

Lacey Maxwell

From: Harry Swain [REDACTED]
Sent: December 7, 2017 9:56 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: 1201 Fort

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

I write in support of the current proposal for 1201 Fort Street, by Abstract Developments. My reasoning is as follows:

- There has been a complete redesign in response to the neighbourhood consultations of 2016
- The curvilinear façade of the main building and the pathway through the project seem to me to be aesthetically a great improvement
- The smaller number of units, especially on the Pentrelew side, together with the gabled roofs, make the project's south side fit better with the neighbourhood
- The north side of the property should, as proposed, be multi-story, consistent with the OCP and with buildings already along the street
- This degree of densification along a major corridor connecting downtown to Oak Bay is an appropriate response to population pressures

The complaints of the near neighbours seem to me to have a high NIMBY quotient. 'We're OK in the lifeboat—now pull up the ladder.' I think the response to these complaints by the proponent are more than constructive, and that Council should approve the project. My happiness would be complete if a developer as quality-oriented as Abstract were to redevelop the eyesore at 1178 Yates.

Sincerely,
Harry Swain,
838 Pemberton Road,
Victoria V8S 3R4



December 11, 2017

Re: 1201 Fort Street/1050 Pentrelew REZ00525/DPV00035

Dear Mayor and Council:

The RNA wishes to go on record as supporting the neighbours in their continued opposition to this proposed rezoning. They are correct in that the proposed development is significantly incompatible with the OCP vision for the Fort Street Corridor, and that the infliction of profound change in the neighbourhood immediately in advance of the Rockland Local Area Planning process is inappropriate.

Although alterations have been made to the townhouse complex and some adjustment has been made on Building B to the transition to the south, fundamental issues - such as the massing of both buildings A and B - remain. A review of the Nov. 15/17 Plan Revision, South East Elevation p.10) clearly shows the unacceptable massing against the westerly skyline that will be inflicted upon the neighborhood. Six stories is an unreasonable height for the neighbourhood to be forced to absorb.

The core question remains: does a dominating bulk of six storeys fronting on Fort respond to the City's mandate to "conserve the heritage value, special character, significant historic buildings, and features and character of this area" and complement the "clusters of high quality examples of Italianate, Gothic Revival, Second Empire and Edwardian Vernacular-style houses between Cook and Ormond Street"? (OCP p.10)

The RNA continues to denounce what will inevitably be the loss of most of the mature trees on the site. This is the last significantly treed site on the Fort Street Corridor. While effort has been made to maintain a treed frontage on Fort, the removal of ten by-law protected trees and the jeopardizing of many more by blasting is unconscionable.

This proposal does not enhance the neighbourhood and should be unequivocally denied. The neighbours have put forward a reasonable compromise which includes affordable housing, respects current zoning, and allows for a fair increase in density. True citizen engagement and regard for neighbourhoods would expect that this is the way to move forward.

Sincerely,
Janet Simpson, President

Ronald Bell / Alison Heldman
1005 Pentrelew Place
Victoria, B.C.
V8V-4J5

December 10, 2017

Via Email

City of Victoria

Attention: Mayor Helps and Council

**Re: Abstract Developments Proposal - 1201 Fort Street and
1050 Pentrelew Place (the "Proposal")**

This is our third letter to you indicating our unequivocal opposition to the Proposal. We understand that the Committee of the Whole will receive the third report on 1201 Fort/1050 Pentrelew Proposal on December 14, 2017.

In our view the changes to the Proposal are so insignificant that the Proposal can be said to be substantially the same as the last two times it was presented and rejected by the Committee of the Whole.

So what more can be said when the Proposal remains entirely incompatible with the site, the neighbourhood, the Official Community Plan, and the zoning?

First, as per our October 24, 2017 letter, you cannot approve the Proposal. No reasonable basis (e.g., need, hardship, or new overriding consideration) for approving the massive over-development has been demonstrated. Acting properly in discharging your "duty" to the community at large requires you to reject the Proposal. It would be patently unreasonable for the Council to approve the Proposal.

Second, various adverse consequences would flow from approving the Proposal:

- (a) You will be making a decision to destroy the neighborhood.
- (b) You will aggravate the affordable housing problem by adding more high-end real estate product that will fuel the speculative investment market bubble (and make housing more un-affordable).
- (c) You will encourage developers to continue to ignore the Official Community Plan (a moral hazard which already seems to have taken root).
- (d) You will perpetuate a development process in which the burden is misplaced. In the current situation the burden seems to have been placed on the citizens to demonstrate why the Proposal is non-compliant and

unjustifiable. Surely, it must be the case that the developer should bear the burden of showing why the existing planning decisions reflected in the Official Community Plan warrant modification. (This has not been the process we have observed).

Third, we are also aware of a number of very thoughtful communications sent to you that detail the ongoing concerns, problems, and deficits of the Proposal. All of these make a persuasive argument against the Project.

Fourth, there have been various "wedge" issues, and other spurious concerns raised. We say that the Council must focus on the Proposal itself; and, when that is done the absence of any reasonable basis for the long list of variances can only lead to the Proposal being rejected.

Fifth, there is a reasonable development solution within the current zoning: a strata building along the Fort Street (where the zoning allows 4-storeys), and normal residential structures on the balance of the site. The Committee of the Whole should direct the developer to start with that configuration and come back with an appropriate proposal.

Conclusion

The Proposal is unsupported by any rational that can withstand even cursory analysis. This means the Official Community Plan remains the guide for the development of the properties. Your duty to the community is to prevent massive over-development which results in the destruction of neighborhoods and has the pernicious effect of increasing the real estate product for speculation and investment in residential housing (which only serves to make residential housing less affordable).

Your duty requires you to say "no" to the Proposal.

Respectfully,



Alison Heldman



Ronald L. Bell