

April 1, 2019

Dear Mayor and City Councillors,

I live around the corner from Fairfield Plaza.

I have just read the "Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres: e. Fairfield Plaza".

What this document basically means is:

The total destruction of an unobtrusive, successful, vibrant mall that had 24 important services, to which many people could walk, and where many people could park their cars to bring home bagfuls of groceries.

In this document, item viii 1 says, "Create a series of smaller store front modules..." What does this mean? **Does it mean take two loved, well used shops and make them into one large pot shop?**

A huge pot shop is certainly a service the neighbourhood young and old need. **No!**

The city council and city planners, specifically Marc Cittone and Andrea Hudson, have done little to address the Fairfield Plaza Neighbourhood Group's major concerns about the development of this plaza. The lack of trust towards the city council and city planners has increased over the past number of months, especially since a council motion from June 2018, to come up with compromises between the planners and the neighbourhood group, has basically been ignored.

With respect to development, we now have a city council that has been highly aided by developers to get elected. Developers, such as Aryze, should have no problem getting their projects approved in Fairfield. The ugly, huge Rhodo Development (that encroaches on Hollywood Park) will be approved with no changes. Another developer who has said in a meeting that he doesn't care what the neighbours think, and who has said that he is doing nothing "green" because of the expense, wants to put 8 townhouses on Kipling between Fairfield and Thurlow. **This is NOT the Fairfield corridor!** And we also have a councillor, greatly assisted by Aryze for her election, who abandons ship after not even one year of her term to get into federal politics. All this is shameful, and in some people's eyes, seemingly corrupt.

No wonder the public is so cynical and disgusted by the goings on in civic politics, and by many of the decisions made by our city council.

Sincerely,

Rita Isaac
348 Stannard Avenue

Monica Dhawan

From: Sharpe [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 8:34 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: COV Corridors Policy and Fairfield Road

[OCP DPA 7A: CORRIDORS page 217]

3. The special conditions that justify this designation include:

1. (a) Victoria contains arterial and secondary arterial streets designed to carry high volumes of both through and local traffic at moderate speeds connecting to major city and regional destinations and points of entry. These street corridors are primarily routes for goods movement, transit and emergency response, and include sidewalks for pedestrians. Some also accommodate dedicated bicycle lanes.

COV Planning Staff are presenting Fairfield Road as a Corridor in the March 2019 draft Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan. To be considered as a 'Corridor' Fairfield Road would be identified as an Arterial or Secondary Arterial street and have a primary purpose of commercial, industrial and multi-family residential use, particularly commercial.

But in fact, Fairfield Road does not qualify as a Corridor because it is rated as a Collector Street (COV Street and Traffic Bylaw) as it forms a primary route from local streets to arterials (Cook Street) and is a minor transit route and limited truck route (COV Highway Access Bylaw).

To be in accord with COV's existing policy repeated above the COTW should remove the attempt to designate Fairfield Road as a Corridor.

Sincerely,

Michael Sharpe
1592 Earle Place

Monica Dhawan

From: Sharpe <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2019 8:59 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Fairfield Plaza

OCP Figure 8 Urban Place Guidelines

Small Urban Villages

- Total floor space ratios ranging up to approximately 1.5:1.
 - Total floor space ratios up to approximately 2:1 along **arterial and secondary arterial** roads. [note that Fairfield Road is rated by the City as a **'collector'** road.]
 - Single and attached buildings up to two storeys.
- Low-rise multi-unit buildings up to approximately three storeys including rowhouses and apartments, freestanding commercial and mixed-use buildings.
- Mixed-use buildings up to approximately four storeys on **arterial and secondary arterial** roads. [note that Fairfield Road is rated by the City as a **'collector'** road.]

The COV Planning Staff are recommending 4 storeys and FSR of 2.0:1 for Fairfield Plaza in the March 2019 draft Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan. To be in accord with COV existing policy the COTW should amend the draft Plan to a maximum number of 3 storeys and FSR of 1.5:1.

The COTW does not need to prematurely gift the uplift in building height and FSR density until a proposal is presented requesting a Council decision on bonus density for affordable housing.

Sincerely,

Michael Sharpe
1592 Earle Place

April 1, 2019

Dear Mayor and City Councillors,

I live around the corner from Fairfield Plaza.

I have just read the "Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres: e. Fairfield Plaza".

What this document basically means is:

The total destruction of an unobtrusive, successful, vibrant mall that had 24 important services, to which many people could walk, and where many people could park their cars to bring home bagfuls of groceries.

In this document, item viii 1 says, "Create a series of smaller store front modules..." What does this mean? Does it mean take two loved, well used shops and make them into one large pot shop?

A huge pot shop is certainly a service the neighbourhood young and old need. No!

The city council and city planners, specifically Marc Cittone and Andrea Hudson, have done little to address the Fairfield Plaza Neighbourhood Group's major concerns about the development of this plaza. The lack of trust towards the city council and city planners has increased over the past number of months, especially since a council motion from June 2018, to come up with compromises between the planners and the neighbourhood group, has basically been ignored.

Yes, with respect to development, we now have a city council that has been highly aided by developers to get elected. Developers, such as Aryze, should have no problem getting their projects approved in Fairfield. The ugly, huge Rhodo Development (that encroaches on Hollywood Park) will be approved with no changes. Another developer who has said in a meeting that he doesn't care what the neighbours think, and who has said that he is doing nothing "green" because of the expense, wants to put 9 townhouses on Kipling between Fairfield and Thurlow. This is NOT the Fairfield corridor! And we also have a councillor, greatly assisted by Aryze for her election, who abandons ship after not even one year of her term to get into federal politics. All this is shameful, and in some people's eyes, seemingly corrupt.

No wonder the public is so cynical and disgusted by the goings on in civic politics, and by many of the decisions made by our city council.

Sincerely,

Rita Isaac
348 Stannard Avenue

Marc Cittone

From: Sean Leitenberg [REDACTED]
Sent: April 2, 2019 4:38 PM
To: Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Lisa Helps (Mayor); Geoff at Home; Geoff Young (Councillor); Sharmarke Dubow (Councillor); Laurel Collins (Councillor); Sarah Potts (Councillor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Marc Cittone; Andrea Hudson; [REDACTED]; Juan Rohon
Subject: Fairfield draft plan 5 corners reduction in number of floors means no more affordable housing

The lowering of the number of floors allowed in the Fairfield Draft plan for the 5 corners down to 3 floors when we are already zoned for 4 is to say the least unfair after passing 1303 Fairfield Rd. Then changing the draft plan. The same planners who had recommended the 1303 Fairfield be passed had already changed the draft plan to 3 storeys before approving 4 storeys for the new development. This is a fact.

This reduction of floors is the only place in the city that the density or number of floors is being reduced (aside from 1 property already zoned 6 floors and a 4.5:1 FSR). Because of all the work the city has done on 1303 Fairfield you should know that this change means it will not be viable to develop and will make it impossible to produce affordable rentals.

I was working on a plan for 20 affordable rental units on the corner. This change will make it impossible.

How come the city planners did not include a diagram of the 5 corners as they did with the other corners?

Leave the plan the way it was with 3-4 storeys and a possibility of bonus density of 2:1 which was in the plan before the last change. When I asked city staff why, they said they had opposition to the 4 storeys. They shared the data with me that shows 69% in support of 3-4 storeys.

Where is the justification for the change and if they cared about the 31% not in favour, then why recommend 1303 Fairfield?

We are zoned 4 storeys. We should be given the large urban designation and not have what we already have taken away.

You are making the creation of new affordable housing impossible. I thought city and councils direction was to create affordable housing.

Lastly this change was not recommended by council last fall and did not have a majority support from the neighbourhood this change was done solely by 2 individual city staff members.

Sincerely
Sean Leitenberg
[REDACTED]

Rob Gordon

From: Personal info <Personal info>
Sent: November 28, 2018 8:38 PM
To: Marc Cittone
Subject: Thanks for answers & a question

Marc Cittone

Thanks for answering ^{Personal}info ourselves. I do appreciate having the information.

I do have a question re the front yard setbacks "to vary from from 7.5m, where they fit into context.since . . . Does this seems to mean that the longest setback is 7.5 and it goes down sometimes. If so, to what measurement does it go down to? Does this include 0?

You see I believe that developers will argue for the least setback they can get away since "In context" is somewhat fuzzy.The would pick the least setback as example.

Sometimes seeming innocuous unclear words end up consistently "at the very least possible." I would prefer the inclusion of words on the theme of ensuring that the "real trees", able to grow large in the front as help against climate change, can be grown in the front, not just the small, tame ones in front of condos. Trees nearby also act so that air conditioning or heating may be less, so power is saved. A forest study in Ohio showed that it takes 269 saplings to replace the counter climate change effect of a mature tree.

Can you answer me on this? Is it possible to put in a condition like that?

Personal info

Rob Gordon

Subject: FW: The City needs to consult neighbours about Fairfield Small Urban Villages

From: Personal info
Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 4:23 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: Community Planning email inquiries <CommunityPlanning@victoria.ca>; Jonathan Tinney <Tinney@victoria.ca>
Subject: The City needs to consult neighbours about Fairfield Small Urban Villages

Dear Mayor and Council,

Another issue has arisen with the "Draft Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan" with regards the suggested 13.5 (4 storey) buildings in Fairfield small urban villages. An exception for rezoning individual building as OCP, Large Urban village buildings, was not included in the draft plan. This was obviously a planning oversight.

At a recent CALUC meeting on rezoning Fairfield United Church at 1303 Fairfield Rd. from a small to a large urban village in order to accommodate the new structure on a road that was not arterial there was wide scale opposition from the neighbours. There was a good attendance at the meeting (perhaps 80-100). Alex Johnston in attendance for the City and he spoke briefly about the application for why the last minute change from small to large urban village designation was appropriate (Government regulations). In any case there were about 25 speakers and about 22 were opposed with only 3 in favour. The major reason for opposition was the precedent of changing 2/3 storey to 4 storey (i.e. making an exception to the OCP for this case, which would obviously have a knock-on effect to the surrounding buildings). We also heard that a petition was circulated against allowing the development application and it already has 560 signatures. Julie Angus who circulated that petition was given 5 minutes to speak and listed about 10 major faults with the zoning variances that covered most of the bases. (You will no doubt be sent the text) by CALUC.

The draft Fairfield Plan was not at any time mentioned in the discussion by either the advocates or the opponents. However, it is obvious to me that the planners should be compelled by City Council to do a consultation with those in vicinity of the Fairfield small urban villages just as they will be doing with Cook St. Village groups. The CALUC attendance sheet and the Julie Angus' petition should provide the names of those who should be consulted as well as those in the local businesses, the school and the Fairfield United Church. Certainly all buildings in the Small Urban Villages should be restricted to a 3 storeys maximum and there should be consideration of the heritage and land mark value of the present structures and safety considerations around the nonarterial roads.

Thank you for your consideration,
Personal info

Fairfield

Personal info

Rob Gordon

Subject: FW: The Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan

From: [Personal info](#)
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 7:08 PM
To: Engagement <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: The Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan

Hi Planners,

I missed completing your survey so I will simply briefly send you my views. I live in a 5 storey condo in Fairfield. I feel very strongly that we need to give others the same opportunity of life by constructing 4-6 story Rental buildings in our neighborhood. Look at what happened in the past along Cook Street from the village and north. Now no one objects to all those rental buildings which displaced old homes; they are taken for granted; they were needed. I do not own a car and I walk all the time so I really know my surroundings. I feel disheartened when I see signs in peoples' yards expressing views against new development. I find the 'not in my back yard' attitude so arrogant, so lacking in compassion towards your fellow human beings and their needs. Fairfield is a pleasant area, but it is full of what I call "mean, little, grey, stucco bungalows of no architectural merit", probably built during the 2nd W.W. We will not lose any delight in our area by exchanging those for more dense buildings of 3-4 storeys, if the planning department has some control over the looks. I should love to see such buildings built for mixed use but built so that each apt. has wide doorways (walkers, beds etc), large bathrooms and where the elevator is sufficiently capacious to take an electric scooter, a gurney, a baby stroller and the like. There should also be a communal garden with benches and a sandpit. It is very possible to create these, and they would be suitable for both seniors and families.

I personally am not in favour of narrow town houses with many stairs and few rooms on several floors in the same dwelling. They are much harder to live in than horizontal dwellings. I hope you show courage and come forward with a plan that has much greater density; there will be opposition from the Nimby Persons but we need the density. Maybe then more people will use the public transit.

I feel sure I am unusual in my views, but I think you should hear them.

Cheers, [Personal info](#)

Rob Gordon

From: Engagement
Sent: October 1, 2018 3:48 PM
To: Personal info
Subject: RE: Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan

Good afternoon, Personal info

Thank you for contacting the City of Victoria.

I have added your email address to our Fairfield distribution list and will ensure your comments are passed along to the Community Planning Department as well.

Kind regards,

Roz Beddall
Engagement Assistant
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6



From: Personal info
Sent: September 30, 2018 9:42 AM
To: Engagement <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan

Hi,

I would like to be kept informed as this plan evolves

I live in Fairfield and this plan really seems to be well thought out and is something I could support, especially the Large and Small Urban Village concepts.

I have people knocking on my door saying it is a bad plan, but I don't see it that way and don't want a loud minority group speaking for the everyone.

Regards,
Personal info

December 26, 2018

Marc Cittone, Senior Planner
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC V8W 1P6

Dear Marc, Mayor and Council,

I understand that a review of building heights, design and density is being considered in some Core Residential blocks in the Northeastern part of Fairfield.

As you are aware the 2012 Official Community Plan and the draft 2017 Fairfield Local Area Plan support a base density of 2:1 to 3.5:1 FSR with building heights up to 20 meters in the Northeastern block bordering Vancouver, Meares and Cook Street.

I would like to respectfully submit that staff and council should continue to support this direction. This area would appear to be a logical choice to encourage density given the current housing situation, the blocks proximity to the Harris Green and the Downtown Core.

Many properties in the 1000 block of Meares are unique as they are still single story or undeveloped parking lots. Development on this block would assist with the rental stock and add a spectrum of more affordable types of housing that are being rejected in other parts of Fairfield.

Given the scarcity of development lands in the City, adherence to the heights and densities previously outlined would be prudent. The OCP correctly allocated density to this area to support population growth over the next 25 years.

Individual applications will still require public vetting and will be considered on a case by case basis. Such decisions will likely be made by future councils and in an environment that may be much different from what exists today.

Given the proximity to the downtown core it makes sense politically, economically and most importantly from a land use perspective to continue to support the direction currently contemplated for the Northeastern block of Fairfield.

Respectfully,

Personal info

THE URBAN VILLAGE AND ITS RADIUS OF HIGHER DENSITY WHAT NEEDS TO BE REMOVED TO REMOVE THE RADIUS'S INFLUENCE

Before the election, the planning staff had sent a paper recommending draft plan actions, which included removing clause 6.20 from the OCP re the radius with the urban village. On Sept. 20th I explained to Mayor and Council that much more than that one clause would have to be removed to remove the "radius affect" of 200 or 400 metres. with high development around. I heard later that, during an electioneering meeting, the electors were reassured that the clause would be removed and "gentle density" would cover the rest. That explanation is not adequate to the facts.

1. This paper lists what would have to be removed to assure no such radius which occurs in different parts of the OCP, so eliminating 6.20 will not remove the radius in any small or large urban village:
 - The idea of specifically removing the radius for complete Urban Villages from a site specific zoning will have no effect because it is a land use plan for that plot of land only, not the surrounding land. The OCP still guides development for surrounding lands.
 - The only way to remove the 400m complete Urban Village design objective is to remove from OCP mentions of urban villages anywhere including:
 - 21.6.2 [Moss and May Streets, and Fairfield Five Points],
 - and 21.6.7 Fairfield Plaza (Ross Bay Village). ["Under strategic Direction p. 147]
 - Also make sure that these locations are not identified in the Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan as Small or Large Urban Village.

Further, special notice could make sure that the 400 metres is not specified for the two proposed urban centres, so that there would be less neighbourhood resistance.

- This avoidance simply means that the whole process is not followed at one time.
- After the designation, radius metres could be added later when citizens were less alert

2. The use of general clauses with the need for Urban Villages development means that every neighbourhood could have them (p. 48):

6.14 This clause prepares a local area plan for Victoria West, Neighbourhood with a focus on Large Urban Village, Core Songhees, Small Urban Village, General Employment and Urban Residential to support its transition "as a mixed use urban residential" with specific focus.

6.15 This clause wants Town Centres and Urban Villages to progress towards a complement of community and commercial services, as described in the guidelines as shown in figure 9 [pg. 49].

NB: 6.16 this clause wants expanding or establishing Development Permit Areas and Heritage Conservation Areas in and around Town Centres and Urban Villages to achieve a unique character and sense of place in the design and a high quality of architecture, landscape, and urban design.

NB: We already have all of the above, unlike many buildings shown in the Draft Plan.

6.17 This clause considers design and traffic calming in Town Centres and Urban Villages, "for safety and temporary street closures for events.

6.18 This clause prioritizes consideration in local area planning Town Centre, large Urban Villages and Small Urban Villages, as illustrated on Map 9, [p. 51 showing circles] to checking on pace of phasing and scope of residential and commercial lands. (The map would have to be changed also.)

Specified Areas: (p 48)

Section 6.19 This clause prepares a local area plan for the North Park Urban Village with a focus on the lands generally within 400 metres, to complete and improve.

Clause 6.20 lists the sites for LUV "to support the development of complete Urban Villages, generally focusing on the lands within 400 metres of Village Centres.

Fairfield: sites are: Cook St. Village, Five Points Village,, Moss Street Village, Fairfield at Irving Village.

Total Encouragement for Densification

Section 6.21 This clause for new Town Centres and Urban Villages further encourages residential densities within 400 metres of a Town Centre or Urban Village sufficient to support the appropriate services and amenities. [See also Sections 8, 20 and 21]

6.22 This clause, for areas designated Traditional Residential, wants new development infill and redevelopment consistent with the density and uses established within the plan, and permits their increase following the completion of local area plan.

6.23 This clause supports new development in areas designated Traditional Residential that seeks densities towards the upper end of the range identified in figure 8 (p. 49) where the proposal significantly advances the objectives of in the plan

1. within 200 metres of the urban core,
2. within 200 metres of Town Centres and Large Urban Village
3. along arterial or secondary arterial roads.

NB: It seems possible the two clauses 6.22-6.23 would come in with a Large Urban Village at Fairfield Rd. and Moss. St. even without 6.20.

IMPLICATIONS AND COMMENTS RE MOSS ST.'S HERITAGE

Please leave out the Urban Village Concept, since this neighbourhood is organically well organized:

- The Street deserves to be made a Heritage Conservation Area, not to be broken up with new large housing "boxes" by using the Development Permit route..(Both are in clause 6.16.)
- The Heritage Advisory Panel should be the group consulted, Design Panels understand mostly new:
 - The Five Corners is a long-established historic area with aspects of heritage and cultural celebrations as the Moss St. Paint -In.
 - The original theme was "brick" [opposite to white box] with all the older buildings and a newer 1960s one.
 - The cheery trees the whole length of the street are both natural elements and cultural, since they were planted as an irreplaceable art form.
 - The variety of housing has a majority of arts-and-crafts buildings, some impressive interspersed with styles from 20s and 30s and some later.
 - The large houses here, even just below the centre of Fairfield and Moss and on adjoining Oscar St., are perfect for Gentle Density modification, some already so.
 - The half timbered brick church with Scottish square tower is a fitting arts-and crafts style.

Re the Trees, Moss Street is magnificent in spring with iconic blossoms, a tourism destination featured in brochures, irreplaceable and, if removed, adding to climate change.

The Urban Village breaks the rule that the concept, especially large urban village requires an arterial (4 lanes) Street or secondary arterial (3 lanes) (see clause 6.23.3.). Fairfield Road is a collector (2 lanes) and Moss St. a subordinate collector (1 1/2 lanes).

It would seem inevitable that, with the Urban Village development, most, if not all the trees, would be cut to make both Fairfield Rd. and Moss St. wider. A tragic loss.

Personal info

November 14, 2018

