotiated with the City at the staff level.

Q: What if you had a 4-storey building on Fort and 3-storeys for the southern condo building?

A: In calculating density, we have looked at existing zoning and the OCP's guidelines on how the city should grow by increasing density in certain locations.

Comment: It is very difficult for young people to find affordable rental housing in the area, and there needs to be a compromise to address this.

**Jamie Hammond (1000 Pentrelew)**



- Q: I would like to know more about what you are thinking? Your concept does *not* match what the OCP says. The 6-storey building is higher than what was proposed Cook Street, and that is an 'urban village' – this area is not an urban village. We do not want any more tweaks to the proposal. We're neighbours, we own properties together, we respect each other, yet here we are again. You *must* re-think it.
- A: The 6-storey building is on Fort Street, and the 4-storey building is pulled away at the southern end; thus the higher massing is close to Fort Street, adjacent to 4-storey buildings.

**Don Hamilton (1020 Pentrelew)**

- Q: The statement made by the Committee of the Whole in response to your initial proposal focused on scale, massing, height, architectural expression, etc., and suggested that a revised proposal should provide more 'breathing room'. However, the townhouses presented in the revised plan are even bigger than before. You mention apartment buildings on Linden, but *this* side of Linden is Rockland – the other side is not! The calls for revisions from the City have *not* been addressed. More specifically, the set-backs for the townhouses are not sufficient, and are zero where the cars park as if set-backs don't exist – 6" is embarrassing! And the paths are too close to the patios, creating a lack of privacy. (clapping)
- A: The set-backs are the result of the way the City calculates set-backs – they are actually larger than required.

**Anna Cal (1054 Pentrelew Place)**

- Q: The set-backs are too small and the townhouses do not have sufficient space. They will dwarf everything nearby. The variances requested for a property of this significance could only be justified for the construction of a world heritage class building (comparison made with a Gaudi site in Barcelona that has World Heritage status).
- A: We can show you the measurements, and you can look at the townhouses on Carberry Gardens. Anything in the Heritage Corridor has to go through the Heritage Advisory Committee.

**Doreen Mueller (1301 Rockland Avenue)**

Statement: I support Sally Hamilton's statement. I am the steward of the two Sequoias that may be 140 years old. Your proposal is monstrous! It is very difficult to plant Garry Oaks, and they take a very long time to grow. I do not think that we will get changes from Abstract, so we look to the city. Otherwise, we're not going to get anything that is anywhere near what should be. Furthermore, the bargain of 10 affordable housing units for this massive development is not adequate. And the affordable housing should be built in our district, not somewhere else. I oppose the project. (clapping)

**Don Cal (1054 Pentrelew Place)**

- Q: Why are you developing 94 units? Your previous answer, in simple English, seemed to be that someone else "at the office" forced you to do this. There is no reason to try to squeeze so much on this site, that is the gateway to Rockland. Why are you externalizing the costs onto the community, and internalizing the benefits to yourself? You are stealing the space that is a community amenity in our neighbourhood, a place that has operated as a park for over 40 years. Every other house now has space around it; every four-storey condominium and apartment has adequate setbacks with landscaping and trees. You take it all and expect the community to make do. What was once considered a part of civilization – the way one fits in with one's neighbours, a cost that every other developer bore – you refuse to bear. You refuse to bear the real costs and are taking away our space. If you would build modestly, there would not be this issue. (clapping)
- A: We are not externalizing the costs – we are doing our job as community developers. We buy land and look at how that land can be redeveloped. I hope that answers your question.
- Q: (from Don to audience) does that answer the question?
- A: (from members of audience) No
- Comment: (Don) That's community involvement.
- Comment: (Mike Miller) Bob, could you clarify the question.
- Comment: (Bob) I think is philosophical. It is outside what's supposed to be covered in the meeting. I understand the idea. The parties are at loggerheads.
- Comment: (Don) It's about zoning. I don't think the zoning should be changed to take away our space.
- Q: You are taking set-back space from neighbours, and this is taking amenities away. Why does Abstract think he has the right to take this away? (clapping)
- A: (RNA) This is a request for a rezoning, and we have to go through this process.

**Kam Lidder (1252 Wilspencer Place)**

- Q: We continue to be concerned about the height of the townhouses, and the information presented on their height is not correct.
- A: (Zebra) We have tried to mitigate the massing, and the building height has not changed. The calculations have to take into account the change in grade. The height is related to trying to hide the elevator over-run.
- Q: You have eliminated rooftop decks, but have now included a walkout terrace – what is the difference?
- A: We have done similar project at View Royal and Selkirk which have worked well.
- Q: Why compare Rockland with View Royal and Selkirk? You should be looking at Rockland.
- A: (architect) We have to look at what the client wants. This property is on the periphery of Rockland and is on a traffic artery, so it is an ideal place to increase density. This is an appropriate site for what we are proposing. The density will still be relatively low. The City needs some renewal and infill.

**Lynnette Kissoon (1025 Pentrelew Place)**



Comment: The OCP was published in 2012 with input from about 6,000 people. There are many instances (33 instances) where you are not complying with the OCP.

Q: Has the 1201 Fort property declined in value since you bought it?

A: Probably not.

Q: Would you consider selling the property who would respect the neighbourhood, the comments provided by the mayor and council, and respect the community's input?

A: I think that is a loaded question – in my business I take those things into consideration. We are not considering selling the property. We have a difference of opinion. ~~on the~~  
OCP.

**Gordon McAllister (1301 Rockland Avenue)**

Comment: A neighbour has done a legal analysis (referencing the Bondi case in the supreme court of Canada), which shows that spot re-zoning is discriminatory and will not be supported in the courts.

Comment: That's a great thing to bring to the local area planning committee.

Bob June was congratulated on running a very good meeting. (clapping)