

Lacey Maxwell

From: Ian Sherwin [REDACTED]
Sent: March 4, 2018 5:25 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: GONZALES PLAN IS HUGE MISTAKE

MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS VICTORIA B.C.

IT TAKES A 100 YEARS TO GROW A REAL NEIGHBORHOOD

**IT TAKE ONLY ONE FOOLISH PLANNING MESS TO DESTROY IT
THIS NEW PLAN IS CLEARLY ANOTHER COSTLY DISASTER
IN THE MAKING IN BOTH CONCEPT AND EXECUTION.**

**GONZALES BAY IS A RARE NEIGHBOURHOOD TODAY
WHERE EVERYONE RICH OR POOR KNOWS THEIR NEIGHBOUR.
THERE IS A HISTORIC REASON FOR THIS.**

**GONZALES BAY (PROPER) GREW POST 1912 WITH THE EXTENSION OF
THE NO 6 STREET CAR LINE ALONG MAY & FAIRFIELD ROAD TO ITS
TERMINUS AT FOUL BAY ROAD. IT PROVIDED ACCESS FOR
SMALL HOUSES ON SMALL LOTS FOR WORKING PEOPLE AND
THE MODEST RETIRED. THOSE FEW THAT COULD AFFORD A CAR
USED FAIRFIELD ROAD.**

**NORTH OF FAIRFIELD ROAD WAS THE SWAMP AND MARKET GARDENS AND
PEMBERTON WOODS THE LAST TINY REMNANT OF WHICH IS PEMBERTON
PARK.**

**THAT IS WHY GONZALES BAY STARTED AS A REAL KNOW YOUR NEIGHBOUR
NEIGHBOURHOOD WITH ITS SIMPLE TENNIS COURT AND SANDY BEACH.
I FIRST SWAM IN GONZALES BAY OVER 70 YEARS AGO. IT STILL FEELS
LIKE A REAL NEIGHBOURHOOD. THIS IS A VERY RARE THING TODAY.**

**NORTH OF PEMBERTON WOODS THE LAND SLOPED TOWARDS OAK BAY
AND THIS AREA WAS SERVED BY THE NO1 OAK BAY STREET CAR
AND CARS IN THIS AREA BY OAK BAY AVENUE. THIS IS AN AREA
OF LARGER LOTS AND LARGER HOUSES AND MORE CITIFIED.
LUMPING THESE AREAS TOGETHER IS FOOLISH IN THE EXTREME**

**LANGFORD WITH STU YOUNG HAS VERY COMPETENT GOVERNANCE
AND MASSES OF LAND OPEN FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT AT SPECTACULAR
ROYAL BAY AND AND AREA, ALL WITHOUT ADDING TO VICTORIA 'S
INCREASINGLY CONSTIPATED ROAD SYSTEM.**

WHY DESTROY GONZALES BAY A NEIGHBOURHOOD THAT STILL WORKS ?

IAN M. SHERWIN 1863 HOLLYWOOD CR. VICTORIA B.C.

Lacey Maxwell

From: Barbara Abercrombie [REDACTED]
Sent: February 22, 2018 12:23 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Draft Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

As a resident of the stretch of Richardson St. between St. Charles and Richmond, I am opposed to any plan that would allow street-fronting townhouses on wider lots in this area, as well as densification by means of unrestricted development using small apartment buildings and townhouses up to three storeys along the Fairfield corridor. This area already has more vehicle traffic than it can cope with. Furthermore, our existing infrastructure is not equal to the challenges posed by densification. The existing Official Community Plan for Gonzales should be respected, and any departures from that plan thoroughly discussed with area residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barbara Abercrombie
1657 Richardson St.

Lacey Maxwell

From: VIVIENNE PHILLIPS [REDACTED]
Sent: March 6, 2018 8:21 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan Input

Dear Mayor and Council,

PROPOSED GONZALES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Today in the mail I recieved a flyer from Michael McMullen, Realtor with Re-Max Camosun it says:

"Hello Neighbour,

I have been reading with interest the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood plans. What a time of CHANGE for your community!

I am sure everyone will be watching closely for the results of the upcoming Council meeting and Public Hearing. I believe the outcome could provide an exciting opportunity to anyone who is considering selling in Gonzales area.

It was a shock to think that a realtor was waiting on the outcome of this plan.

I love where I live, we have a amazing community where twice a year we all congregare for pot-luck suppers in the local church hall. We catch up on the news of each others lives. There are very few changes of neighbours as everyone LOVES living here. Most people renovate their homes as they don't want to move. We have everything here the local grocery shop in walking distance, the wonderful family based beach where we all meet in the summer in "our spot", when it snows someone clears a neighbours sidewalk. We take care of each other ... and you want to change all of this NO NO NO. We live in old stock homes that are loved and cared for, a few square block cement homes have squeeked in, which upsets the look and feel of the neighbourhood.

There is nothing wrong with the way Gonzales is presently, we love it the way it is. Why do you want to change it please leave it alone.

Vivienne Phillips

Voter and home owner

Lacey Maxwell

From: Mike Fenger [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 9:41 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Input to meeting Thursday and concerns with Gonzales neighbor plan

Dear Mayor and Council of City of Victoria

March 7th 2017

We are write regarding the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan and provide our concerns and why we think the plan as written should not be approved without major amendments. We cannot attend the meeting being held Thursday March 8th 6:30 at City Hall hence we are sending this statement.

The character of the Gonzales neighborhood is defined by older well-built and well maintained single family houses built 40 to 100 years ago. Gonzales was fully built out a few decades ago and contains a great stock of older homes and these define the Gonzales neighborhood. Absent from the Gonzales plan is any statement of the need to maintain existing older homes that define the Gonzales. Protection of older homes needs to be a stated principle in the Gonzales plan and it is not.

Newer homes in our estimation are not as well built as the existing homes, for example the recent use of oriented strand board (OSB) to lower building costs by a developer means a home, townhouse or condo built to day will simply not last as long as existing home and most existing homes with regular maintenance will outlast new construction even if the older home are already 100 years old. The Gonzales plan will destroy the older homes of Gonzales and it will do so by design unless it is amended. It is so sad that this plan encourages the destruction of good quality old homes under the pretense of a better future through densification and “*modern row and townhouses*”. Taking down older homes and replacing them with newer poor quality structures in the name of densification is so misguided. The Gonzales Plan is so misguided.

The statement “*new housing diversity should be encouraged*” is a statement that signals the Gonzales plan means a shift towards new townhouses and row houses and is a signal to developers to amalgamate properties and build new townhouses and demolish single family homes. Giving such incentives to nonresident’s developers and speculators means the plan is focused on the interests of developer/speculators over the interests of the existing owners. So sad that if this plan is approved it is a clear signal that Council and planning staff support developers and speculators over the current residents and taxpayers. Please change the focus back to the existing resident land owners.

Council can refocus the Gonzales plan to enable the existing home owners the means to achieve greater density and affordability. Affordable housing and increased density will not come to Gonzales from developers and those who are looking to maximize their return by building for upper-end clientele. There are a number of commercial builders in Gonzales who have built executive style boxes that maximize the height and minimize setbacks and in some cases seek variances on setbacks to better their financial bottom lines. These newer executive boxes are not designed to be affordable nor are they in character in Gonzales but are within the allowed zoning so staff must approve. It is discouraging to see in the plan mention of housing diversity and the link or nod to the executive box as well as the townhouse and row house all of which are foreign to the Gonzales and the existing character but are now the now preferred developer style. The Gonzales plan needs to be changes so that it puts a full stop on what is now a developer maximum-return vision for Gonzales neighborhood.

It is unclear if the number of secondary suites legal or otherwise is understood fully understood. Gonzales may already have achieved the increase density goals which we understand to be 1200 new units within a decade if the current suites are added and grandfathered or recognized and encouraged. Council must change the plan focus away from incentives for developers to demolish existing homes to a focus that enables residents and property owners more easily to add secondary suites in existing houses or build smaller modest lane way type houses in rear yards when they maintain the existing houses.

We attended the Gonzales public input sessions last summer at Margret Jenkins school. At that time we understood through questioning planning staff that they were in favor of zoning for row housing and townhouses and thought this was the way to increase density. Those ideas have persisted in the plan and show a city hall staff writing into the plan their preferred solution as new townhouses and row houses. What was troubling was the staff indicated they preferred this type of zoning as it eased their workload. What was even more troubling for us at least was that the very character of Gonzales i.e. the stock of existing well-built house could be collateral damage as means for planners to achieve a reduced workload.

At the open house planning staff also stated they did not favor resident lead initiatives to achieve higher densities such as adding a second small rear yard smaller home for example to increase the livable area on their properties. If the ambience of Gonzales is to endure we have far greater confidence that the solutions to increase density that come from current land owners working with their neighbors and city planning staff will better main the Gonzales character than what is reflected in the Gonzales plan as currently written. The plan appears to be an arrangement between planning staff and developers with residents as secondary or allowed some future role or perhaps or no role at all once high density zoning is approved. If council is really supportive of this approach it means that council sees land owners and taxpayers as secondary to increasing density in Gonzales and developers and speculators as the solution. That is the way the plan is written. Council is that your preferred approach?

Please do not approve the Gonzales plan. Please rewrite the current Gonzales plan so that it puts the resident property owners first on ideas and proposals for increasing density on our properties. We believe that the residents of Gonzales and the city will achieve greater density and keep the Gonzales neighbor character and ambience if given an opportunity in a neighborhood plan that puts us first. Thanks for considering a refocusing of the plan.

Mike Fenger and Valerie Hignett
511 Foul Bay Road.

Wednesday, March 7, 2018

To whom it may concern:

I live on 160 Passmore St and want to start by saying thank you for fresh ideas and plans for the future of Gonzales. It's a lot of work. Though we disagree in part I appreciate your efforts and good will to listen to those who live here, own property and want to see the right thing done to keep most of Gonzales a rare and valuable neighbourhood/asset in Victoria.

From my careful study of lot sizes from your 2018 redevelopment plan for Gonzales it appears the 2002 plan need not be altered to the degree you wish it. The new plan far over-reaches and will result in over-densification and the destruction of our valuable Victoria neighbourhood character and lifestyle.

Some of the new plan defeats the intimate, relaxed character highly valued by residents and tourists and investors alike. Areas close to the ocean are an enclave. By you allowing new condo development in Gonzales on the scale you propose, it will destroy a quality of life people in Victoria, all over Canada, and the world long for.

For example, the new plan would allow tiny Passmore St or Ross St with existing single family lots over 5000 sq. feet to be torn down and replaced by triple row houses. Stats show your plans permits taking about 88% of my neighborhood's homes and making them open to developers to plug in 3 townhouses. Along Fairfield Road you are proposing 3 story condominium projects; this should be limited to 2 stories. Double of rows of townhouses are proposed for St. Charles and several other streets, completely unacceptable, alien to and for the low key, family feeling Gonzales neighbourhood.

Out of the 871 residences in Gonzales only 109 existing single-family dwellings would be excluded from development into duplexes, triplexes and duplexes with suites, this over development would completely disturb likely ruin the livability we currently enjoy in Gonzales. The increase in population that would result from the proposed development would overwhelm our minuscule parks and green spaces.

Thank you for the hard work and now your openness and care in considering what residents like myself are telling you. Please don't take away the quality of life and views that make Victoria unique and a haven for the happy.

Sincerely,

Don Morris
160 Passmore St
Victoria V8S 3V7

██████████

Lacey Maxwell

From: Janice and Kevin [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 2:34 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Feedback on Draft Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

We wanted to first thank the City of Victoria for your efforts engaging the community to revise the Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan.

Through the years, Fairfield Road has maintained abundant green space and mostly single-family homes that provide a comfortable residential feel to the community. The family friendly environment and general lack of higher density units on Fairfield Road sets Gonzales aside from other areas of the city, making the area very desirable to live.

Our key concern of the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan is the impact on the Fairfield Corridor. The plan proposes multi-unit living along Fairfield corridor and more specifically small apartment buildings from St. Charles to Foul Bay. The plan provides detail on townhouses and residential housing, but provides no information or constraints (other than 3 stories and a density of 1.0 FSR) for smaller apartments.

The proliferation of poorly situated and designed apartment buildings will impact the experience of residents and especially those living in proximity to Fairfield Road. The lack of any detail in the plan could result in a ramshackle of congested buildings crammed into the available space. Regardless of the type of multi-unit living units or multiple dwellings, there should be strong constraints placed on the building sites and designs.

We ask the counsel that the density of the Fairfield corridor be limited to two story townhouses or row housing. Though I am strongly opposed to apartments, if they are to be considered, we would like to propose the following:

- Minimum lot size of 670m²
- Minimum setbacks be required of 9m for the rear, 7.5m for the front, and sides of 1.5m
- Site coverage limited to a maximum of 35% (40% open space)
- Maximum building heights be 2 ½ stories and 8.5m to ensure limited neighbourhood impact
- At least 1.5 on-site parking spaces be provided per unit
- Minimum density of 1.0 :1 FSR as stated in the draft plan

Thank you for your consideration.

Janice Linton and Kevin Warren

356 Robertson Street

Lacey Maxwell

From: Janice and Kevin [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Feedback on Draft Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

I sent the Mayor and Counsel an email earlier opposing 3 story apartments along the Fairfield corridor. Since then I have had conversations with a few of my neighbours and though they were aware of the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan, they had not read the drafts or participated in the consultation (myself included). They found it alarming the proposed plan enables a 35 foot high wall of buildings along our rear yards.

Looking at a map of the area, it appears that over 70 residents could have an immediate negative impact by the construction of 3 story buildings along Fairfield Road between St. Charles and Foul Bay. There will also be a loss of green space, sunlight, cityscape and the neighbourhood ambiance along Fairfield Road.

I believe city planners may have failed to take into consideration the negative impact of those living in proximity of Fairfield Road when they proposed 3 story multi living units. The implications to this neighbourhood and community are far greater than the few additional units created.

On the assumption that opinions of those living around Fairfield Road that are directly affected have not been properly expressed and the clear impact of the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan, I would ask that the Mayor and Council delay approval at your March 8th meeting. This would allow city planners to engage the affected home owners and/or allow a petition opposing the densification to be circulated to those living next to Fairfield Road.

Please feel free to disregard this request if the Mayor and Council have directed staff to remove all references allowing 3 story multi living units/apartments and replaced it with two story, single row rowhouses/townhouses along the Fairfield Corridor.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin Warren

Lacey Maxwell

From: Karen Ayers [REDACTED]
Sent: February 27, 2018 10:27 AM
To: Councillors
Cc: planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca; Kristina Bouris
Subject: Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing regarding the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan.

The new plan has a number of improvements, and in particular builds on the 2002 Plan with respect to Queen Anne Heights/Gonzales Hill, with clearer language and recognition of the need to protect the large lot heritage character, Garry Oak woodlands and green space. I would like to express my appreciation to Kristina Bouris who worked with us to better reflect the neighbourhood's vision for this area within the plan.

However, the new plan also proposes changes which will dramatically change the overall landscape, look and feel of Gonzales, and to which I am opposed. The plan:

- significantly increases housing density - by at least double, and in some areas of Gonzales by more than quadruple the current density
- proposes multi-storey apartment buildings along Fairfield, and triplexes, duplexes with secondary suites and townhouse developments throughout Gonzales, with double rows of townhouses in multiple areas
- encourages land assembly and the demolition of existing affordable and rental housing, with no plans to replace it with any affordable housing
- makes no provision for schools, parks or other public infrastructure needed to support such a dramatic increase in density
- takes away the ability of residents to have an effective say in future development projects, by designating what form of housing (e.g. apartment building, townhouses) can go on which lots, essentially "pre-zoning" properties for development throughout Gonzales, and
- removes Richardson as a major vehicle transportation route, diverting vehicle traffic volumes to Fairfield (which is already congested at peak times), and up to Rockland Avenue.

Although I support the need for additional and varied forms of housing in Gonzales, population growth projections for Victoria do not support the need for the density levels proposed in this plan. The "trickle down" theory that if you build sufficient housing it will result in affordable housing has not worked in any city in the world, and current research debunks that approach. The plan makes no provision for affordable housing, in fact will do the opposite, as affordable and rental housing is demolished to make way for new developments. Land assembly is encouraged (and already occurring in anticipation of the plan), which will destabilize neighbourhoods.

The lack of an appropriate interface between the multi-storey buildings proposed for the Fairfield Corridor and the surrounding homes will cause consideration friction, and is not supportable as proposed. Double rows of townhouses are also not supportable (too dense, loss of green space and parking issues).

New housing is expensive and generally affordable only to those with high incomes and those seeking to invest in our community. Opportunities to increase density without demolishing existing housing stock are not fully realized in the plan, for example allowing both a secondary and a garden suite on suitably sized properties.

The January 2018 Union of BC Municipalities report “A Home for Everyone” states “It has long been recognized that because a change in use – for example from a house to a three-story apartment building – impacts surrounding properties, neighbouring residents must be notified of the proposed change and be able to have a say in whether the change proceeds.” This plan takes away the ability of residents to have an effective say in future development. By designating what form of housing (e.g. apartment building, townhouses) can go where, by individual lot within Gonzales, a clear signal is sent to the development community as to what the City will approve. It is treated as a form of “pre-zoning”, and has already resulted in Gonzales residents being told by developers that multi-rows of townhouses are approved for their block.

Encouraging residents to leave their cars behind is a positive move, however given the aging demographic and the fact that Gonzales has the oldest demographic in the City, it is not realistic to plan on the basis of a significant shift to cycling. Cars will remain the dominant form of transportation in Gonzales for the foreseeable future.

The transportation plan proposes an All Ages and Abilities route for Richardson Street, and the City's transportation staff have advised that vehicle traffic is to be reduced along Richardson by lowering the speed limit (currently 40 km), installing speed humps and narrowing the road at various points in order to make it “uncomfortable” for drivers; vehicle traffic is to be diverted to other roads. Richardson is a major transportation corridor for residents of Fairfield, Gonzales, and south Oak Bay. Diverting traffic to Fairfield Road is of concern, given the morning congestion at Margaret Jenkins and Sir James Douglas schools, and in entering/exiting from the Fairfield Plaza. This situation will be exacerbated given the density increases proposed for along Fairfield Road (apartment buildings/double row townhouses), and the area between Richardson and the Fairfield Corridor (double row townhouses). Rockland Avenue will also experience a significant increase in vehicle traffic from those seeking to avoid a “vehicle unfriendly” Richardson.

The public engagement process did not ensure that residents could participate to develop the draft plan, or to provide informed feedback. As a result, most Gonzales residents that I speak with do not understand the plan nor are they aware of its impacts. Many residents were not aware the planning process was underway, so had no opportunity to participate in the sessions leading up to the initial draft of the plan. Some residents did not receive the Key Moves brochure. Those that did could provide input based on reading either seven high level themes (with a few bullets under each), or a 75 page draft plan. It is not reasonable to expect residents to read a 75 page document in order to become appropriately informed about what is proposed for their community.

The housing session (which I attended) was structured to pressure residents into agreeing to building forms and densities the participants did not support. Participants were not asked whether they wanted multi-storey buildings, for example, rather were repeatedly shown multi-storey developments and asked where in Gonzales that should be built. The outcome was a housing plan that came from a “top down” rather than a collaborative and community driven process that could consider a broader range of options for accommodating future density.

The consultation process was open to anyone to participate, whether or not they pay taxes, live or work in Gonzales. It is impossible to know who provided input to the plan.

Major concerns with the draft plan identified by residents, such as the high density levels and double rows of townhouses have not resulted in substantive changes to the plan.

Council's decision on the Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan will impact future decisions on the Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan. Similarly the Fairfield Plan, for example as it relates to the Fairfield Plaza, will affect many in the Gonzales neighbourhood. While I support continuing with separate plans, the local area plans for both neighbourhoods should be complimentary, consistent in approach, and should be considered by Council at the same or a similar time.

Gonzales residents are proud of their community. This plan does not sufficiently recognize or value what we have, rather it apparently seeks to demolish and replace it. We need a neighbourhood plan that reflects our vision for Gonzales, with growth that enhances our community, not over-development without due regard for or input from residents.

We want real collaboration between the City and Gonzales residents, and propose that the City work with us to revise the plan to better ensure that it reflects our values and vision for the future of the Gonzales neighbourhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Karen Ayers

Lacey Maxwell

From: Darryl [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 8:05 AM
To: Councillors
Cc: planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Proposed Plan for Gonzales Neighbourhood

Categories: LAP

We are writing to express our concern that the proposed plan for Gonzales Neighbourhood was developed without sufficient consultation with the residents of this community.

Darryl and Christine Harker
1695 Richardson Street
Victoria, BC

Lacey Maxwell

From: Deborah Lowry [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 8:42 AM
To: Councillors; planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Gonzales

To Mayor and Council, and whoever is actually listening,

I along with many of my fellow residents of Gonzales have grave concerns over the proposed changes to the Gonzales Plan and its horrible impact it will have on our community. For all intents and purposes it looks like a plan drawn up by developers not the whole family of people it will directly and indirectly impact.

First of all I cannot imagine what is so terribly wrong with our neighbourhood that requires blanket rezoning and rezoning of properties that have not requested it.

Most developers will be wringing their hands at these proposals whilst the rest of us are living in dread of these changes. Once again we are under attack. Our once charming community turned into an unrecognizable urban experiment with terrible results.

I am concerned with the process and lack of real engagement. I can only speculate that this is done as Gonzales residents are well known to be opinionated and protective of our way of life. Many of my usually well informed neighbours and friends were and are unaware this process was even going on.

When I asked a city planner why we were redoing our plan now he said "because the plan had not been updated for 15 years" and this was a 25 year plan. This made little or no sense to me. This current plan which was meant to offer a certain amount of protection has never been implemented. It has however been twisted and turned at every opportunity to the advantage of those that look at Gonzales as a cash cow. This includes a money hungry planning department and city council.

We love and are proud of our "Hood". Not for what it could become but for what it is. We have fought hard for this. This is why it is now a sought after place to live.

If only a third of what are proposed changes are allowed this will alter and not for the better. The plan is reminiscent of James Bay in the 70's. Disasterous!

We need to preserve and protect affordable old stock housing. Historically when old homes are torn down up go seriously unaffordable, light obstructive, no green space monsters, that resemble storage units more than homes.

The cities vision for the future of Gonzales is disturbing and unsettling. It is not our vision. We need thoughtful sympathetic growth. No blanket rezoning but a case by case merit based system with neighbour and neighbourhood consultation.

This is the only way a harmonious happy and safe community can be developed.

Judging by the fliers we are already receiving in our mail boxes by realtors the Vultures are already circling. Please do not consider this seriously flawed plan.

Sincerely

Long time resident,

Home owner,

and committed Voter

Deborah Lowry
1829 Lillian Rd.

Lacey Maxwell

From: Marion Clare [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 12:04 PM
To: Councillors; planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca; fgnpa@shaw.ca
Subject: Proposed Gonzales Neighborhood Plan

Marion Clare & Denis Clare

1847 Gonzales Avenue,
Victoria, B.C.
Canada. V8S 1T9
Phone: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

The Mayor and Council
councillors@victoria.ca

David Biltek, Chair of the Fairfield Gonzales land use committee
planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca

8th March 2018

Re: Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

City Council Meeting March 8 2018

As we will both be unable to attend the meeting on March 8th we would like to strongly oppose this development, especially related to the stretch of Gonzales Avenue between Richmond and Richardson where our house is located.

We are shocked to see from your website report that Public Feedback has already been taken and was divulged at the council meeting on December 2017. As home owners in the Gonzales area why were we not notified to give our opinions at that time.

- Also how come this part of Gonzales Road between Richmond and Richardson used to be zoned as Rockland but now has been changed to the new extended part of Gonzales. As before why were we not notified of this change.
- Our main concerns are that the council are proposing to densify building and infill in this area of quality, single family dwellings, the majority of which are valued over 1 million dollars.
- We invested a lot of money into our house and should the multi house townhouse development go ahead on the opposite side of our road, the value of our house would drop considerably and the quality of life of our surroundings and that of our neighbors would be very much inferior to what it is now. Our road has nicely spaced our larger detached houses, a tree lined street and a general up market ambience of this Oak Bay border location.
- Will the City of Victoria compensate us for the devaluation of our properties, especially in a lump sum and lower property taxes, although this is not the preferred approach?

Our main concerns about the proposed Gonzales Plan Development in particular to the stretch of Gonzales between Richmond and Richardson are as follows

1. Our immediate Gonzales Road area is amongst one of the most prestigious in the city next to others like Oak Bay and Ten Mile Point. Homes are generally spread out with spaces in between, are set back with front yards and have a more superior feel than other parts of the city. Why over develop this area with high density housing such as multiple townhouse developments and condos, when you could channel this idea to other cheaper areas like parts of Esquimalt and View Royal.
2. No single family house should be demolished and used for multiple density housing. One house as now, one house in the future.
3. It is said in your report "When additions to existing buildings or new buildings are proposed, consider granting variances, if required, to retain significant trees, landscape or native ecosystem features." We say that variances to extend the building line of any new development are not to be used purely to make the single family dwelling larger. At present a builder can go to city to extend the building lines and usually win at variance. This practice is wrong.
4. The area should be for families not high density rentals or executive type housing.
5. Families need space. Children need to play. Adults like the recreation of their own space, not herded together in townhouse or condo developments
6. In fill be limited only to duplex or single family homes on places where single family dwelling currently exist
7. No trees removed for any new development
8. No bicycle lanes anywhere in the Gonzales area for two reasons.
 - The roads are getting busier. If the area develops there will be even more cars. There is not enough room to move cars around safely with bicycle lanes taking up lots of space
 - With existing bicycle lanes a large proportion of cyclist we have seen still continue to use the roads.
 - When cyclists pay a road tax, however small, then this will be justified. Until then it is not right that non cyclists have to fund this in their property taxes

Lacey Maxwell

From: Caleb [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 12:34 PM
To: Councillors
Cc: Planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Letter of Opposition to Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

March 7, 2018

Mayor and Council
City of Victoria
Centennial Square, Victoria BC

cc: David Biltek, Fairfield Gonzales Land Use Committee

Re: Opposition to Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Honorable Mayor and Council:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan on the basis that it encourages densification of our neighbourhood without consultation, increases traffic congestion, increases emergency vehicle response time, and increases the cost of transportation.

I am the owner of two adjoining homes on Gonzales Ave, and have lived on this property for 50 years. I was shocked to see the so-called Neighbourhood Plan call for double row townhouses on my quiet residential street, with absolutely no consultation with those of us who live here.

I am further horrified by the combination of densification throughout the neighbourhood combined with elimination of the last functional thoroughfare to downtown, that being Richardson Rd, which services not only this neighbourhood, but also South Oak Bay. Where does council think the growing number of cars (as densification implies) will go when "traffic speeds are lowered and volumes reduced"? Shall we learn to levitate?

This council has been absolutely ignorant of the fact that a city needs a functional transportation network so that goods and services can be delivered, emergency vehicles can get through, taxis can provide an efficient and economical service, and people can get to downtown and back.

Please add my voice to the growing number of people that are opposed to this flawed plan that promises to change the whole landscape and character of our neighbourhood, congest our roads, and destroy the quality of life this neighbourhood represents.

In Opposition,

William Caleb Small
1832 Gonzales Ave
Victoria, BC

Lacey Maxwell

From: Jennifer Earle [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 5:27 PM
To: Councillors
Cc: planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: March 8/18 meeting, Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Jennifer R. Earle
1615 Pinewood Avenue
Victoria, BC V8S 1K8
[REDACTED]

March 7, 2018

Mayor Helps and Victoria Council Members
City of Victoria
Delivered electronically to: councillors@victoria.ca

Dear Mayor Helps and Council Members:

My name is Jennifer Earle, and I live in the Gonzales neighbourhood of our city. I write this letter to most vehemently oppose the November 2017 Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan ("Plan"), for reasons that I describe below.

As background for the context in which I write this letter, I bought my modest 105-year-old house three years ago and have thoroughly enjoyed living in the neighbourhood, even moreso since I retired and started collecting a pension last year.

Before I purchased my home, I considered the usual property-purchasing criteria: size/age/condition of the house, nearby amenities, proximity to the ocean, local crime and safety statistics, price, proximity to professional services, parking, available public transportation, road and traffic noise levels, whether there is a local sense of community, curb appeal of the house and district, local zoning, and, neighbourhood. The most important criterion to me was the neighbourhood. There are many things that one can do to improve a house, however, one's options are limited when it comes to enhancing a quaint and charming neighbourhood that is well over a century old.

I was overjoyed to have found my home: a 105-year-old small character bungalow, on a 50' x 100' lot on a quiet side street with treed boulevards. Similar houses, though mostly larger, surround me. I live directly across from, and beside, Heritage-designated houses. I paid a "premium" for the house: it was old and in need of some TLC, but the Gonzales neighbourhood was what really drew me to the home and I couldn't be happier with my new, old, house.

I am extremely dismayed to imagine the degradation of neighbourhood that the residential zoning changes in the Plan would render.

Page 8 of the Plan reads, “. . . more rental housing, more mortgage-helpers, and more affordable forms of family-friendly housing, such as townhouses and rowhouses.” Why is an established 100+-year-old neighbourhood expected to retrofit itself with affordable housing? I am aware that cost of housing in Gonzales is prohibitively expensive for many people. However, I cannot comprehend any rationale or plan that proposes that it comes to residents and property-owners in this established neighbourhood to change zoning to accommodate those who are unable to afford the price of a home here. Would not the same rationale mean also that, because others want to buy or live in a home in Uplands, that that neighbourhood also needs to rezone and lower its standards to enable more people to afford to reside there? The notion that the neighbourhood of Uplands would be expected to do that is absolutely absurd. So is any expectation for existing residents and property owners of Gonzales.

Building in planned communities remains a way to accommodate renters and those entering the market—not by destroying the “character” that this Plan claims to appreciate. New housing is being created downtown, and in areas north and west of Victoria. A reasonable expectation for those starting off in the housing market would be for them to start in places like that, or at least work with existing housing and zoning in older areas. I have two adult children who aspire to enter the housing market, but I have no expectation that they could afford to live in one of Victoria’s more expensive neighbourhoods.

Pages 7 and 8 of the Plan read, “Add housing that fits the neighbourhood’s character”, and “New housing diversity should be encouraged . . .” These two statements are inconsistent. Our neighbourhood’s character is comprised of the existing housing. How could Gonzales be diversified and stay the same?

Pages 8 and 54 of the Plan read, “Create opportunity for small apartment buildings (up to 3 storeys) . . .”, and “Support the long-term development of a Ross Bay Village as a 3-4 storeys mixed use . . .” It is deceiving that the Plan requires the reader to drill down to the fine print from page 8 to 54 to learn that “up to 3 stories” actually means 4 stories.

Page 30, 3.9.4., Vehicle Parking Management, states “. . . consider reductions in parking for multi-unit housing to support greater housing affordability”. Page 46 of the Plan, 5.8.6., reads, “Consider the reduction of on-site parking requirements to support quality site plans and unit livability . . .” Another absurdity in the Plan. Reductions in off-street parking will directly correlate to a worsened situation an already difficult parking situation in the area. The house beside mine has two tenanted suites, and there are a total of seven vehicles belonging to those who live there. The owner of a house across the street from me operates transient “Air B&B” accommodation. Another owner of a house a few doors down also operates transient accommodation. An owner of a house around the corner, on Fairfield Drive, has off-street parking that accommodates 6 vehicles, yet continuously parks at least one of his “overflow” vehicles near my house because parking is already limited on Fairfield Drive. The row housing, townhouses, 4-story apartments, triplexes, and duplexes (complete with “reductions in parking”) now proposed on Fairfield Drive and in the vicinity that currently has single family houses would make my ever being able to park in front of my home practically impossible.

Page 8 of the Plan reads, “. . . minimizes additional impact on tree canopy and green spaces.” “Encourage housing and siting that limit disturbance to green space.” “Continue to discourage subdivisions . . .” This language is entirely vague and commits to nothing. It is also contradictory, as this Plan very much encourages subdivision through extensive rezoning.

It took me a lifetime to work and afford my way into my home and neighbourhood. I would never have purchased a home here if I had known such an abomination for a neighbourhood plan were being

created. However, now that I am living in this community, I will use my available means to protect and preserve it.

I implore you to reject this Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Jennifer R. Earle

cc: David Biltek, Chair, Fairfield Gonzales Land Use Committee

March 7, 2018

Nic Humphreys
167 Passmore Street
Victoria, BC
V8S 3V6

Dear Mayor and Council:

RE Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

I am writing this letter even though I have registered to speak at tomorrow's meeting, not sure I can make the meeting.

First, I would like to thank you for the hard work you have put in on this file. I have several concerns about the proposed Gonzales plan.

Community Engagement

For whatever reason the citizens of Gonzales did not become adequately engaged in the consultation process around the new plan. This lack of engagement has led to frustration and anger from the people in the neighbourhood. I look enviously at Vic - West, from talking with people from that community most seem pretty happy with the process and feel that they have been able to contribute positively to the development of a plan. How did Vic-West have what seems to have been a very successful engagement process and Gonzales such a poor process? Were there different and more effective organizations representing the residents, were there more community meetings, were the meetings better advertised and more accessible? I do not know the reasons, but I do know we have two completely different outcomes.

I would like to see the formation of the Gonzales plan continued for several months to enable real community engagement and consultation. Perhaps whoever organized the Vic-West plan could be put in charge of the Gonzales plan. This time I would like to see more attention paid to the current tax paying residents as opposed to developers and non-residents.

Development Density

The amount of development proposed, and the level of increased density are the two main complaints that I hear in the neighbourhood. The double rows of townhouses proposed for Fairfield and Vic-West have been eliminated from the respective plans but still exist for Gonzales? They need to be eliminated from the Gonzales plan as well.

Gonzales would also like to be treated the same as Fairfield when it comes to minimum lot size. In the Fairfield plan a lot must be a minimum of 6000 sq. feet to be considered for a duplex, the Gonzales plan only requires 5000 sq. feet. For a triplex the Fairfield limit is 7000 sq. feet, for Gonzales only 6000 sq. feet. The Gonzales minimum lot size for increased development needs to be at least as large as what is required for Fairfield.

The 3-story height for condominiums developments along Fairfield road need to be reduced to 2 stories, to fit in with the existing neighbourhood and to prevent shadowing of adjacent properties.

Green space, tree canopy and parks within Gonzales.

The proposed Gonzales plan will reduce the tree canopy, private and perhaps public green spaces and with no new parks proposed will over-crowd the limited park lands. While new developments are not supposed to exceed the current building's footprint, there are variances, and I can think of very, very few new developments in Gonzales that have remained within the old footprint. The new Gonzales plan guarantees we will have way more people compounded with a reduction in Green Space.

Why I live in Gonzales

I moved to Gonzales 17 years ago because I like the neighbourhood, I liked the ambience, the vibe, the predominance of single family dwellings, clean air, low traffic volume all the things that make Gonzales the great place to live that it is. I have been happily paying a lot of taxes to have the privilege of living where I live. The proposed Gonzales plan changes all that and not for the better. This plan supports developers and people that think they may one day possibly want to live here, not the current tax paying residents.

Thanks again for all the time and effort.

Sincerely,

Nic Humphreys

Lacey Maxwell

From: Janet Land [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 7:20 PM
To: Councillors
Cc: planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed neighbourhood plan for the Gonzales neighbourhood. While I support some increase in density the proposal to allow double rows of townhouses on what are now residential single family lots is unacceptable to me. I have asked how many townhouses could be placed on my lot under this proposal but have not been able to get an answer. I do know that two lots near me on Fairfield Rd will be developed into 20 townhouses some of which are 3 and 4 bedrooms. This isn't doubling or tripling density, it is a ten fold increase and inappropriate in a single family residential area. I was told some time ago that I could have a duplex on my lot but could not have an infill house along with my bungalow. But now what is being proposed is double row townhouses at a much higher density. That doesn't make sense to me unless you are trying to appeal only to developers.

Such density will drastically change the nature of our community. Many of the houses on my street are rented and have been for many years. The proposed development will mean that existing houses will be demolished and replaced by much more expensive homes for sale. People currently living here will not be able to afford to buy and the amount of rental accommodation will be drastically reduced. Why not encourage landlords to maintain older rental houses with some incentive like allowing infill housing? I would support allowing duplexes on smaller lots and even triplexes on bigger properties but not multiple townhouses on residential lots. To me that isn't much better than condos.

I chose to buy in my neighbourhood because as a senior I wanted a home where I could age in place. I don't think I want to live in a community high density townhouses, parking problems and only people who can afford to buy expensive new housing. Please don't ruin our neighbourhood.

Janet Land
1638 Earle St

Lacey Maxwell

From: Mully Jackson [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 7:44 PM
To: Councillors
Subject: Gonzales Plan

Dear Mayor and Council:

I was shocked and appalled when I received a copy of the Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan that is being discussed at the public hearing on Thursday March 8. I am out of town and wanted my voice to be heard.

Why have you proposed to destroy what the people of Fairfield have moved here to enjoy. The 'neighbourhood' of Fairfield is just that. Small groups of caring people who appreciate space, limited traffic, good schools and walkable amenities. What you are proposing is TERRIBLE.

You propose to increase density - by at least double in some areas and quadruple in others. Shake your (collective) heads.

Your multi-storey apartments with double rows of townhouses will skyrocket the population and density but at the same time, you have made NO PROVISIONS for schools, parks or other public infrastructure needed to support such a dramatic increase in density.

YOUR PROPOSAL WILL RUIN FAIRFIELD.

I just hope there is an election of council so I can vote you ALL OUT OF OFFICE before you can proceed with this TERRIBLE plan.

Yes - increase density with sensible, low rise, low cost, affordable housing on the busy streets such as Fairfield or Dallas Road and leave the 'neighbourhood' just as it is.

Respectfully,

Mully Jackson
266 Robertson Street
Victoria.

Lacey Maxwell

From: adrian philion [REDACTED]
Sent: March 7, 2018 9:18 PM
To: Councillors
Subject: Gonzales Neighborhood Plan

To the Mayor and Councillors,

My name is Adrian Philion and I live at 1617 Fairfield Road. My house is in the area where multi-story apartment buildings are proposed. My wife and I are appalled at the thought of living next to an apartment building that will block light from our garden, diminish our privacy, and change the character of the neighborhood that we have loved so much. The only people in this area of Gonzales who would be in support of this new neighbourhood plan are absentee landlords who stand to make a quick dollar by selling to a developer. Consideration must be given to people who live in this area and are directly affected by your decision.

I do not believe that the infrastructure of this part of Victoria is sufficient, nor has the capability to become sufficient, to support the higher density that will result. We have seen the negative consequences of bike lanes being built on wide roads such as Fort and Pandora; I fear what the consequences will be when applied to the narrower two-way streets of Gonzales. Although this plan is intended to encourage active transportation, anybody who does not ride a bike or use public transit will suffer. The elderly in this part of town will be disadvantaged and risk being displaced along with many other long-time residents.

There are so many areas nearby, such as Esquimalt and the Western Communities, where density could be increased without the need to compromise a historic and pleasant neighbourhood such as Gonzales. I understand the temptation to reign in more tax dollars by having higher numbers of property owners in Victoria proper, but this is not the answer. I am vehemently opposed to this new Gonzales neighbourhood plan. I am opposed to the point where I will vote against anybody in public office who supports this plan.

Sincerely,

Adrian Philion

Lacey Maxwell

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: March 8, 2018 8:24 AM
To: Councillors
Subject: Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am a resident of Gonzales and unfortunately am unable to attend tonight's Council meeting to speak against the Plan in its current form. Densification in our neighbourhood would, as intended, put more people in the neighbourhood but the fact that each of those people would almost definitely own a car is rarely mentioned except to do with where they would be parked. There are already areas where so many vehicles are parked on both sides of the road that it's increasingly difficult and dangerous to navigate the single lane remaining between them. It's true that the Plan stipulates off-road parking in some instances, but those cars are still going to be driven on roads which are not designed for even more traffic than there is at present.

We are seniors who do not own a car but who are MODO (car share) members, and we know not one other resident in our area who does not own a car.

Anne Ashley

Lacey Maxwell

From: Ann Steele [REDACTED]
Sent: March 8, 2018 12:48 PM
To: Councillors; planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Ann Steele [REDACTED]

Good Day,

Having reviewed the proposed draft plan and participated in discussions organized by the City in our neighbourhood, we would like to share a few observations: (We have resided here since 1991)

1. Fairfield Road is narrow and very busy already. Any diversion from Richardson would exacerbate a growing problem. The Fairfield Plaza is frequently overcapacity, especially near weekends and holidays. Increased density along Fairfield Road whether inside or outside Gonzales will further strain the main shopping Plaza (Thrifty Foods). It is difficult to imagine how this small plaza can expand unless it becomes multi level which will drive the demand for more parking as not everything can be done by bicycle or on foot-although we try.

Making Fairfield Road safer for all users, including bicycles is much appreciated as it is a main commuter link to downtown and Cook Street village.

2. The proposed increased density in the area will further congest schools, parks and shopping areas that are already challenged for space. It should be noted that Glenlyon Norfolk private school caters to families outside of the residential area. Gonzales Beach similarly, caters to visitors and local users alike. Tourism not only brings buses including large coaches, but also private vehicles and motor scooters. (Large tour buses not infrequently drive up Beechwood to Hollywood Crescent).

3. The sketches of the proposed style of townhouses/apartments show sensible consideration for the heritage building style of this area. This is in sharp contrast to the gradual replacement of this style by the square, flat-roofed, box style currently in vogue which block out light and have little or no green area around them. Houses disappear overnight to be replaced by very large, out-of character buildings.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ann and Jim Steele

Pamela Martin

From: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

From: [REDACTED]
Date: March 7, 2018 at 3:05:48 PM PST
To: <councillors@victoria.ca>
Cc: <planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca>
Subject: **Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan**

We wanted to express our concern regarding what would be allowed under the proposed Fairfield plan.

Numerous family homes have recently been demolished in the Gonzales neighbourhood and replaced with huge, multi million dollar homes. This has greatly increased the value of other homes; but with huge increases in property taxes. For those of us who are seniors and on fixed incomes, this is of great concern.

We totally disagree with allowing DOUBLE rows on townhouses on our street as well as other streets. Allowing 4 storey apartment buildings along Fairfield Rd. should only be considered if the units would be for low income or "working poor" families. We feel that no houses should be demolished without a guarantee that they will be replaced with affordable housing - affordable for the average family! The only ones to benefit from the proposals currently being considered are the developers and realtors. (We have already had realtors approach us with a view to purchasing our strata duplex - hoping your proposed plan is approved.)

Traffic near Richmond and Gonzales is congested at peak times of the day. Numerous students cross at the corner (often on their bikes) and allowing more density would increase the danger. The City took out crosswalks at this corner years ago so cars speed along with no recognition of people waiting to cross.

We urge you, the City Mayor and Councillors, not to approve the drastic proposals for Fairfield and collaborate with residents who live or work in Gonzales to come with a suitable plan.

Kathleen and Gary Rankin
1820 Gonzales Avenue

Pamela Martin

From: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Proposed Gonzales Plan

From: VIVIENNE PHILLIPS [REDACTED]
Date: March 7, 2018 at 3:35:19 PM PST
To: <councillors@victoria.ca>
Subject: Proposed Gonzales Plan

Dear Mayor and Council,

PROPOSED GONZALES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Today in the mail I recieved a flyer from Michael McMullen, Realtor with Re-Max Camosun it says:

"Hello Neighbour,

*I have been reading with interest the proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood plans. What a time of CHANGE for your community!
I am sure everyone will be watching closely for the results of the upcoming Council meeting and Public Hearing. I believe the outcome could provide an exciting opportunity to anyone who is considering selling in Gonzales area.*

It was a shock to think that a realtor was waiting on the outcome of this plan.

I love where I live, we have a amazing community where twice a year we all congregate for pot-luck suppers in the local church hall. We catch up on the news of each others lives. There are very few changes of neighbours as everyone LOVES living here. Most people renovate their homes as they don't want to move. We have everything here the local grocery shop in walking distance, the wonderful family based beach where we all meet in the summer in "our spot", when it snows someone clears a neighbours sidewalk. We take care of each other ... and you want to change all of this NO NO NO. We live in old stock homes that are loved and cared for, a few square block homes have squeeked in, which upsets the look and feel of the neighbourhood.

There is nothing wrong with the way Gonzales is presently, we love it the way it is. Why do you want to change it please leave it alone.

Vivienne Phillips

Voter and home owner

Lacey Maxwell

From: Susan [REDACTED]
Sent: February 20, 2018 10:06 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council; Lisa Helps (Mayor); Marianne Alto (Councillor); Chris Coleman (Councillor); Ben Isitt (Councillor); Jeremy Loveday (Councillor); Margaret Lucas (Councillor); Pam Madoff (Councillor); Charlayne Thornton-Joe (Councillor); Geoff Young (Councillor)
Subject: Request to Council to give the public engagement process for Fairfield & Gonzales Plans an additional three months.

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

We the undersigned are writing to you on the subject of community engagement in local area planning, specifically the Gonzales and Fairfield Neighbourhood Plans. We are residents of Fairfield and Gonzales who live around the Fairfield Neighbourhood Plaza between Fairfield and Richardson, and Stannard Ave and Richmond Roads.

The City policy on public engagement states that the process for neighbourhood planning should be at the 'involve' level. We certainly do not feel involved when we saw the detailed plans in September for Gonzales and in November for Fairfield, and given a short periods of time to offer feedback. We have not been given sufficient time to learn, absorb and understand the implications of the changes Council, planners and developers are proposing to our neighbourhood.

As the City policy states: "Community members are experts in their neighbourhoods and are best positioned to identify neighbourhood needs and outline strategies for both the short-term and long-term success of the area. Community members can participate in neighbourhood planning in many different ways, including participating at events and on advisory groups, developing and leading engagement activities, **and co-creating aspects of the plan.**"

Residents are now talking to one another about this and request Council to give the public engagement process for Fairfield & Gonzales Plans an additional three months more time to allow us, the residents, to complete our own engagement process, submit our recommended changes, and to recognize this "**residents' response phase**" as a necessary component of the overall engagement process. We also request that Council not consider Official Community Plan Bylaw, 2012, Amendment Bylaw (No. 21) to affect Gonzales land use until residents have this opportunity to respond.

After submission of our residents' response we commit to working with City staff to incorporate our recommended changes.

Yours sincerely,

Jessica Knowles, Tom Gregory, Dave Beulah, Suzan Doricic, John Luton, Heather Dickinson, Ivan Miller, Michael Sharpe, Barbara Power, Jim Fuller, Chris Ayles, Sara Ritchie, Lisa Buchan, Brett Pretty, Patricia Williams, Diane Pinch, Rob Schuckel, Glen Gerein, Rita Isaac, Dara Frere, Wayne Regan, Susan Kangasniemi, Ben Kangasniemi, Candice Csaky, Twila Lavender, F L Rippon, Carla Ode, Todd Polvi, Cris Hope, Bruce Heagle, Samir Jinnah, Frank Bea, Jared Boudreau, Susan Kainer*, Helen Fletcher, Adrianna Thompson, Maureen Thompson, Mike Thompson, S. Horak, David Knee, Ron Willson, Jim Johnson, Calvin Jones, Koksun Loo, David Clark, Melanie Austin, Louise Joly, Lucas Lindley, Paula Parkinson.

Residents of Sub Area 4 & Earle St
Fairfield Plaza Neighbourhood

*Member FGCA CALUC Any views or opinions expressed are solely mine and do not represent those of the FGCA CALUC.

Pamela Martin

From: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Re zoning plans for Fairfield and Gonzales Districts

From: Marg Penfold [REDACTED]
Date: March 8, 2018 at 9:22:08 AM PST
To: <councillors@victoria.ca>
Subject: Fwd: Re zoning plans for Fairfield and Gonzales Districts

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marg Penfold [REDACTED]
Date: March 8, 2018 at 9:09:23 AM PST
To: planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Re zoning plans for Fairfield and Gonzales Districts

Good Morning,
I will be travelling today, so will miss the public meeting regarding rezoning.

I am providing feedback based on what I have read online about the proposed changes. I understand the need to increase density, but I have concerns about some of the proposed actions.

My concerns about the changes are:

- by dramatically reducing parking, will we lose the diversity of tourists who visit locations like Dallas Road, Gonzales Beach, etc. (Public transport is not as easy to follow here as it is in Europe, nor is it as frequent)
- by dramatically reducing parking will we lose how involved our seniors are in the larger community because they are unable to take public transit. (example, my neighbour who does quite a bit of city bus travel, finds it just too physically challenging to shop at her Shoppers Drug Mart because she has to take 2 buses, and the overall trip lasts more than 1.5 hours.
When I drive her, the trip is 5 minutes, so we are able to shop at ease, have a coffee together and get her home before she is exhausted.
- by dramatically reducing parking, will we lose the diversity of families from outlying areas coming to Victoria for the day? (ie. too much "stuff" to bring when there are several children in tow.
- Could sidewalks be widened to accommodate bicycles, scooters, and perhaps golf carts?

I appreciate you taking my concerns into consideration.

Marg Penfold
204 St. Charles Street

Pamela Martin

From: Public Hearings
Subject: FW: Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

From: Susan Phillips [REDACTED]
Date: March 8, 2018 at 10:28:07 AM PST
To: <councillors@victoria.ca>, <planandzone@fieldcommunity.ca>
Subject: **Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan**

Dear Mayor, Councillors and Mr Biltek -

I am writing to let you know that I am strongly opposed to the proposed Gonzales neighbourhood plan. The plan does not appear to recognize the views and opinions of the majority of people that live in the neighbourhood. Further, it does not seem to recognize a number of practicalities such as the lack of infrastructure to support such a large increase in the local population. There are no plans for additional parks and schools, or ways to mitigate traffic congestion or to increase shopping areas. The Gonzales area is currently a pleasant neighbourhood with much green space, the majority of which would be built on or paved over if this plan should go ahead.

In addition, there are a number of houses currently rented in the area, and there are no plans to replace these houses/apartments with new rental housing if they are torn down.

Please consider the views of the people that live in the area and have much to lose in terms of their quality of life, if the proposed plan should go forward.

Sincerely -

Susan Phillips
710 Laurentian Place

Sent from my iPad

Pamela Martin

Subject: FW: Gonzales resident feedback

From: Kathy [REDACTED]

Date: March 8, 2018 at 2:50:35 PM PST

To: <councillors@victoria.ca>, <planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca>

Subject: Gonzales resident feedback

Dear Council,

As a long time resident of Fairfield, I would like to oppose several aspects of your proposed plan..

I feel that this amazing neighbourhood is in danger.

- 1.The densification in downtown Victoria should be meeting the needs for more housing.
- 2.The plan for Richardson to be made less attractive to street traffic will only serve to make Fairfield, Rockland and Richmond more congested than they already are.
3. Finding a parking spot at Fairfield Plaza is already difficult. How will our stores and services meet the needs of such an increase in density?
4. I drive a mobility scooter and the sidewalks are difficult enough without the added inconvenience and damage caused by construction and large vehicles like cement trucks,etc.

I feel that not enough planning has been done to ensure our infrastructure is ready for your vision.

I'm not opposed to having more affordable housing being built, but not at the expense of changing the look and character of Gonzales. Perhaps a grant to help build secondary suites would help the affordable accommodation needs?

I've been a taxpayer for 15 years, and am feeling railroaded into accepting this plan. I know I should have spoken up before but would appreciate being part of the solution henceforth. I look forward to attending the meeting online tonight.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Kathy Burch

Gerald E. Stinson
1851 Hollywood Crescent
Victoria B.C.
V8S 1J2

Victoria Mayor and Council
#1 Centennial Square
Victoria B.C.
V8W 1P6

FAX [REDACTED]

March 07 2018

SUBJECT: Proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Mayor and Council

I am thoroughly opposed to the proposed development plan, to be discussed and hopefully defeated at the weekly council meeting of March 08 2018. Again, access and egress to the area is limited to the north. Parking, is horrendous and roadways congested with stuff, cars, trucks, trailers, campers, some never moving for days. This added density limits land cultivation and can inhibit natural light, increased crime, leading to a ghetto type style life. I believe adopting this plan will destroy this liveable area.

It is all about money, follow it!

As ever , Jerry Stinson

Jerry Stinson

[REDACTED]

Lacey Maxwell

From: Kathy [REDACTED]
Sent: March 8, 2018 2:51 PM
To: Councillors; planandzone@fairfieldcommunity.ca
Subject: Gonzales resident feedback

Dear Council,

As a long time resident of Fairfield, I would like to oppose several aspects of your proposed plan..
I feel that this amazing neighbourhood is in danger.

- 1.The densification in downtown Victoria should be meeting the needs for more housing.
- 2.The plan for Richardson to be made less attractive to street traffic will only serve to make Fairfield, Rockland and Richmond more congested than they already are.
3. Finding a parking spot at Fairfield Plaza is already difficult. How will our stores and services meet the needs of such an increase in density?
4. I drive a mobility scooter and the sidewalks are difficult enough without the added inconvenience and damage caused by construction and large vehicles like cement trucks,etc.

I feel that not enough planning has been done to ensure our infrastructure is ready for your vision.
I'm not opposed to having more affordable housing being built, but not at the expense of changing the look and character of Gonzales. Perhaps a grant to help build secondary suites would help the affordable accommodation needs?

I've been a taxpayer for 15 years, and am feeling railroaded into accepting this plan. I know I should have spoken up before but would appreciate being part of the solution henceforth.
I look forward to attending the meeting online tonight.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Kathy Burch

Lacey Maxwell

From: Maery Callaghan [REDACTED]
Sent: March 8, 2018 3:59 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: SUSANNE RAUTIO; MAERY CALLAGHAN
Subject: Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Mayor & Council.

I had planned to attend tonight's council meeting but I have that terrible flu so I am communicating this way. I love living in Gonzales.....it is beautiful ,green, with lots of wonderful old houses and a great sense of community. The people who live here, choose to live here for these reasons. We have a Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan in which a certain density was agreed to. my main fear was that we would lose too many beautiful old homes to tasteless developers! But now it seems you want to circumvent the established and increase the density even more ! This is so unfair! I didn't vote for this; I didn't agree to this and I don't want this! If I wanted to live in an ugly ,overcrowded, world-class city I could have stayed in Vancouver !!! People, including tourists, love Victoria for a reason.....LET'S NOT LOVE VICTORIA TO DEATH !!!!!

Thanks for your attention

MAERY CALLAGHAN
324 Richmond Ave.
V8S 3Y1