

[REDACTED]

From: Lisa Hebb [REDACTED]
Sent: January 24, 2022 4:34 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: City boundaries - Jan. 27, 2022 Council Meeting

Good evening –

Please excuse my lack of understanding regarding the impetus for the change in the Fairfield/Downtown boundary. How did this come about? i.e. Military-grid city planning, City maintenance issues preference, the neighbourhoods asked for it, a bigger Downtown for more development, it tax base motivated? Sorry, just not clear why needed.

The area in question is a small parcel of Fairfield jutting into Downtown, similar to the finger of Saanich land that exists in Oak Bay. This involved area of Fairfield houses historic lands and buildings, heritage residential, seniors' community housing, City housing, family homes and older affordable apartments, small parks, small guest accommodations, etc., much like Fairfield. It does not have a Downtown-feel.

Also, I am not sure what the proposed change would do to property taxes and property values for those who currently live in Fairfield, but with the stroke of a pen will find themselves living in Downtown. And then there are the differences in community planning in Fairfield and Downtown. Those involved in this proposed change now will have had no input into their neighbourhood planning.

The results of the community feedback on this change in the Fairfield/Downtown boundary were very divided and not supported by the Fairfield/Gonzales CALUC. I am thinking it is likely the 38% of those opposed to this change were from Fairfield as well. It is important to listen to those who live in and who have built and supported this area on Fairfield through time.

Personally, I am not in support of changing the Fairfield/Downtown boundary.

Thank you,

Lisa Hebb

977 Convent Place

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

[REDACTED]

From: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: OAKLANDS/JUBILEE BORDER AMENDMENT

From: Kathryn Foster [REDACTED]
Sent: January 26, 2022 12:48 PM
To: Engagement-External <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: OAKLANDS/JUBILEE BORDER AMENDMENT

Don't merge. This was not an anomaly. The extension of the boundary to Shelbourne was intended to give NJ a stronger voice in both issues with Saanich for the panhandle areas south of Hillside/Landsdowne and the intersection at Shelbourne & Hillside. Oaklands has a greater population than NJ but that should not minimize OUR voice when amending OUR plan which seems to be the case judging by survey results. This is picking apart North Jubilee a slice at a time and each time you diminish our voice you undo all the tremendous work and careful thought that went into establishing the neighbourhood in the first place. Our neighbourhood IS unique and deserves to be heard in spite of our smaller presence. Traffic and rezoning issues are a huge piece of this so minimizing our say or seat at any table where what happens on Shelbourne could be an influence is disenfranchising our Association and neighbourhood. It is silencing our voice.

PLEASE DON'T!!! Just don't.

Kathryn Foster

North Jubilee resident

[REDACTED]

From: Victoria Mayor and Council
Sent: January 26, 2022 2:36 PM
To: Public Hearings
Subject: Fw: City of Victoria: Neighbourhood Boundaries

From: Nick & Sharon Russell [REDACTED]
Sent: January 25, 2022 6:59 PM
To: MUNI.Minister@gov.bc.ca <MUNI.Minister@gov.bc.ca>; Lisa Helps (Mayor) <LHelps@victoria.ca>
Subject: City of Victoria: Neighbourhood Boundaries

Attn Hon. Josie Osborne,
Minister, Municipal Affairs,
Government of B.C.

Dear Minister:

We are seriously concerned about the City of Victoria's rush to alter neighbourhood boundaries without demonstrable need.

According to the city's own website, hundreds of citizens have registered their antagonism to these proposed changes, but there is every indication that Council will push ahead and approve them at Thursday's Council meeting.

One of the proposed changes, opaque in the fine print, involves expanding "Downtown" to Church Hill (the site of the Law Courts and much else). Fairfield Community Association has indicated that it would accept this expansion. But what they (and others, looking at this complex gerrymandering) did not take into account was that the City has recently made substantive change to Downtown zoning regulations.

According to the long and convoluted City Bylaw #2018-072, passed in 2018, variances will be permitted within this area of up to 21 storeys.

To consider colossal towers on this six blocks of Church Hill now or even in the distant future would be appalling: Towers on the hill would totally compromise the nature of Victoria, and of course over-shadow and diminish the Legislative precinct.

If this area (Fort to Academy; Blanshard to Quadra) were filled with 20-storey towers, many historic buildings on the Hill would be dwarfed, including the Royal Theatre, Abigail's Hotel, Rose Manor Angela College, St Ann's Academy, 780 Blanshard and many more. Even the majestic Christchurch Cathedral would be overshadowed. (For details, please see the national *Register of Historic Places*, and *Victoria Heritage Register*.)

This matter is urgent, and must surely come within your mandate. Somebody has to oversee the more egregious activities of municipalities. Please intervene!

Sincerely, Nick & Sharon Russell.
1609 Pembroke St, Victoria BC,
V8R 1W4.

cc: Mayor & Council.