

Dear Mayor and Council,

October 22, 2017

At the September 12th, 2017 Community Meeting where Abstract Development showcased its "substantially updated proposal" for [1201 Fort Street](#), it became very clear very quickly, that the developer and his paid staff do not listen.

At the April 6th, 2017 Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss Abstract's initial proposal, Mayor and Council discussed the proposal at length, sent it back to Planning to work with Abstract on addressing concerns expressed by the Committee. Below is a summary of those concerns - the X's indicate where Abstract did not address your concerns in the updated proposal:

Person/group	Concern	X/✓
<b>Mayor Helps</b>		
	The Pemberton Crease walkway	✓
	Fulfill need for development to meet the expected rise in residents over 65	?
	Affordable housing – CRD initiative	X
	The number one priority in this city now is affordable housing so any extra density we get should go toward affordable housing	X
	This affordable ownership responsibility is taken very seriously over at the region and there is excitement across the region which is good	X
	Creative ways to make this a livable city for working families	X
<b>Councilor Madoff</b>		
	Heritage corridor and development that reflects the neighbourhood characteristics	X
	Architectural expression	X
	A Rockland responsive design	X
	Local area plan and whether those designs meet aspirational goals	X
	Application is inconsistent with the OCP and DP7	X
	Include heritage report in the proposal	X
<b>Councilor Loveday</b>		
	No single family dwellings on the site	✓
	Make more affordable housing	X
	Garry Oaks may not survive the blasting	X
	Inclusionary housing	X
	Creative ways to ensure affordability – lots of development in the city that people cannot afford	X
	Applicant has considered affordability but has chosen not to apply it here	✓
	There are a number of options that can be pursued	X
	Make this housing boom one that everyone can benefit from	X

<b>Councilor Isitt</b>		
	Is rezoning necessary; affordable homes	<b>X</b>
	What is appropriate for the site	<b>X</b>
	Concerned with density, massing, height, set backs	<b>X</b>
	Does not favour ground oriented on Fort but asks what is appropriate for the south portion	<b>X</b>
	Region does not need buildings with the price point proposed	<b>X</b>
	Substantial degree of affordable housing on the south lot	<b>X</b>
<b>Councilor Thornton-Joe</b>		
	Concerned with the removal of sequoias	<b>X</b>
	Concerned by the height of townhouses	<b>X</b>
	Breathing room for townhomes so it is not a wall	<b>X</b>
	Parking and cars coming off of Fort street – Traffic study	<b>X</b>
	Remains on the property	<b>?</b>
	Combined zone standard not so far as OCP will allow	<b>X</b>
<b>Councilor Alto</b>		
	Wants more design diversity	<b>X</b>
	Current zoning means taking down all of the trees, a big building on Fort, smaller homes south	<b>X</b>
	Retain as much of the greenspace as possible as city becomes more densified	<b>X</b>
	Refer to p. 4 of the development report	<b>X</b>
	Get specific on number of units for affordability so that applicant can meet the standard	<b>X</b>
<b>Councilor Coleman</b>		
	Angle townhomes to get a better relationship and improve breathability	<b>X</b>
	Moving forward not everyone will be happy but it will achieve required density	<b>X</b>
<b>Councilor Lucas</b>		
	Segment that's shifting and moving	<b>X</b>
<b>Alison Meyer</b>		
	Abstract's reasons for OCP amendment is to shift density and increase it beyond what R1B zoning allows	<b>X</b>
<b>Concerned residents</b>		
	Proposed development is for inappropriate special site and Rockland	<b>X</b>
	Stick to the current zoning and to the current urban place designations in the OCP	<b>X</b>
	Preserve greenspace and as many trees as possible; protect the urban forest	<b>X</b>
	Stop over development; respect neighbourhoods	<b>X</b>
	Damaging effects of blasting to trees, on and off site; to nearby homes in Rockland and on Linden; to heritage homes in Fernwood and Rockland	<b>X</b>
	Requested a traffic study because of concern about traffic flow and increased cars due to the development	<b>X</b>

If you say yes to this proposal, you are saying that it is okay if Abstract does not listen to your concerns and that your concerns do not matter. I believe they do. I also believe you listen to us and that our concerns matter to you.

I ask that you once again listen to us, the concerned neighbours and community, and send the developer back to address **all** of the outstanding issues you presented in April 2017.

Please do not approve this proposal.

Thank you,

Lynnette M. Kissoon