

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 5:53 PM
To: Kristina Bouris
Cc: Lisa Helps (Mayor); Engagement
Subject: Proposed Victoria Heritage Conservation Area - Durban Street

Hello Ms. Bouris,

By now you will have conducted two meetings about the pros and cons of the proposed Heritage Conservation Areas. Unfortunately I was unable to attend these meetings in person, and thus was unable to express my STRONG disagreement/opposition to this proposal.

I own ^{personal inf} Durban Street. It is a non-descript ^{personal information} sometime in the late 1990s or early 2000s (prior to my purchase). It is absolutely lacking in any form of character or heritage. While I agree that there are some beautiful character/heritage homes in the area, my house is definitely not one of them! A mechanism already exists for the owners of genuine heritage homes to apply for heritage designation and thus be bound by the restrictive conditions (and receive the benefits).

Your proposed "blanket" designation of an entire block is completely unacceptable. Every house in the area would be bound by the restrictive conditions and would not receive any of benefits that individual heritage properties are afforded. Would I be required to keep the "stucco" exterior even if it requires replacing? Would I be required to keep the ^{personal information}; just because it is "heritage"? Would the ^{personal information} (which I would love to remove) be mandated to remain all in the sake of "preserving the heritage"? Should I be forced to leave the ^{personal information} just because it was there when I purchased the property? Your answer to all these questions might be "of course not, you would simply have to apply for a permit and meet with the heritage board". I have heard horror stories of such meetings, since the heritage boards are merely individuals with their own biases and preferences. I am not willing to allow myself to be placed under conditions that homeowners one block away are free from.

If you are trying to preserve the heritage, you are too late. At least half of the houses in the area have been replaced or modified to such an extent that there is NO heritage left. It is merely an eclectic neighborhood that will continue to evolve, much like every other neighborhood in Victoria UNLESS the municipal government decides to single out this block in an attempt to "freeze time". If you are trying to prevent "in-fill" housing, I must request an answer as to why only certain streets are being protected/restricted.

I am sending this email to be placed on record as being STRONGLY opposed. I have spoken with some of my neighbors and they suggested that silence could be regarded as approval. So I am not being silent. I do NOT approve. Some of these same neighbors have indicated a desire to pursue legal representation should this proposal be moved forward against what seems to be overwhelming opposition. I will be contributing toward that legal fight if need be.

I feel that Mayor Helps has done an excellent job at allowing citizens to be involved in municipal affairs, and in allowing our voices to be heard. Please send me a reply to let me know that my voice has been heard on this matter.

Sincerely.

personal information

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2017 4:38 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: Durban Street, Heritage Conservation Area

Dear Mayor Helps,

I would like you to know that I am adamantly opposed to the City of Victoria's plan to make Durban Street a Heritage Conservation Area.

This would completely erode my rights as a property owner and would put me at a financial disadvantage from other home owners in Victoria. My house^{personal informat} Durban Street personal information not an Arts and Crafts house. The value of my Fairfield West home is all in the land.

Durban Street has changed a lot over the last few years with homes being completely redesigned. I have lived in my house since personal information my largest investment for my future as well as the future personal information . I am so scared as to our future if this were to happen! I do not think anyone would be interested in purchasing my house with a Heritage Conservation Area designation.

personal information for us and to maintain my homes appearance. Never in my imagination did I ever think something like this could threaten our financial security.

Sincerely,
personal information
personal information property owner,

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2017 4:16 PM
To: Lisa Helps (Mayor)
Subject: In favor of heritage conservation area

Hello Mayor Helps

I filled out the survey about development in Victoria. I was pleasantly surprised at its efficiency and educational strength.

I understand that there is some resistance to the heritage conservation areas. I wanted to take the other side, as a Durban St resident, and say that I would like this street to conserve its beauty, through conserving the beauty of its houses.

However, I am also in favour of sharing the financial burden of the residents who will obtain less than they could if they sold their house, and who cannot upgrade their houses as much as they want. My preferred option would be to see the city fill the financial gap for these people. Having a historic and beautiful city support all of Victorians and I think all of Victorians should support the residents who lose through the decision to create heritage conservation areas.

I am not sure of how this would be achieved. One idea would be to have the city pay the difference between offered price and the *appraised* price for a property of similar size in neighbouring streets, at the time when the property is bought. I understand that it will be costing a few millions to the city, but I believe it would be only fair to the residents and does not represent a huge amount for our city. I would suggest that such an arrangement be a condition for the continuation of the heritage designation.

For clarification, I own a newly renovated house and do not belong to the group of people who will likely suffer from the designation (although I may).

These were my quick thoughts, I am not sure how applicable they are.

Thank you
personal information

--

personal information

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, May 1, 2017 11:17 AM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: Heritage Conservation Area personal information Dallas Road

Dear Ms. Bouris.

I was unable to attend to meeting on the 26th of April and am unavailable on May 3rd.

Please place me on record as being opposed to designation of my residence within a Heritage Conservation Area.

Please also acknowledge receipt of my opposition.

Thank you.

personal information

Dallas Road
Victoria BC
Telephone: personal information

Rob Gordon

From: Kristina Bouris
Sent: Monday, May 1, 2017 8:55 AM
To: Merinda Conley; Adrian Brett
Cc: Lauren Martin
Subject: RE: Heritage Conservation- Fairfield

Thanks, Merinda. I'll ask Adrian to follow up.
Kristina

-----Original Message-----

From: Merinda Conley
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2017 8:54 AM
To: Adrian Brett <abrett@victoria.ca>; Kristina Bouris <KBouris@victoria.ca>
Cc: Lauren Martin <LMartin@victoria.ca>
Subject: FW: Heritage Conservation- Fairfield

Good morning, Adrian and Kristina.

As mentioned to Kristina after work on Friday, please see the email below regarding concerns over one of the HCA's in Fairfield. Since I was not at the Open House, I have not responded to this email and hope that one of you can address his concerns.

Thank you.

Cheers,
Merinda

Merinda Conley, MRAIC, MAAA(IA), CET
Senior Planner - Heritage
Sustainable Planning and Community Development Department City of Victoria
1 Centennial Square, Victoria BC V8W 1P6

T 250.361.0533 F 250.361.0386

-----Original Message-----

From: **personal information**
Sent: April 28, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Merinda Conley <mconley@victoria.ca>
Subject: Heritage Conservation- Fairfield

Dear Ms. Conley,

I first would like to express my support for maintaining the heritage of the community. However, I am perplexed that my property **personal information** Dallas Road is being considered for inclusion in the conservation area. My house was built in 1939 and has been extensively modified. Before I purchased our home, it had an addition added to the back of the house. When the stucco siding started to breakdown, the previous owners added insulation to the stucco then covered it with vinyl siding. In its present state, I wouldn't consider our home as something that constitutes being in the conservation area.

In the future, if our house needs repairs then we plan to make improvements that maintain the character of the neighbourhood (remove the vinyl siding). However, if our home is included in the conservation area then this will likely devalue our property once we decide to sell at some distant time in the future. Furthermore, there are several examples in the neighbourhood where building permits have been allowed to remove existing buildings and/or add and modify existing buildings that make absolutely no sense.

For these reasons, I do not support personal information Dallas Road as part of the Fairfield Conservation Area.

Best regards,
personal information

personal information Dallas Road
Victoria, B. C. V8V 1B8 Canada
Office:
personal information

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Tuesday, Apr 25, 2017 2:38 PM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: Heritage Conversations Areas

Hello Kristina,

I am unable to attend the meeting on the Heritage Conversation Areas on Wednesday the 26th and will try to on May 3rd. Your timing is bad for me as I am volunteering full time personal information

. I wanted you to know I do take the subject of heritage in the Fairfield areas very seriously. The subject of conversation areas has already created heated discussions in my neighbourhood and I really don't have enough details to understand my view on this so would very much appreciate some more information from you.

Here are my questions at this point.

- What is the process for the current Heritage areas around changes to their property?
- Who, how and when will the decision be made to make these areas a Heritage Conservation Area?
- What does the may require a permit mean? if I want to update the windows in my house will I need a permit? if I want to landscape will I need a permit? if I want to paint my house will I need a permit? the more detail you can provide me with be helpful.
- How will this permit process differ from the existing permit process? and will be have to go through two processes?
- If the costs are more to follow the new permit process with the city compensate property owners?
- The city has already allowed flat top buildings to happen in this area? why should other property owners going forward be restricted now? and how will the city compensate?
- I have had two developers tell me if the city would allow extra height as an option they would be happy not to build flat tops. People are wanting high ceilings and therefore are forced to go a route that does not fit in. Why not look at changing this? has this been looked in to? I would prefer to see this happen as a way of preserving more than just a few streets.
- How was the area I live in picked as a possibility and what was the process?
- I have been told my two developers this will negatively impact my property value as will put more restrictions on potential new development and created a long process? Please comment on this?

I do value the beauty of my community and the heritage feel of my neighbourhood . We have worked hard over the years to maintain our property and to contribute to this . I am not convinced by creating a few more heritage areas in my neighbour it will be preserving enough of the historic feel of Fairfield. Clearly from walking through Fairfield the current methods are not preserving and I don't think what you are proposing is a huge help. I think it is time the city and planners look at different methods and be innovative. if this is a priority. I understand my neighbours concerns about the negative financial impacts to them. So as much as I support preserving the heritage feel of my neighborhood at this point I am not convince the city is approaching this in a way that achieves this.

I appreciate you answering my questions and will give this more thought and engage with my neighborhoods more on this subject.

In closing I think your process has already got us a bit defensive as I must admit I found it a surprise to get your letter with the suggested areas. I would suggest an approach of informing us of the possibilities and why and having us part of the selection would have been more helpful.

Thanks

personal information

Cook St.

personal information

personal information

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, Apr 17, 2017 6:45 AM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Ms. Bouris, personal information
personal information and I, owners and residents Trutch Street, will attend the meeting on April 26 at Fairfield Community Place.

I want to make you aware that Trutch Street is in desperate need of speed bumps. This beautiful heritage area has become a racetrack -- particularly before/after work commuting hours, but actually ALL DAY -- for motorists : taxis, delivery trucks, everything imaginable, intending to cut out the bottleneck at Richardson/Cook and Fairfield /Cook. I hope you will help the residents of Trutch, quickly, to attain the peace, and safety, that speed bumps will bring.

I shall be bringing, to the meeting, a petition for residents of Trutch , who attend, to sign, to this end. Please help us get speed bumps on Trutch!

Sincerely, personal information

Sent from my iPad

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Sunday, Apr 16, 2017 8:46 AM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: Fairfield Heritage Conservation Area

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Kristina, My wife and I reviewed the correspondence you mailed on April 10. We very much support your initiative to maintain the character of our neighbourhood and would also support one for greater Victoria as a whole. The current trend of “modern” homes being built in established, consistent neighbourhoods is not predicated on good architecture but strictly on maximizing square footage, therefore enhanced profit for the developer. I see this as selfish, greed by the developer with no regard for the vision of what Victoria will look like in the future. One thing I would suggest taking a look at would be to lower the height restriction on new houses if they fail to have a certain pitch roof. This would also help to eliminate the box look of some new construction. We are currently personal information Durban and are doing what we think you are trying to achieve; maintain the heritage/ character of a home but still allow incorporation of current building techniques and up to date amenities. Hope this little rant helps you and if you would like to talk about it we can be reached at personal information , we probably won’t be able to attend the information meetings. Best Regards. personal information

~~personal information~~ Durban
Victoria, BC
May 1, 2017

personal information

Mayor Lisa Helps,
Victoria City Council,
Victoria, BC

Dear Mayor Helps,

RE: Enveloping Durban Street in a Heritage Conservation Area

I would like you to know that I am adamantly opposed to this plan and will be contacting legal counsel if necessary. The neighbours with whom I have met are opposed as well and have contributed to the research on this issue as presented below.

This concept erodes our rights as property owners and citizens, and arbitrarily puts us at a financial disadvantage to other private property owners in Victoria. We were unaware of this plan until mid-April by mail, with a subsequent meeting April 26th.

Real estate firms in Victoria have stated unequivocally that this designation has a negative affect on property values and immediately diminishes the number of prospective buyers. They have had potential buyers turned down on mortgages (CHMC) for homes that require heritage upgrading. Homeowners with Heritage Designation revealed that it is extremely costly to replicate historic elements as time goes by. My previous neighbour will attest to the added cost, frustrations, and time delays in restoring for sale her uncle's Heritage Designated home on Durban two years ago.

Recently several houses on Durban have been significantly redesigned from their original appearance. Presently, a small one-storey building on a large street frontage is being demolished and replaced by two two-storey houses. And even though the option is available, no present Durban homeowners have chosen to have their home designated as heritage. Two previous owners had this designation placed on their homes years ago.

Parking already is compromised by proximity to a school, the Moss Street Market, a daycare, and a hydrant serving the City Sewer trucks multiple times per day. We do not want increased congestion, transient traffic, or more street noise.

I value heritage. I support, within reason, tax dollars to preserve public buildings. In fact I was on the 10-person architectural team that negotiated the saving of Gastown in the 60's. I do take exception however to private homeowners being forced to give up rights and be encumbered by added permits to benefit visitors and local sight-seers.

As our young neighbours have stated, future generations should not be encumbered by limitations that make it difficult and expensive to build energy efficient, earthquake resistant homes that fit the needs of their families. It is totally unfair and wrong to place this designation on our street, and its present and future residents.

Sincerely,
~~personal information~~ property owner, ~~personal information~~

From: personal information
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 7:44 AM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council <mayorandcouncil@victoria.ca>
Cc: Jonathan Tinney <JTinney@victoria.ca>
Subject: Heritage Conservations Areas Fairfield Conerns

Dear Mayor and Council,

Subject: Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs) in Fairfield:

I strongly oppose the four HCAs being proposed in Fairfield. To start, I want you to know the subject of heritage preservation in Fairfield is one I take very seriously and have lived in one of the proposed areas (Cook St. and Dallas Rd) for over 20 years. I value heritage, evident by the thousands of hours we have personally invested in respectfully maintaining the heritage in our home. Along with heritage, I also value fairness, and my relationships with neighbours and the community, the HCAs do not support these values. This is why it is now important for me to write directly to Mayor and Council expressing my concerns. I have been engaging with city staff, they are aware of my concerns and attended the impacted property owners workshop. I appreciate all the work city staff has done and know it is very hard trying to balance many perspectives and engage busy community members. **Staff have informed me many of the process problems are a result of the Fairfield Local Area Plan being fast tracked. Along, with my concerns I will also recommend an alternative approach, one which will cover a larger area working in a cooperative and collaborative manner resulting in preserving more heritage in Fairfield.**

Concerns:

1) HCA's in these few tiny areas will do little to achieve heritage preservation in Fairfield. What about the remaining 99%. HCAs are the wrong tool for preservation heritage in Fairfield.

I have tried to understand what will be achieved within these tiny areas. At the workshop a photo of the new house at 123 Cook St. was shown saying we need to protect from more of these flat tops because they don't fit. If this is the case how will this help the broader community preserve a heritage look? The majority of the homes highlighted in the survey and at the workshop in my area are already designated heritage. Is the objective of these HCAs to force the few that aren't? How does this help the broader community preserve heritage? The homes in my area and street are very diverse and I do not think you can put the same umbrella of restrictions over such a diversity of homes and doing so has caused tension among neighbours. I do not understand the criteria for the selection of these tiny areas. Why stop at May St? Why stop at Cambridge? And why not include other areas where heritage homes exist? In talking to my neighbours many who also attended the impacted owners workshops they do not understand either and feel the overly restrictive approach of few HCAs are the wrong tool for preserving heritage.

2) The proposed HCAs will negatively impact our property values; restrict and limit our ability to afford the maintenance on our homes. Understandably, this has many of my neighbours frightened, angry, anxious and talking about potentially taking legal

action. For some, this could have a negative impact on their retirement plans and the ability to age in place.

Normally, if a City forces heritage designation on a property owner the City is required to compensate the owner. We have been informed the City does not plan any compensation to impacted property owners. The last two heritage designations on Cook St were part of a package that included approval for a zoning change to allow a small lot on the same property. In my view this is a large compensation. I do not think it is fair to for HCAs to be forced on areas with no consideration of compensation. I have and many of my neighbours have also talked to real estate agents and developers and they have all told us will have negative impact our property values. The Local Government Act states; **Compensation for heritage designation 613 (1)** *If a designation by a heritage designation bylaw causes, or will cause at the time of designation, a reduction in the market value of the designated **property**, the local government must compensate an owner of the designated **property** (HCA is a designation of all the properties within and the same rules and regulations that apply to homes with heritage designation according to section 615 can be applied to homes within a HCA)*

The current approach has many of my neighbours talking about legal action if this goes ahead. I am very hopeful this doesn't happen when I believe we can accomplish much more working collaboratively rather than in a confrontational manner. As a taxpayer I am also very concerned about the potentially large liability for loss of property value this can have to the city/taxpayer.

3) The process to date has not been fair to impacted property owners. A former resident spoke in 2012 to Mayor and Council about a HCA in my area. Next in the fall of 2017, a top down workshop of 30 people(none from my area) the city presented proposed areas followed by a yellow sticker exercise resulted in the four areas begin selected. Then, a survey to the broader community was sent asking for their input and did not cover any cons as was done in previous sections nor did it ask for other ideas and thoughts on preserving heritage. This is a huge missed opportunity. At the same time the survey was out a letter was sent to impacted property owners inviting them to attend a workshop. At the workshop I asked if the communities input from the survey would have as much weight as impacted property owners input I was told yes. This is not fair given the survey was biased and has added to the tensions.

Here is the process as I understand it in more detail:

City staff informed me the idea of my area being a HCA started in 2012 by a former resident **personal information** This resulted in a small mention in the OCP to explore the idea. The neighbour who requested this no longer lives in the area and I can find no one else including myself that was aware of this. The next mention of a HCA is in the Strategic Plan updated in January 2017 this time was Dallas Road between Cook St and Clover Point. Next the Fairfield Local Area Plan started. A workshop of about 30 people showed up. The format was the city presenting their ideas then a yellow sticker exercise. This resulted in the four areas being selected. No one from the areas the city presented as options were directly invited to attend this initial workshop. Next a survey asking the boarder community for input was sent out at the same time letters to impacted property owners was sent with an invite to a workshops to discuss the impacts with them. The

HCA part of the survey did not follow the rest of the survey's format of pros and cons and just highlight benefits and most homes highlighted are already designated nor did it take an ideal opportunity to ask for other ideas. Once I did the survey I voiced my concerns about the survey going out before impacted property owners could voice their concerns, being biased, missing an opportunity for other input and asked for the survey to be changed and or the results not to weigh the same and to reflect the process problem. I was told no but good idea for the next surveys.

The above approach being fast tracked through the Fairfield Local Area Plan has missed a huge opportunity to achieve broader input and ideas from the community and to work in a collaborative approach and I do not think aligns with the spirit of Section 15: Community well-being Civic Engagement.

Recommendation:

Create a Heritage Collaboration Area for Fairfield

This is an idea a neighbour discussed with me, one I support, and would invest my time in. The approach would be collaborative vs. top down by regulators and would focus on education and solutions for enhancing and preserving heritage values. The city, homeowners, developers and NGOs would help facilitate a process where solutions are found for renovations and construction that preserve and enhance heritage values. I think this creative approach will have far more benefits to enhancing heritage in Fairfield than a few HCAs. It will also achieve broader awareness of heritage values and better contribute to culture change on this important issue. **This approach also will allow us to focus on preserving heritage rather than pitting neighbours against one another and the city.**

Thanks very much for your time and consideration and would look forward to discussing this important subject with you.

personal information

Cook St.

personal information

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2017 9:01 AM
To: Kristina Bouris <KBouris@victoria.ca>
Subject: Re: follow up to last friday's meeting and email sent April 25th

hello,

thanks for the information.

Thought best to send my comments since previous comments were on the workshop notes.

I do not support the Heritage Conservations area being proposed in Fairfield. HCAs are not the appropriate tool for preserving heritage in Fairfield. It is not fair to impose restrictions on property owners a few areas. Also, I think the consultation process along with the survey has not been fair to impacted property owners and does not follow the OCP community well-being civic engagement.

I appreciate the fact you have been asked to fast tack the planning process but do think given the impact on properly owners consulting with them before the broader community was the fair and respectful way to approach consultation and also there was a missed opportunity to hear other ideas on heritage.

Happy to answer any questions you have on the above.

personal information

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, Jun 5, 2017 6:49 AM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: Heritage Conservation Area ~ opposed!

Hi Kristina,

Thank you for taking the time to chat with me about the heritage conservation area after our last working group meeting. I've been talking with some of our neighbours and am in alignment with personal information, and will quote their letter to you and the city here, as my husband and I could not have worded it more perfectly:

*"We are big supporters of heritage values and do want to help to preserve heritage values in our own home and in the community more broadly. That said, **we have significant concerns about the heritage conservation approach being proposed and are very much opposed to its implementation.** When we originally heard about this our understanding was that it was going to be significantly different than heritage designation, and would still enable all home owners a lot of flexibility to make changes to their homes. After learning more about this the other day it sounds like it will actually be very restrictive and could end up having a similar effect as actually being fully designated. This is a significant concern for us and many neighbours we have spoken to. This would in fact be even worse than a heritage designation as a home owner would be forced into it and would receive no compensation, even if the restrictions caused significant financial loss. As **our homes are our biggest asset, this is an enormous concern.***

*We are also concerned about these restrictions preventing home owners from making changes to their properties to improve energy efficiency, aesthetics, maintenance, etc. **The restrictions could result in dramatically higher costs and loss in value. What's even more concerning, is that this approach would only address heritage concerns for a tiny portion of the homes in our community, many of which have heritage values. It seems like an odd approach as it leaves most homes that have heritage value with no mechanism what so ever for maintaining and enhancing heritage values but ensures an overly restrictive approach to a few homes.***

*Some of our neighbours have already started talking about taking legal action to prevent this as they are truly afraid of the restrictions and potential loss in value. I am not very knowledgeable on the legalities of the matter but hope that no one will go down such an acrimonious path. None the less, it does point to the fact that **if the City does pursue this it will ensure an adversarial process with many neighbours rather than the cooperative process we hope for in our community.***

***We, and many of our neighbours, are strongly opposed to this approach** and are hopeful that the City will instead take a new approach. **We suggest the City take an approach focused on educating and collaborating with homeowners on heritage preservation.** This would include providing home owners information at time of permit on opportunities to conduct renovations in ways that preserve and enhance heritage values. Suggestions can be made, without requiring our homes to adhere to an entirely different set of rules than everyone else, including other local homes with heritage values, must adhere to. **This approach could be rolled out across the whole neighbourhood, resulting in much higher levels of overall heritage preservation and enhancement overall.** We and our neighbours would happily cooperate with the City to maintain and enhance heritage values in our homes, but **we are strongly opposed to being forced into adhering to someone else's ideas of what our homes must look like.** This collaborative approach would encourage cooperation, and our whole*

neighbourhood would work together to strengthen heritage values in our community. The alternative will result in an adversarial process that will be detrimental to everyone in the long run.”

We are **strongly opposed** to the Heritage Conservation Area being imposed upon our street and neighbourhood, and would like our opposition to be taken into consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me for further discussion. **personal information**

Sincerely,

personal information

Cook Street
Victoria BC

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Thursday, Jun 1, 2017 3:25 PM
To: Kristina Bouris
Cc: Rebecca Penz
Subject: Heritage Conversion Area - South Cook St/ Dallas Road

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Kristina,

Thank you for taking the time to provide information about the heritage conservation area that is being considered in South Cook St Dallas Rd. We really appreciate your time and all the information provided. I know how busy staff are and it means a lot that you put so much effort in. Here are my key thoughts on this matter:

We are big supporters of heritage values and do want to help to preserve heritage values in our own home and in the community more broadly. That said, **we have significant concerns about the heritage conservation approach being proposed and are very much opposed to its implementation.** When we originally heard about this our understanding was that it was going to be significantly different than heritage designation, and would still enable all home owners a lot of flexibility to make changes to their homes. After learning more about this the other day it sounds like it will actually be very restrictive and could end up having a similar effect as actually being fully designated. This is a significant concern for us and many neighbours we have spoken to. This would in fact be even worse than a heritage designation as a home owner would be forced into it and would receive no compensation, even if the restrictions caused significant financial loss. As **our homes are our biggest asset, this is an enormous concern.**

We are also concerned about these restrictions preventing home owners from making changes to their properties to improve energy efficiency, aesthetics, maintenance, etc. **The restrictions could result in dramatically higher costs and loss in value. What's even more concerning, is that this approach would only address heritage concerns for a tiny portion of the homes in our community, many of which have heritage values.** It seems like an odd approach as **it leaves most homes that have heritage value with no mechanism what so ever for maintaining and enhancing heritage values but ensures an overly restrictive approach to a few homes.**

Some of our neighbours have already started talking about taking legal action to prevent this as they are truly afraid of the restrictions and potential loss in value. I am not very knowledgeable on the legalities of the matter but hope that no one will go down such an acrimonious path. None the less, it does point to the fact that **if the City does pursue this it will ensure an adversarial process with many neighbours rather than the cooperative process we hope for in our community.**

We, and many of our neighbours, are strongly opposed to this approach and are hopeful that the City will instead take a new approach. **We suggest the City take an approach focused on educating and collaborating with homeowners on heritage preservation.** This would include providing home owners information at time of permit on opportunities to conduct renovations in ways that preserve and enhance heritage values. Suggestions can be made, without requiring our homes to adhere to an entirely different set of rules than everyone else, including other local homes with heritage values, must adhere to. **This approach could be rolled out across the whole neighbourhood, resulting in much higher levels of overall heritage preservation and enhancement overall.** We and our neighbours would happily cooperate with the City to maintain and enhance heritage values in our homes, but **we are strongly opposed to being forced into adhering to someone else's ideas of what our homes must look like.** This collaborative approach would encourage cooperation, and our whole neighbourhood would work together to strengthen heritage values in our community. The alternative will result in an adversarial process that will be detrimental to everyone in the long run.

Thank you for your consideration.

personal information

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, Jun 12, 2017 2:53 PM
To: Victoria Mayor and Council
Cc: Kristina Bouris; Engagement; Community Planning email inquiries
Subject: Dallas and Cook Heritage Conservation Area

Dear Mayor Helps and Councillors,

As part of the review and development of the new Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan (FNP), City of Victoria planning staff have presented a proposal for additional Heritage Conservation Areas. This proposal is apparently in response to what staff have heard from participants engaged in the FNP development process. Participants reportedly have identified the importance of preserving the historic feel of Fairfield's homes and streets as part of maintaining the beauty and character of this neighbourhood and staff have proposed four additional residentially oriented Heritage Conservation Areas as a potential approach for pursuing this outcome.

We live within one of the proposed Heritage Conservation Areas, the Dallas and Cook HCA. We highly value the character and amenities of the entire Fairfield neighbourhood, including the interesting collection of housing styles. It is a key reason why we have happily lived in our home for 38 years. We also recognize that a neighbourhood is a dynamic entity, always changing in response to social, economic and environmental influences.

The proposed Dallas and Cook HCA (south along Cook Street from May to Dallas, and east along Dallas from Cook to Cambridge) includes 24 properties. The properties are a mix of housing styles, sizes and ages and include apartment buildings, one large tourist accommodation complex, multi-family buildings (both strata and non-strata) as well as single family residences. Of the 24 properties with this proposed HCA, 9 have already been identified with a heritage designation - seven are designated heritage and 2 are listed on the heritage registry. 15 properties are not part of the heritage protection and/or recognition process. While these 15 properties are well well-maintained, reflecting a pride of ownership, and complement the streetscape, they likely contribute minimal heritage values. Dallas and Cook are among Victoria's busiest arteries for residents and visitors alike who no doubt enjoy driving, biking and walking past these buildings. We can understand why city staff are proposing to designate this area as an HCA.

However, we are firmly opposed to the proposed HCA for the Dallas and Cook area for the following reasons:

1. existing heritage designation tools allow homeowners to elect to protect and/or recognize heritage attributes of their properties - this approach works
2. designation of an HCA over an area with a minority of structures that exhibit heritage values, imposes an unnecessary and inappropriate restriction on the majority of properties that do not have heritage values
3. inclusion of a non-heritage property within an HCA will impact the future value of that property - restrictions on the use and development of the property will narrow the range of potential buyers in the market
4. future property improvements will require an additional municipal approval process, potentially both limiting what can be done and requiring additional costs for 'heritage' style design and construction
5. there is no homeowner incentive, financial or otherwise, to agree with an HCA designation over a non-heritage property when there is clearly an impact

We attended a Homeowner Workshop facilitated by City planning staff and we appreciate the efforts to engage those affected by the proposed HCA concept. There were strongly expressed concerns and opposition to the Dallas and Cook HCA proposal at the Workshop by the majority of homeowners participating. Based on conversations we are having in our neighbourhood, the City does not have support for the Dallas and Cook HCA proposal from those citizens directly affected. We respectfully ask that you listen to and respect our views, and protect our interests.

Sincerely,

personal information

Cook Street
Victoria, BC

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Wednesday, Apr 26, 2017 12:44 PM
To: Kristina Bouris
Cc: Victoria Mayor and Council
Subject: Fw: Heritage Conversations Areas

Hello Kristina,

I have left you a voice message to call me and will be busy for the rest of the day and given the timing of this subject thought would email you.

I did get a call yesterday from someone in your office in response to my following email. He was unable to answer many of my questions. As you know from my questions I wanted some answers on process and decision making. I was told the proposed areas came out of a planning session with about 30 people attending. The next steps would be a consultation with people impacted. Today I decided to do the future of Fairfield survey. I was shocked to see a whole section on the heritage conservation areas including a photo and address of my house. I do not feel this consultation process has followed the spirit of the OCP where people that are impacted are consulted. I think sending out a broad survey before consulting with the impacted property owners is wrong. You are actively seeking other opinions before consulting with the people who stand to be significantly impacted.. As a result of the photos of our house and address in this survey I had a neighbour very upset at me for supporting heritage conservation in our area. I had no idea my house and address was part of this survey.

My request is you put the current survey on hold until you have consulted with the impacted property owners on this subject.

Thank you

personal information

Cook St

personal information

----- O
From: personal information
To: kbouris@victoria.ca
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2017 2:38 PM
Subject: Heritage Conversations Areas

Hello Kristina,

I am unable to attend the meeting on the Heritage Conversation Areas on Wednesday the 26th and will try to on May 3rd. Your timing is bad for me as I am volunteering full time personal information

I wanted you to know I do take the subject of heritage in the Fairfield areas very seriously. The

subject of conversation areas to has already created heated discussions in my neighbourhood and I really don't have enough details to understand my view on this so would very much appreciate some more information. from you.

Here are my questions at this point.

- What is the process for the current Heritage areas around changes to their property?
- Who, how and when will the decision be made to make these areas a Heritage Conservation Area?
- What does the may require a permit mean? if I want to update the windows in my house will I need a permit? if I want to landscape will I need a permit? if I want to paint my house will I need a permit? the more detail you can provide me with be helpful.
- How will this permit process differ from the existing permit process? and will be have to go through two processes?
- If the costs are more to follow the new permit process with the city compensate property owners?
- The city has already allowed flat top buildings to happen in this area? why should other property owners going forward be restricted now? and how will the city compensate?
- I have had two developers tell me if the city would allow extra height as an option they would be happy not to build flat tops. People are wanting high ceilings and therefore are forced to go a route that does not fit in. Why not look at changing this? has this been looked in to? I would prefer to see this happen as a way of preserving more than just a few streets.
- How was the area I live in picked as a possibility and what was the process?
- I have been told my two developers this will negatively impact my property value as will put more restrictions on potential new development and created a long process? Please comment on this?

I do value the beauty of my community and the heritage feel of my neighbourhood . We have worked hard over the years to maintain our property and to contribute to this . I am not convinced by creating a few more heritage areas in my neighbour it will be preserving enough of the historic feel of Fairfield. Clearly from walking through Fairfield the current methods are not preserving and I don't think what you are proposing is a huge help. I think it is time the city and planners look at different methods and be innovative. if this is a priority. I understand my neighbours concerns about the negative financial impacts to them. So as much as I support preserving the heritage feel of my neighborhood at this point I am not convince the city is approaching this in a way that achieves this.

I appreciate you answering my questions and will give this more thought and engage with my neighborhoods more on this subject.

In closing I think your process has already got us a bit defensive as I must admit I found it a surprise to get your letter with the suggested areas. I would suggest an approach of informing us of the possibilities and why and having us part of the selection would have been more helpful.

Thanks

personal information

Cook St.

personal information

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, Jun 12, 2017 9:40 AM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: Re: HCA for Kipling St.

Good Morning Kristina,
My wife and I personal information Kipling Street (area 3) our original intention was to let the younger owners decide on this proposal without our input, but over the weekend we were visited by an interested party from Area 1, distributing input from realtors and developers; so we want you to know we are in favor of the HCA designation as proposed.
Thank You,
personal information

Rob Gordon

Subject: FW: Fairfield Gonzales Survey

From: personal information

Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2017 7:20 PM

To: Engagement <engage@victoria.ca>

Subject: Fairfield Gonzales Survey

I just completed the online survey regarding the Neighbourhood Plan for the Fairfield/Gonzales area and I'm very disappointed in the structure of the survey. There is very limited attention in the survey given to the Heritage Conservation Areas being proposed and zero opportunity in the survey to comment on that aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan being developed.

Should the HCA be implemented as proposed it could have a very significant impact on our property, especially if some of the forms of new housing will be permitted in the future. For example, the street we are on is proposed to have HCA on one side but not the other and could theoretically be considered a major street. One side would be subject to HCA while the other could be developed into townhomes with no special consideration of how the townhomes would fit into the HCA. Highly unfair and there is no doubt this would affect our property value in that one side could take financial advantage of redevelopment while our side very likely would not be able to.

The HCA areas proposed are far too narrow in scope. We support the retention of the character of our neighbourhood but the HCA needs to be implemented on a much bigger scale, or not at all. If the intention is to designate a handful of houses, and not entire neighbourhoods as the examples suggest, then the City should be contacting the Owners of those specific properties and encouraging them to apply for Heritage designation. If the objective is to preserve neighbourhoods rather than individual properties, then it needs to be 10 fold larger in its application as a minimum, and maybe almost City wide. Obviously there will be a higher percentage of properties that have little heritage value, but the intent of the HCA is by neighbourhood not by individual property. So even if a property had little or no current heritage value, any future development would need to work to blend in better with those that do. Unless the designated areas are significantly increased, the HCA process effectively puts a heritage designation, albeit less restrictive, on homeowners without their consent.

To summarize, we are not opposed to the attempt to retain the historical value of Victoria's neighbourhoods, but if this is to go ahead, it needs to be applied to virtually all in a broad neighbourhood, not the tight confines as proposed.

Regards,
personal information
Kipling

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, Jun 12, 2017 4:52 PM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: HCA

To whom it may concern,

My wife and I personal information Kipling Street in Fairfield.

We do not support the Heritage Conservation designation for our area. It is unfair to impose restrictions on property owners.

I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely

personal information

Rob Gordon

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, Jun 12, 2017 9:04 AM
To: Kristina Bouris
Subject: Questions and concerns about the proposed Fairfield Heritage Conservation Areas

Hi Kristina,

Thanks in advance for taking the time to read my email - I am a homeowner on Trutch Street and I also attended the May 3rd Workshop - I wanted to further express my concerns about the proposal and ask a few additional questions.

I am currently opposed to the creation of an HCA on Trutch st.

I very much appreciate the heritage buildings on Trutch Street but I feel that any kind of Heritage designations should be a choice and not something that is imposed on homeowners.

Since homeowners are still allowed to build new buildings in an HCA (as long as those buildings conform to a certain aesthetic) then we are not going to accomplish the preservation of our city's heritage buildings with an HCA, but rather create the aesthetic, or illusion, of heritage. My opinion is that the City should put more focus on promoting the Heritage designation program that is already in place and work with homeowners to encourage more preservation of original heritage buildings. There are many other streets in Fairfield with beautiful heritage homes and it feels unfair to impose an HCA on only some, but not all.

Change and growth are a natural part of a healthy and thriving city - preserving our past is important but so is allowing for evolution. I think there can be a more balance approach than imposing an HCA on an entire block.

Perhaps creating a proposal to neighbourhoods which clearly outlines what an HCA would look like would be a better approach - many homeowners might voluntarily apply for such a designation. Perhaps there could be some incentives, such as grants.

Below are some questions I had:

- 1) What kind of effect would living in an HCA have on my house insurance costs? Do you have any information on how insurance rates have been effected by HCA designations in other areas?
- 2) When I attended the workshop I was hoping for a clearer idea of what the guidelines for living in an HCA would entail? Do you have any information or general guidelines on what living in an HCA would look like? For example, would HCA guidelines extend to things like landscaping features, paint colours, windows and chimneys?
- 3) I am concerned about the wait times for permit approvals. Do you have any information (perhaps from already existing HCA's) about how long the average wait times for permit approvals would be in an HCA?
- 4) If an HCA is created would there be any kind of base line standards retroactively imposed on homes? For example, in the presentation you put on at the workshop a home on Trutch st. was used as an example of what

happens without regulation - would owners of such homes be asked to alter their appearance to conform to the HCA guidelines?

6) I am also concerned about regulations - once an HCA is imposed on a neighbourhood that sets the stage for additional requirements in the future. How would this issue be addressed?

7) Finally, what kind of future opportunities will there be for public feedback? Should we also be directing our concerns to members of city council at this time? Will there be additional information sent out to homeowners in the areas in which HCA's are being considered? I have spoken to some of my neighbours and they were unaware that this was happening - I have shared the information I've received with them but I am concerned not everyone is aware of what is being considered for their homes.

Thank you for taking the time to read this, I didn't mean to write such a long email but I have a lot of concerns and questions on this matter.

Thanks so much,

personal information

RECEIVED

Victoria, BC
V8S 3J8

JUL 18 2017

July 14, 2017

City of Victoria
Attention: Mayor and Council
1 Centennial Square
Victoria, BC
V8W 1P6

RE: Proposed New HCA Areas

Dear Mayor and Council,

We own the residential property **personal information**, which is one of the properties being considered in the proposed new Heritage Conservation Areas (HCA). We are very concerned about the possibility of the HCA being forced on us regardless of our concerns or objections. Below are our concerns.

I attended the Homeowner Workshop #1 in April and have the following comments in regard to that night. There was a relatively brief introduction including a short speech by the City's Heritage expert. I say speech because there was no opportunity to ask him questions about what he said or get clarifications regarding his material. This was a great disservice as there was no opportunity to discuss in a larger group of homeowners or seek clarification on items that affect the entire group who attended. It was as if it was the intent of those organizing the meeting was to divide and conquer rather than have a true discussion.

Part of the Heritage expert's presentation discussed how the HCA would protect against developments that don't fit into their surroundings and the example given was the commercial/residential development on the corner of Fairfield Rd. and Arnold Ave. This was terribly misleading to those who don't understand zoning/DP regulations and processes, and the example was extremely misleading and inappropriate. I expect a presentation from the City to be fair and reasonable. Showing this building as an example of what is not wanted was neither fair or reasonable in the context of discussing HCAs. The reason I know this:

personal information

First of all, this example gave the impression, to those who don't understand development processes (virtually all who attended the meeting), that this sort of development could happen anywhere in their neighbourhood. This is simply not the case.

Existing zoning would prevent any such development and any attempt by a developer to rezone in a residential neighbourhood would need to go through the normal city processes and it would be extremely unlikely a rezoning would be granted. The current zoning regulations already deal with this situation and an HCA designation is not needed as an additional measure for a situation as occurred for this property. The reason the above development could occur as it did is because the property was already zoned for commercial use in a non-DP designated area with the existing zoning allowing up to 4 storeys.

If the City wants more control over similar properties, requiring a DP for all commercial and/or non-single-family developments to cover similar sites that are anomalies would be much more effective, especially as an HCA isn't even proposed for those properties adjacent to the one above and therefore it's unlikely that this property would have been included had HCA areas been proposed prior to this development. Using the property above as an example was a terrible disservice to the general discussion as it misled what the actual issues are and what HCAs will and will not govern. Unfortunately, as there was no opportunity for questions or discussions in the Homeowner's meeting, there was no opportunity to correct this misrepresentation and people were under the impression the HCA was intended to stop such development.

The other aspect of concern that night was a blanket statement that Heritage Conservation areas in other cities didn't lead to decreased property values but in fact often lead to increases in property values. It is difficult to find studies on this and compare what Victoria is proposing with other city's approaches, but from what I can find it appears there are potentially significant differences that need to be considered in such a bold claim. The most important consideration would be the size of the area considered. From the info I can find, where heritage classification has been designated rather than voluntarily applied for, it is a whole district not a couple of buildings on a couple of streets that the designation applies to. It is critical to consider this as our property is in the middle of a half dozen or so properties the HCA would apply to but nothing on the other side of the street or further down the street. Should we put our property up for sale and a similar property across the street be for sale at the same time there is no question there would be more buyers interested in a property with fewer development restrictions and city processes involved to upgrade or redevelop. Having fewer buyers interested means lower prices is how everyone knows real estate works. My understanding in discussions with others is that the members of the Victoria Real Estate Board agree the HCA designation as proposed will have a negative impact on property values for those properties affected.

We are confused as to why our street has been selected as an HCA and not others. It's true there are a number of old stock houses all in a row, but that is true of many areas in the City, some of them very close by to our property on Kipling. The background documents provided by the City explain well why the areas have been selected but doesn't explain why the selection isn't broader. The whole area bordered by Dallas to the south, Fairfield on the north and Cook to Memorial Crescent is chock-a-block full of old stock residential that is at least as worthy of protecting as the areas selected for an HCA and I would suggest is much worthier of the designation due to the volume of old stock housing, many of which are in good condition. It is unfair to the homeowners in the areas selected to ignore other areas that are at least as representational, if not more, of the old housing stock. As these areas are not included in the discussions, it leads us to question the motive of the City and if the intention isn't to slowly introduce HCAs on a small but incremental scale so that those affected aren't able to gather enough of a voice to influence the decision of council. That's my pessimistic side coming out but the manner in which this has been introduced, for a few individual areas that aren't necessarily outstanding in comparison to other nearby areas, requires an explanation of not only why the areas have been selected but why others haven't been included. If this is truly a value the citizens of Victoria desire, then it should apply more broadly than what is proposed.

In regard to the description of why Kipling was selected, it's primarily because of the California style bungalows. Also mentioned are the English style cottage houses. Our property personal information is not a California bungalow and is not a particularly good example of an English style cottage as the majority of detail and decoration was stripped away years ago, prior to us purchasing. About the only aspect of character that remains are the windows, which are drafty, single paned units in desperate need of

replacement. We intend to replace within the next couple of years but to replicate an historical style would add significantly to the replacement cost and likely put replacement out of reach for us.

Further to the above discussion about the size of the proposed HCAs, I would argue the City already has an appropriate procedure to handle properties of heritage value. That would be through the already existing program of Heritage Designation. This program is far more appropriate for the size of the HCAs being proposed. The City could canvas the homeowners directly and encourage them to voluntarily register by offering incentives already in place. If the Heritage Designation is found to be too restricting for some homeowners, the City could consider a two-tier designation where the restrictions are less, perhaps in line with what is envisioned for the HCAs, and the incentives reduced accordingly. This could be a win-win situation for both the City and the homeowners rather than forcing further regulations on a handful of people who happened to purchase on the wrong side of the block. We find it strange that in the years that we have owned the property we have never been approached by the City to consider Heritage Designation and yet the City feels there is enough heritage value to consider legislating heritage restrictions on the property.

Notwithstanding the above, I am not opposed to having HCA's implemented within the City. It's the manner in which it's being proposed that is the issue. Having grown up in Vancouver and moving to Victoria almost a decade ago, I marvel at how much original housing stock remains in Victoria. Vancouver is not near as fortunate. But in order to protect and enhance, if HCAs are brought into residential neighbourhoods they need to be of significant size to be fair and effective. Designating half a block here and half a block there is not fair to the homeowners affected. HCA areas should be substantial so that the whole neighbourhood is affected and protected. At the fine grain proposed, voluntary Heritage Designation is appropriate. Legislated heritage is not. If a whole area becomes an HCA it will have meaning that possibly will increase rather than decrease property values and regardless of market value will put all of the neighbourhood on the same standing. It will also be a better measure of what the city resident's actually want as they will need to consider not only what affect it will have on their neighbour's property but on their own property. I understand why many people want to introduce HCAs, but the cost or benefit should be equal across the whole neighbourhood and not be a burden implemented on those who happened to buy on the wrong side of the street. Should council decide to pursue a broad designation of HCAs, I will support it, as I do appreciate what Victoria has been able to retain. But as proposed I believe it is immensely unfair and remain strongly opposed.

I trust the above will be considered carefully as Mayor and Council consider the implementation of the proposed HCAs. I will make myself available to meet at your convenience should we have the opportunity to discuss in person.

Sincerely,

personal information

From: personal information
Sent: Monday, September 4, 2017 1:54 PM
To: Engagement <engage@victoria.ca>
Subject: Fairfield Neighbourhood plan

Hello, We own a house at personal information and we are adamantly opposed to restricting our property rights by designating this street into a protected 2-3 story area as outlined in your option 3 Plan. We have a 5 story condo building going up across the street from us that has set the precedent for our street. You can't expect the residents here to be surrounded by 4-5 story condo buildings while we are restricted to 2-3 stories. I have made this point by email to this address before and I notice my comments did not get included in any of the summaries posted on the website.

Before any decisions are made I believe you need to consult with residents and get their opinions. You cannot make an arbitrary designation because a few residents like the idea. Talk to everyone (there aren't very many of us) before obstructing our property rights.
Thanks very much,

personal information

From: personal information

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 7:24 AM

To: Engagement <engage@victoria.ca>

Subject: Fairfield community plan - Oliphant Street

Hello,

Can you please confirm for me if Oliphant Street is being considered for any kind of Heritage zoning or designation? I have heard that this is being considered and I would like to get more information on that.

For the record can you please document that I am opposed to any restrictions on this street for development or Heritage designation. The reason for this is that the City Council recently approved a 5 story massive condo building at the corner of Cook Street and Oliphant Street. This is across the street from our house. Therefore the "heritage" value of the street is already being destroyed when this development was approved and the Carmel apartment building was removed. Therefore I would also like to build a 5 story building on my property. The precedent has been set and it is absolutely ludicrous to let a developer re-zone to the maximum and then say to the rest of the property owners on the street that they cannot do that. Now that the quaintness and heritage nature of our street will be gone forever my wife and I will be looking to another location to live after we re-zone and re-develop our property in keeping with the direction established by the City of Victoria Council for Oliphant Street.

personal information

Sincerely,

personal information