

City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC, V8W 1P6

Mayor Lisa Helps and Council,

Re: Development Permit with Variance
DVP 000004 1421 Fairfield Road

Your Worship

We are the owners of a bare land strata property located at 240 Moss Rock Place, directly opposite the proposed development property.

The applicant, Moss Rock Developments have been in consultation with us over the past year and have provided conceptual drawings of the proposed development and houses.

We are in favor of the proposed development and have no objection to the requested variances.

We are supportive of the concept that the proposed development property should become part of the existing strata property.

We urge you and your Councillors to support and approve this development proposal and the requested variances in order that what is currently a vacant lot can be developed into attractive residential properties.

Yours truly,



Kane Scott



Heather Robson

Pamela Martin

From: Sandra Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 12:57 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: DVP00004-1421 Fairfield-Sept.08

September 06, 2016

To: City of Victoria Council

Re: Development Permit with Variances Application No. 00004, 1421 Fairfield Road

I ask that you reject this permit being considered by Council on September 08 for the following five reasons:

1. **Notification:** We are within 100 metres of the proposed development and have not been notified by letter. We are directly affected by both viewscape and increased traffic and parking. We are particularly concerned about the effect on the neighbourhood.
2. **No public consultation:** While public consultation is optional, this is 2016. Although Jane Jacobs died 10 years ago, surely we have not forgotten her concept of community.
3. **Density:** The proposed development is the antithesis of the conditions established for DPA 15B, as shown below:

DPA 15B: INTENSIVE RESIDENTIAL – PANHANDLE LOT

...3. The special conditions that justify this designation are: (a) Victoria's Traditional Residential areas are primarily characterized by low density single-family dwellings, some on relatively large lots with ample green space. (b) These neighbourhoods each have a unique sense of place, traditional lot configuration, consistent pattern of building placement oriented towards the adjoining streets, and consistent pattern of building separation. (c) Subdivision of land into panhandle lot configurations within these Traditional Residential areas create a more intensive use than anticipated and a non-traditional housing pattern that may result in negative impacts to neighbourhood character and create privacy issues.

The proposals' increased density is unacceptable. We specifically object to the 2-storey exemption – the tripling of single family dwellings is enough without doubling the height. We object to the secondary suite – that's 4 homes where one used to be. What community amenities are being offered in exchange for tripling or quadrupling (with the secondary suite) the density?

1. **Heritage trees and screening:** The poplar on the lot to the west of the subject property is an iconic marker of this area and a joy at every season. This development will likely affect this and other trees. The proposed relaxation of the front yard setback on Lot F does not allow for adequate landscape screening.
2. **Traffic and parking** are a continuous problem in this block of Fairfield. Have the sight lines been checked for access/egress out of the private road for westbound traffic coming around the corner from Moss Street? Could a parking and traffic study be done to address neighbourhood concerns? Could four more off-street parking spaces be provided to compensate for the increased density?

Thank you for giving serious consideration to our concerns.

Sandra and Peter Smith
1436 Fairfield Road, Victoria, BC, V8S 1E5 (Please obscure email address)

Pamela Martin

From: Maria Abbott [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2016 7:59 AM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Re: Variances Application No. 00004

To whom this will concern:

As being immediately affected by the changes demanded by the developer, I will state here that I object to the request of all the variances, height and foot print.

I am the owner of 311 Masters Road. This is the property above 1421 Fairfield Road. ABOVE is the important word here. The land, Moss Rocks, falls steeply from Masters Road to Fairfield Road. The houses will affect the view, privacy and air circulation and make this corner a dark and damp place.

I went to City Hall to look at the plans and to match them visually with the words used in the application. The houses on the plans are VERY big. They reach into the sky and as shown, will cut out light and circulation of air above and on the ground. The plans appear to belie the implications of the description, of the words. When speaking of increasing the number of storeys from 1 to 2, the fact that the basements are above ground is not said. And how high are the ceilings of those storeys. To state again, the roofs reach into the sky and will throw my property to a large degree into darkness since the plans show that there is very little space left between our properties and the houses below as well.

As to foot print, the plans show that all land is pretty much taken up. What will be left, is hardly worth mentioning. It felt like deception when I read that the coverage for Lot E, for instance goes from 25% to 27.4%. The important information, of how large in percentages within the whole property is lot E. If it is 30% of the whole, the increase from 25% to 27.4% is very great.

As confirmed by the Underground section of Public Works, there is a Right of Way along the whole property, therefore the set back close to that strip should stay as legally stated in the Bye laws. There might be repairs and maintenance and there is little land left as is. (Legal contract on file at City Hall.)

My comments: To the ordinary citizen of Victoria such houses are simply a riddle. What is the purpose of them? They will not ease the housing shortage that we daily read about. They will be so big that they may, as are the houses opposite them, constantly changing hands or, while being owned by someone, will be little lived in. Such large houses, while fashionable are visually changing the picture which Fairfield is. They also change the landscapes and and hinder what little wild life there still may be. I put some hope into the remark our Mayor made recently, when she said that this city governs for the good of the majority not the EXCEPTIONS.

Thank you for your attention.

M. K. Abbott