

Dear Mayor, council and staff,



We are once again writing to you with regard to the development variances proposed by Aragon at 429 Lampson St. sites A and B. To be clear, we are very much opposed to all of the variances requested by Aragon.

**Site A (7)(a)** - The variance at Site A doesn't say how much they want to increase their footprint, it doesn't say how close to the property line the previous wing was or how close to the property line they would like the new wing to be. Looking at the drawing it appears to be about four feet from the property line, which is far too close for the setback and an imposition to the immediate neighbours. When an old building is torn down, the new buildings need to adhere to current setbacks. Looking at the plan, I can see there is plenty of space to build their wing if they move it to the south allowing the current allowable setbacks (7.5 M as per Schedule "A" to bylaw 2809) to be met. A precedent must not be set allowing developers to place their buildings wherever they please. This proposed variance request clearly lacks important detail and should not be granted.

**Site B (17)(a)** - The variance request for a 10% increase in lot coverage is unacceptable. That would mean an additional coverage amount of something close to 16,000 square feet! Preposterous! They already have well in excess of 150,000 square feet on which to build, adhering to the currently allowed lot coverage and keeping the green space should be of a paramount concern in Esquimalt. A precedent should not be set allowing developers to take away valuable green space.

**Site B (18) (a)** - The reduction in setbacks for the allowed heights is unacceptable. As we have said in previous letters and at council meetings this development already looms large over the surrounding neighbours. To allow additional heights with reduced setbacks would be a huge imposition to all of the existing neighbours. As we have said before, they have plenty of land to build a development, there is no need to push it to the edge.

Aragon has already shown to be a most disrespectful neighbour. They have lied to the people about aspects of this development, specifically about the use of Hithergreen Park as a fire access. They said it was a "done deal" and that using the park was the only way this development would work. This was clearly untrue as they somehow managed to come up with alternate plans. They have torn down fences in our back yards and done nothing to address that. They have clear cut the property at 429 Lampson allowing runoff into people's yards in some cases causing flooding and in our case a river running down our driveway. All of these things have created stress and anger amongst the surrounding neighbours, something none of us want to feel.

Aragon continues to ask for too much with regard to this development and none of the variances requested are in the best interests of the surrounding neighbourhood, they only satisfy the developer's needs. All of these variance requests have the appearances of maximizing the size of their development at the great expense of the already established properties surrounding it. In a word, greed. Previously when Aragon asked for these variances and more, staff recommended ALL of them. This showed a blatant disregard for the people that wrote in showing opposition. Most, if not all, letters written were in opposition to the requests made by Aragon. We sincerely hope that the wishes of the residents of Esquimalt are not disregarded yet again.

Can someone tell us how Aragon came up with the population density of this property? It seems to us they used both sites A and B combined to show a lower density than allowed for site B. These properties will be 2 separate parcels, not 1.

Also, it shows on the latest drawings from Aragon that there is an accessory building behind 1032 Bewdley Ave. This accessory building is shown to be tight to the property line without the required 1.5M setback for accessory buildings.

Neil Brown and Colleen Ryan  
1032 Bewdley Ave.



(Our backyard looking south over the proposed development site)

**Willow Easton & Olivier Néron-Bilodeau**  
**1031 Wychbury Avenue, Esquimalt BC V9A 5K7**

**November 22, 2017**

**Mayor and Council**  
**Township of Esquimalt Municipal Hall**  
**1229 Esquimalt Road**  
**Esquimalt, BC V9A 3P1**

### **Your Worship and Council,**

My husband and I own 1031 and 1029 Wychbury Ave, a duplex which backs directly onto the proposed development site at 429 Lampson Street [English Inn]. We are opposed to the variances being requested because of the direct impact they will have on our well-being, property and our community.

We work for the provincial and federal governments and purchased this, our first home, in December 2016 as a place to start our family (I am currently 39 weeks pregnant) and to have a large south facing backyard to grow fruit and vegetables. Our tenant, who works at a local tech company, recently moved here from Vancouver and also has a young family. They too grow produce, and are considering eventually purchasing a home in the area.

**We believe the variances to the lot line setbacks are unnecessary.** The proposed development plans show ample green space between the condo buildings – this green space could be redistributed to the perimeter of the development, thus variances [Site A (7) (a); Site B (18)(a), (18)(a)(ii), (18)(a)(iii), (18)(a)(iv); and (1)(b)&(e)] are not required. Why should council even consider a plan that infringes on existing properties, when there is obvious objection and no justification?

In 2013 council approved the density and six-storey zoning for this site based on tasteful



drawings that situated condo buildings near the centre of the property, where the impact to neighbouring properties would be minimal. We are not against development on this site, we are only asking it to be done respectfully so all Esquimalt property owners can enjoy the homes and land they have worked so hard to achieve.

**The requested variances unfairly infringe on neighbouring properties.** Lot line setback bylaws are in place to allow light between buildings and reasonable privacy amongst neighbours. Even if the developer built at the bylawed lot line setbacks, the amount of sunlight blocked by the 6-storey building would decrease the amount of light our backyard could receive from twelve months of the year to only four months (May – August).

If variance Site B(18)(a)(iii) to the Northern Lot Line setback were to be approved, which would allow an extra 5 m in height (16 m total) to building elements allowed at the 4.5 m setback, our sunlight would be perpetually blocked from the rear portion of our yard and the ability for sunlight to reach the rest of our backyard would be limited to just three months a year according to the National Research Council's Sun Angle Calculator (<https://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/services/sunrise/advanced.html>). In addition to losing sunlight September through April, the properties along Wychbury would additionally lose sunlight for all of August. As you may know, August is an essential month for families to enjoy their backyards and when vegetables and fruit need sun to ripen. Vegetables and fruit we currently grow, such as early lettuces, tomatoes, beans, cucumbers, raspberries, grapes, and figs will likely not produce and/or ripen with such a short growing season.

Not to mention the loss of quality of life of enjoying year-round sun in our own backyard. We know the sun is not out every day between September and April, but we enjoy our backyard year-round. We do not take sunlight for granted, especially in the winter months, as it does so much to lift our spirits and keep us mentally healthy.

We are also extremely "green" minded and were considering using solar energy to supplement our non-renewable electricity consumption. If permitted to block so much of our sunlight, this development takes away the option to lower our carbon footprint. Meanwhile the development itself will not be LEED certified nor make use of the ample sunlight wasted on its rooves. Green minded people flock to municipalities that encourage innovation – will Esquimalt use this opportunity to showcase long term "Smart Cities" planning?

These proposed plans to build so close to the property lines would mean the surrounding neighbours would completely lose all privacy. The proposed four and six storey buildings will be looking directly into our once private backyards. The setback bylaws are in place to limit this infringement on our properties and should be respected.

We also oppose variance Site A(7)(a) which requests an increase to the footprint of the new hotel wing, to build a 4-story building 1.2 m from our next-door neighbour's lot line. This extreme proximity should not be considered. The developer is already fortunate to have had a more than generous 3 m (2.2 m in one spot) setback approved where the previous building sat, why should they be allowed to encroach further than that on neighbouring properties?

The six properties along Wychbury that stand to lose eight months of their sunlight and all their privacy are already shouldering most of the impact and burden of this development – please do not approve these variances that will further infringe on our rights.

**If these variances were to be approved, it would set a bad precedent for development in Esquimalt.** Young families like ours pour their entire savings and much of their income into purchasing a first house. With so much invested in the purchase, families need to consider carefully how their investment will be protected. We chose Esquimalt for many reasons (the parks, ocean, recreation centres, and community) but also because we felt proud of the Township leadership, and how it represented its constituents. We felt safe that property bylaws were respected, and development planning was done with integrity.

Now, for the second time during my first pregnancy, I am faced with hours of research, writing, meetings and petitioning – all to fight for my property rights to be respected. Is this what it is like to live in Esquimalt? I and my neighbours would love to put our time and efforts into more productive aspects of our community but we are being regularly taxed with the emotional and physical burden of standing up for our rights against the continued unfair proposals being put forth for 429 Lampson Street.

As our representatives, we are asking you to stop this from being a regular burden on us. Please deny these variances and tell the developer to once and for all create plans that respect the neighbouring properties and fit the bylaws and generous zoning he has already been granted.

Sincerely,

Willow Easton & Olivier Neron-Bilodeau  
Owners, 1029/1031 Wychbury Avenue