

Section 19: Local Area Planning

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
General		There is a basic lack of direction in this section.
	P. 125	one of the strengths is that there is a local group involved but that does not include the broad corporate plan. Implementation plan for local area development needs to be reviewed.
		Not enough planning vision/ no pro-active enough. Recognition of relationship of regulation as way to implement plan policy
		I like the creation of distinct areas in the downtown core and I feel that this is the right direction to ensure growth downtown without losing the character of our City.
		There is no allowance for grassroots initiatives, nor flexibility to retain uniqueness in this draft OCP. Local plans should have been done first and engaged the public with their sense of place, then moved forward to the OCP review before adopting the local plans. The draft OCP survey is written with such legal wording without any real understanding the outcome of this language, I feel disconnected and wondering how "one size fits all" will impact me where I live, work, play and learn. It would have been more sensible if I could have responded to a local plan and that information moves forward to the Official Community Planning. I'm also not happy that the RGS is the basis for the OCP. Too much top down approach.
Overview	Figure 18 p. 124	I support this diversity of local area plan types and purposes. It reflects a complex urban fabric. This fabric will need to be carefully explained time and again to the public.
Objectives	p. 123	P. 123 - the foundation of local area planning is a broad and vague objective.
	19e	19e is difficult to understand. REFINEMENT: Clarify.
		19(f) The city has a history of superficial engagement. This objective should be stronger.
		<p>The Uber Policy: 50-40-10 With my understanding of municipal jurisdiction, the growth management policy of 50% of new residents and housing in the urban core, 40% in town centres/large urban villages and 10% elsewhere is the overarching policy that has an impact on all of the other chapters. This policy, when extended into other topics, may mean that 50% of new affordable housing will be in urban core, and that in order to meet per capita need for greenspace/park where residents live there will be a need for more parkland in the core (which could include access to the waterfront).</p> <p>I do not see the implications of the 50-40-10 policy adequately threaded through the other chapters except Chapter 13 Housing and Homelessness. Its impact on other topic areas is not explicit in the OCP. I support the 50-40-10 policy as a land use directive, but recommend that its effect on parks, infrastructure, local area planning, etc. be more carefully considered in policy.</p>
Plan Types, Scale and Phasing	Boundaries	Comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan Update as First Priority. The Vic West community has been long been calling for an update to the neighbourhood plan and has cemented strong stakeholder relationships and support for initiating a neighbourhood planning and design process focused on the future of the neighbourhood. The opportunity to review the Draft OCP has further solidified support for the pursuit of a local, neighbourhood-focused and collaborative planning process.
	Boundaries	In particular, the Roundtable group discussed the proposed new framework for local area planning and was not supportive of the strategy, which calls for the development of phased, stand-alone local area plans in areas where significant changes are anticipated. It was felt that this approach lacks the integrated approach the

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		community has been asking for, which will only be achieved through a neighbourhood-level plan. There was concern noted that individual local area plans may not garner participation from the community as a whole and may result in a series of disconnected directions that do not reflect, nor project the collective aspirations of the neighbourhood of Vic West.
	Boundaries	Rather than being planned in parts and over a number of phases, Vic West asks to be considered as a neighbourhood as a whole in need of a first-priority comprehensive review of its neighbourhood plan. Vic West has experienced significant change in recent years and will continue to evolve as a number of comprehensive development plans for individual sites are realized and the neighbourhood collectively responds to sustainable development directions. An updated neighbourhood plan will allow the community as a whole to consider and shape its shared future. As Vic West is a neighbourhood with strong, perhaps unparalleled, stakeholder interest in supporting such an initiative, the group felt that there is an opportunity to develop a plan for this unique community that could serve as a model for how the City pursues neighbourhood planning.
	Boundaries	Two main feedback themes surfaced during discussions with community and Association members. Victoria West “needs more colours”, and Victoria West requires a Neighbourhood Plan that includes ALL areas within the community boundaries.
	Boundaries	Specifically, the group emphasized a shared interest in seeking city support for initiating a comprehensive neighbourhood plan update for the entire neighbourhood of Vic West as a whole. This was noted as a first priority, of greater importance than the other strategic directions included in the draft plan. As Vic West has already catalyzed an approach to successful stakeholder collaboration and has the resources and support of significant landowners and developers, it was felt that the neighbourhood is a strong candidate for an innovative community planning process that considers the neighbourhood as a whole, and provides an opportunity to best integrate the individual comprehensive development sites and unique community character areas to present a plan that will realize a strong and sustainable future for Vic West.
	Boundaries	Develop a comprehensive neighbourhood plan for Victoria West through a collaborative and consultative process that examines land use, transportation and urban design conditions as well as sustainability directions for the entire community to ensure an integrated plan for the future is achieved.
	Boundaries	Vic West is 20% under redevelopment. LAP phasing undermines the importance of re-establishing connections between existing fragments within Vic West (e.g. Songhees, Docksider, traditional neighbourhood). Boundaries of neighbourhood should be used, as this is the identity of the place. People don't live in a village in Vic West, they live in a neighbourhood
	Boundaries	For Vic West, the whole neighbourhood is the right scale for LAP. Need to connect the traditional with the new.
	Boundaries	Rapid Transit Corridor: As a community, Burnside Gorge has the longest border with the rapid transit corridor. As noted by this map, well over 65% of Burnside Gorge is consumed by the Rapid Transit planning boundary and thus this concept impacts all of the employment and the majority of our residential citizens. Additionally, Burnside Gorge and Vic West are the only communities in Victoria that live and work to the West of the corridor – all other communities are collecting into it to facilitate regional transport. This puts Burnside Gorge in the unique position of being potentially impeded by the corridor as additional barrier to the rest of Victoria vis-à-vis access to downtown and eastern communities. Combining this with the vision of the Green district south of Bay, it is imperative that Burnside Gorge have significant participation in the planning process by those who live and work in the community and that our community be looked upon as a whole community and not segmented into uses and areas which could serve to have Burnside Gorge divided even further into ‘industrial’, ‘commercial’, ‘residential’, and ‘employment core’.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Boundaries	Burnside Gorge has communicated as part of the Downtown Core Area Plan that the separation and naming of Rock Bay into two distinct areas (north of Bay St. and south of Bay St.) further fragments the planning, use and community. Rock Bay should always be looked at as a whole recognizing the migration of one use/type/zone to another (Employment Core (south) to Industrial (north) – Rock Bay as a whole is part of community that provides employment diversity and vitality to our city and neighbourhood, but it is also a transitional and transformative landscape that connects our residential community to the downtown core.
	Boundaries	There should be discussion about boundaries and how adjacent areas will be protected (e.g. residential areas adjacent to village centres). On the other hand, village centres should not be considered distinct / separate from their residential neighbourhoods. It should operate as a whole.
	Boundaries	Phasing of Local Area Plans and Rockland residents' concerns about potential plans for the Fort Street corridor; conflict between urban residential and mixed use development; narrowing the corridor bands as shown on the map. A conceptual area for planning where boundaries will be decided as part of the local area plan; recommending transit-orientated development with transition and conservation areas.
	Boundaries	Travel sheds are an important geographic scale to consider
	Boundaries	Reconsider the metrics for LAP studies – 800 metre radius is huge and will need tremendous staff resources.
	Boundaries	REFINEMENT: Need a specific definition for planning catchment area.
	Boundaries	OPERATIONAL POLICY: How to determine boundary/definition without pre-conditions?
	Boundaries	Recognized that boundaries of coloured blobs (bubble map) is not really defined at this stage – and these likely need to change in the development of the project charter to align with local area / neighbourhood needs
	Figure 18	The definitions between “neighbourhood plan” and “urban village plans” are blurred. REFINEMENT: Need to create the former before the latter.
	Phasing	Group needed this explained several times and seemed to want maps and sequencing to be stronger and clearer.
	Phasing	The proposed phasing of Local Area Planning within the Victoria West community was not well received. The community is severely splintered by large scale development that is currently taking place, significant transformation of the traditional neighbourhood areas that is driven by escalating land costs, changing demographics in the area, a redundant Community Plan (that was created in 1986 and never ratified by Council of the time), and pressures to densify. Newer developments have introduced new neighbours, who may remain segregated from the established communities unless a process of integration and place-making is conducted, such as what a Neighbourhood Planning Process typically provides – particularly when intense community engagement is professionally facilitated. Given the inherent pressures on the Victoria West Community to accommodate population growth, the imminent redevelopment of fully 20% of the land area of the community, and the need to support the establishment of a complete and cohesive community amidst massive redevelopment, the Victoria West Neighbourhood Planning Process is strongly recommended as a priority during Phase 1.
	Phasing	Small areas may not be appropriate. REFINEMENT: base it on the issue rather than the geographic scale.
	phasing	We need to recognize that some of the proposed villages already exist and are viable, possibly with slight additional investment or planning actions, while others would require much more effort. Document language is now “focused on areas with potential for major change” but benefit-cost ratios would suggest we should focus on areas with the greatest leverage for planning actions – effort in for benefit out – which may include areas

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		with actual village development under way rather than potential for a functioning urban village. In these a relatively small planning effort for a mid-course correction could be highly beneficial
	Phasing	This prioritization map is problematic in that it does not reflect the priorities of developers. It does not reflect land economics and capital gains tax implications. There are many landowners along the Douglas Street Corridor that are long-time owners of these properties. These lands are being held and will not be redeveloped in the near future (due to capital gains implications). The priority here does not reflect reality. Developers wish to invest in desirable areas, like the James Bay, and Cook St village areas instead – these should not be designated phase 4.
	Phasing	Be realistic – location and land economics is the most important criteria for development/ redevelopment.
	Phasing	May be best to identify ideal elements that contribute to the Local Area Planning priority and timing.
	Phasing	What does being in a phase 4 area really mean? Does it mean that the area will not have an area plan for 20+ years? What if there is an engaged community that is ready and wanting to be involved in setting the future direction for the area? Should this be delayed because it is phase 4?
	Phasing	The Songhees area is fully developed already – what makes this a phase 1 priority area? There are many questions about this phasing map and whether it would be best to remove it altogether.
	Phasing	Need initiatives to address areas that are not prioritized for local area planning (i.e. dealing with anomalous properties)
	Phasing	Provide OCP growth targets for each “Phase” of local area planning
	Phasing	It is important to make clear on Map 2 and elsewhere what will be the approach to the “white areas” – that is, areas for which no LAP is shown. In fact, we are saying that change will continue to happen in these areas but that it will be governed not by a local area plan but by the existing City-wide tools, such as the zoning bylaw, the secondary and garden suite policies etc.
	Phasing	The previous point makes it very important that we ensure the arrangements for the “white areas” on Map 2 are in fact robust enough to do the job – remember that for a lot of people the historical purpose of the “Neighbourhood Plan” has been to protect them from development, a shield rather than an enabler. If we are not to use the Neighbourhood Plan as a shield, then what is available to protect the neighbours? We have seen bad situations arise in the past where the zoning bylaw was inappropriate to the neighbourhood (for example allowing new buildings way out of scale to what is currently on the ground, so some ambient standards would be required); where there are anomalous properties within neighbourhoods due to their size, location or current use where the “black letter” permissions in the zoning bylaw result in inappropriate development (e.g. publicly held lands with leftover zoning that is inappropriate in the hands of a developer, too-small or too-large parcels that permit out of scale developments, out of date zoning along arterials that provokes conflict by enabling the “wrong” type of land use. The action item here is if we are going to assure people they are protected without a new neighbourhood plan we need to do the homework to make sure these anomalous situations are identified and dealt with. The neighbourhoods would probably be happy to help with info from their own local knowledge
	Phasing	Same concerns re who is involved and engaged; similar concerns re map boundaries and clarity; a concern re what is happening in the “white” areas of the map – might seem that nothing is happening but we know that is not true – need to describe the role of these areas
	Phasing	Does there need to be more directive policies? Possibly link Map 2 - areas of local area planning phases with population growth targets (including white areas)
	Phasing	The corridor has taken precedent over the village centres, which isn’t consistent with previous direction/work.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		REFINEMENT: Language needs to change to reflect this.
	Phasing	If we want a sense of place, the loss of local planning and the overriding of local plans has bruised the sense of community. It's like living with your parents again...they always know better and have the final say. Also, I struggled with how community planning has dragged on these many years without personal contact with the community who worked so hard to get local plans. Hiring people who cannot answer my questions and staff who do answer my queries makes me feel like a number and not a person. The staff that do acknowledge me have made me feel welcomed as part of the community, not just a tax payer. 19.2 What if overlapping plans contradict each other? 19.3 I'm skeptical that transit corridors are the main pressure for development in the city.
	Phasing Map 2 p. 43	Adding phase 2 colouring on the map for Shelbourne Street..
	Phasing	In light of the timing and priority of the Rapid Transit Corridor, developing the local area plan for a Green district in Rock Bay is out of sync and does nothing to advance Burnside Gorge as a whole.
	Phasing	The Shelbourne Corridor Action Plan, currently underway, will hopefully create a balanced transportation network for the Shelbourne Corridor that connects seamlessly with transportation plans for Hillside Corridor. Planning and design guidelines for the three centres and one Village in the Shelbourne Corridor between North Dairy road and Feltham Road will also be part of the Shelbourne Corridor Action Plan. the Action Plan should be completed by early 2012. The Uptown/Douglas Corridor Action Plan is expected to begin in the near future.
	Phasing	The phasing of local area plans appears, at first glance, to be appropriate; however, the phasing must be flexible. For example, the private sector may propose a development in an area/corridor which the City has not identified as a high priority. There may be a need to renew or phase-in a neighbourhood plan for other reasons such as overlapping plans. The OCP must accommodate the revision of neighbourhood plans which overlap the harbour and downtown plans (James Bay, VicWest (Songhees), North Park, etc.).
	phasing	Some concern was expressed about how long a wait there would be for LAP completion.
	Phasing	Priorities on map 2 recognized, but concern expressed about the length of time until later priorities were accomplished.
	Phasing	Section 19, Local Area Planning – We appreciate and support the need for local area planning. A timeline showing the prioritization for planning these areas might be useful here.
	Phasing	Concerned about North Corridor emphasis, including BC Transit decision-making and putting the horse before the cart in terms of planning for the corridor before the village centres.
	Phasing	Although land economics is a critical piece, the process should not purely be market driven.
	Phasing	Developers are more likely to drive the timeline than City Planning department.
	Phasing	The Douglas Corridor and Hillside Corridor match up with Saanich's Uptown/Douglas Corridor and Shelbourne Corridor, both of which have proposed action plans associated with them
	Phasing	The identification in Policy 7.13.3 of the need for the City of Victoria and the District of Saanich to work together with BC Transit in the joint planning and design of Douglas Street as a complete street with dedicated rapid transit alignment and stations, cycling routes, pedestrian areas, general purpose travel lanes and public realm enhancements is appreciated
	Phasing	Like directive approach to the City's future intentions.
	Phasing	Phases should not be determined by city planning but by the market forces
	Scale	Questions around the potential overlap among growth areas (villages and corridors), and on how the local area plans would relate to the neighbourhood areas outside the LAP boundary. It was clarified that the amount of

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		change in the neighbourhood areas outside LAPs was likely to be minor, and that planning focus and change within LAPs was the focus of attention.
	Scales	Need to ensure that the local area plan considers the whole neighbourhood.
	Scales	Clarification regarding the relevance of the neighbourhood plan, community members attachment to their neighbourhood plans; Neighbourhood plans remain valid documents for policy guidance; updating plans where it makes sense to do so; complementing neighbourhood plans with other City-wide initiatives (e.g.: garden suites policy); articulating this to the community.
	Scales	I STRONGLY support James' recommendation that the City take a lead role in developing a harbor / waterfront plan as detailed and comprehensive as the new Downtown Plan. This is a huge gap in the document.
	Scales	A corridor is an area that covers overarching issues; it's not a "small" area
	Scales	Like this direction – allows flexibility and responsiveness. Provides a framework for appropriate scales. Like the descriptions of the appropriate context for each. It makes sense to add the corridor planning areas
	Scales	Idea of focussing on transit corridors seemed to make sense.
	Scales	With respect to the idea of local area plans, the participants were not supportive of the strategy to develop individual plans for small areas of the community. Rather, the participants unanimously supported call for a comprehensive neighbourhood-wide plan. Therefore, draft strategic directions 20.26.4 and 20.26.5 should be removed and replaced with a top priority direction to develop a neighbourhood-wide plan.
		Need clarity on terms and definitions – possibly develop a handbook for use local groups; also add "urban village" and other key terms to OCP glossary
	Policy 19.2	Does this work through self-identification
		Concern that incorporation of area into DT core will lead to a concentration of social services in neighbourhood
		Great interest in a Fort Street corridor planning study
		This doesn't capture existing work on strategic direction for the Downtown
		People were concerned with resources for the various projects; process exhaustion, and confusion re what could be done where and in what sequence.
Map 2	Map 2	Should there be an area specifically added for the harbour/downtown? This had been included in previous plans
	Map 2 p. 43	The maps are excellent. I particularly appreciate Map 2, which is relevant in many places throughout the document. It would be very helpful to be able to overlay the maps by choice. Is there a place online where we can do that?
	Map 2	Does Map 2 belong in bylaw or implementation strategy
	Map 2	Does this belong in bylaw or implementation strategy?
Plan Relationships		REFINEMENTS: need clarity on how the scales interact. The practical reality - will there be a corridor plan that may require cross referencing with a neighbourhood plan (ie. create confusion)? Would there be possible conflict in policies on a single property? Address this practical implementation so that the audience (ie. the user of the plan like a property owner/ developer) can understand the implications clearly. Multiple plans will be confusing for developers / consultants / public (May need to develop an approach for cross referencing to facilitate the use at the current planning counter)
		Major concern was with how the different levels of planning would be coordinated and resourced; people want clarity re the different terms being used, how the OCP directs "lower levels", whether one supercedes the other,

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		etc.
		The point was raised that LAPs will need to be well coordinated where parts of one neighbourhood are to be planned in different stages. The example given was North Park where there will be a corridor plan and a village centre plan in different LAP phases, in addition to the draft Downtown Core Area Plan.
	19 (c); 19 (d); 19 (e) and p. 123-125.	Local Area Planning is a “new model”, an integral component of the OCP, and should provide a consistent template or framework for the completion of area plans. The OCP should elaborate on the relationship with existing neighbourhood plans, as well as new district/precinct and urban village/town centre plans. Have neighbourhood plans and updating them, become irrelevant/redundant? If so, the City should acknowledge and clarify this, and focus on LAP.
	19.11 p. 125	Concerns related to which plan overrides which, and the boundaries creating unease within the community; P. 125, 19.11 – the idea that neighbourhood directions provide overall guidance for local area plan studies; the coloured areas on the map identifying boundaries for a study, not necessarily changes.
		Why would a local area plan not be a part of the neighbourhood plan thereby being consistent? It sounds like Balkanization of our community. How do you support diversity when you narrow into a limited area without the support of neighbours?
		With the proposed Downtown Plan coming “into” James Bay, the OCP should clarify the intent and limitations of overlapping plans. In addition, the James Bay Neighbourhood Plan must be revised prior to the Downtown Plan coming into effect.
		General confusion over the boundaries for place designation that overlap with neighbourhood boundaries. Although the overlap is based on context it may create confusion and additional issues when considering community consultation on planning matters Place designations do not lend themselves to the neighbourhood planning process
		There was limited explanation of how the OCP guides and links with other plans and planning processes such as the recent draft “Downtown Core Area Plan”. We recommend this be made clear in future communications as it helps clarify and solidify the relationships and differences between the various plans. Engaged citizens could, conceivably, end up with planning fatigue if they don’t see an endpoint.
		Be clearer about role of neighbourhood plans and how they will be integrated and updated
		Not enough reference to neighbourhood planning.
		How are plans integrated for physically overlapping plans (e.g. LAPs, OCP)?
		The consideration of a Local Area Plan should be done in conjunction with a neighbourhood plan. Can't impose one on the other.
Plan Content	6.21/6.23	<p>The severity of the language is too light. REFINEMENT: e.g. Change “generally consistent” to “should”, “must”, etc.</p> <p>Should there be limitations on LAP base requirements in order to focus on the more relevant LAP components (e.g. land use)? REFINEMENT: Include and focus on base requirements for LAP content.</p> <p>Concern about extensive scope diminishing strategic emphasis of LAPs; need to focus on core issues</p> <p>This is good to have the list of considerations for consistency and direction of local area plans. Important to add economic objectives as well for local areas. The area plans are also about maintaining the local vibrancy/diversity of economy and employment. Ensure that this priority is also reflected.</p> <p>LAPs should include a description of the sense of place of a neighbourhood</p> <p>Many areas are not necessarily about directing new development, but also about maintaining the values that are in place now and keep them great places / centres.</p>

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	6.21 Local Area Planning	Environmental metrics are missing from lists. Walkability is also missing.
		Idea discussed that as well as an OCP Context Statement, there might be similar statements that relate to adjacent LAPs or Neighbourhood Plans – identifying or clarifying the relationships among plans
		Include “neighbourhood context statements” indicating how local area plans relate to existing neighbourhood plans. Will help ensure alignment of plans and deliberate consideration of broader neighbourhood issues
	18.1 – 18.3; 19.4.1 p. 120; p. 125	Plan Consistency Policies 18.1-18.3 and 19.4.1 This topic arose during the local are planning workshop as well. The need for an “OCP Context Statement” is the mud that will make the hierarchy of planning in the City opaque. I recommend eliminating this statement for several reasons. First, it will be confused with the regional context statement. Second, all other land use planning documents should be subordinate to the OCP because the OCP is the keeper of City-wide values and goals. Third, the use of a variety of local area planning documents of various names can confuse the public in any case. I recommend deleting this context statement and making explicit that all local area plans will be consistent with the OCP. The issue of consistency over the long term can simply be detailed in the local area plan. Indeed, if local area plans will be enacted by bylaw, by law (s.884 of the Local Government Act) they must be consistent with the OCP.
	6.21	In 6.21 include a phrase “appropriate to the scale of the Local Area Plan” to make clear that not every plan must address every topic listed
		Include cross reference to LMD section policies 6.21, 6.23
		Concerned about the plan not landing and being useful at a high level of detail. REFINEMENT: Acknowledge limit in investments to manage expectations, and avoid being inequitable and unfair in where investments are being focused.
		Highlighted that there are unique issues in North Jubilee different from those in South Jubilee.
		Will the City give neighbourhoods a template for local area plans so that citizens can do the local area plans consistently?
		Questions also arose over HOW to create the desired change, while keeping valued existing local area amenities.
		Also discussed was the idea that many actions such as street beautification, tree planting programs, etc. could be undertaken separate from the LAP process
		It was recognized that additional elements might be appropriate locally
		Discussion continued about HOW to reach objectives – such as traffic calming or creating pedestrian-ization and vibrancy in existing high traffic areas. Discussed the role of design charettes, and relationship of urban design to through-traffic objectives
		Concern expressed and supported that a key part of LAP should be to identify ‘what to keep’ in terms of neighbourhood character as well as ‘what to change’ – in particular in Royal Jubilee area
		How do the LAPs influence the OCP? How does regional planning filter down to impact the OCP?
		REFINEMENT: The plans need to be pragmatic/realistic/practical.
		Do not wish to have reference to requiring a OCP ‘context statement’. The term is loaded with reference to the Regional Growth Strategy. Do wish to have a statement of consistency with the OCP and how the LAP advances the objectives of the OCP. The term is problematic, but the intent is good. Do not create more text to refer to than is necessary.
		General support and specifically liked the standardization / customization balance.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Discussion of the need for a “standard list” from which local area committees can choose which items to address; need for due process to allow additions to the City-wide “standard list” including criteria for inclusion/exclusion. For example, for bonus density, may want to add or delete defined “amenities” in particular local areas.
		What amenities? Our lives as residents are not fully contained within "geographic scope". Many many gaps in plan
		Local community members wanted a local plan but there was no trust by the city that we could plan our own neighbourhood's future. I guess this is still the case.
	12 (d) p. 89	Section 12(d) –a district wide participation and achievement of this plan is encouraged.
	6.21	List of Plan Scope elements was generally favourably viewed.
	6.21, 6,23	The scope of considerations is clearly described for Urban and Traditional Residential (6.21), and Industrial and Employment Districts (6.23). Provide the same list of considerations for Town Centres and Urban Villages.
	6.21 Local Area Planning	Encourage waste free behavior: wide-spectrum recycling facilities, energy efficiency, water catchment and recycling, composting, and clean home energy production.
Planning Process		While it is important to develop a coherent template for completing local area plans and thereby maintain consistency with the OCP framework, local area plans should be developed through an open, resident-driven, public process that would in most cases best be led by local neighbourhood associations. A “bottom up” rather than “top down” planning process is required in order to keep the dedicated volunteer community onside. People care about their local communities.
		Neighbourhood planning should be an integral component of the OCP with a bottom-up process, rather than a top-down process. The Neighbourhood/Community Associations provide the local on-site land use volunteer advisory committees under the CALUC process. Volunteers with these associations develop community expertise in land use matters and, in a broader context, act as two-way communication links with City departments and Council.
		Although it is important to develop a template for developing these plans in a manner which is consistent with the OCP, these plans need to be developed using a “bottom up” approach, using the talents and interest of the local residents and volunteer community. A “top down” approach will frustrate these communities and particularly the membership of existing neighbourhood associations. Where area plans overlap into existing neighbourhoods (e.g. DCAP into James Bay) if the James Bay neighbourhood plan needs to adapt to DCAP without serious discussion and input from James Bay residents and JBNA, this kind of “adapt to someone else’s vision” will not be acceptable. It appears, however, that other than “adaptation” the revision of neighbourhood plans (some now 15+ years old) will be put on the back burner, i.e. left for the next generation. This does not need to occur if the City engages the well of expertise that exists in the volunteer community.
		Area planning should be an integral component of the OCP, which should provide a consistent template, or framework, for the completion of area plans. Area plans should be developed through an open, resident-driven public process. Residents who are already engaged in volunteer activity related to neighbourhood quality of life issues are most likely to be knowledgeable about area planning issues. This City strength should be recognized within the OCP.
	(see p. 125, sections 19.7 - 19.11).	It is therefore a glaring omission that neighbourhood associations are not mentioned in the OCP local area planning chapter (see p. 125, sections 19.7 - 19.11).
	p. 123, policy 19.7).	I understand the need for a menu of local area plans. However, please identify neighbourhood associations as

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		stakeholders for LAP's (see p. 123, policy 19.7). Grassroots involvement is longstanding, and essential.
	19.5.3 p. 125	The role of neighbourhood associations needs to be reviewed and defined.
	19.7-19.11 (p. 125)	It is vital that the role of neighbourhood associations be made explicit in the OCP local area planning chapter (see p. 125, sections 19.7 - 19.11). If major changes in roles are anticipated, a transition strategy must be developed. Given the template, local area planning should involve a bottom up process, rather than a top down process. Area plans should be developed through an open, resident-driven public process. Residents who are already engaged in volunteer activity related to neighbourhood quality of life issues are most likely to be knowledgeable about area planning issues.
		James Bay is equally affected - if not more - by the Harbour Plan in addition to the James Bay Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed expansion of the Downtown Plan into James Bay means that the residents of the north side of James Bay, including lands near the causeway, inner harbour and middle harbour, are direct stakeholders in three plans.
		James Bay has no voice in the implementation of the Victoria Harbour Plan. The OCP has no policy on citizen participation in the Harbour Plan; this is necessary.
		Another concern was how to agree on who to engage in each plan – what if people are affected by an “area” of planning but they do not reside there? What if the effects of planning fall outside the boundaries?
		While the flexibility of responding to local context was supported, there was concern over who would define the LAP study boundaries and OCP topics to address in each plan. Who gets to be involved in developing the project charter? Will the City lead a top-down process for each charter with a non-public project committee, like the OCP CAC, or involve citizens in all phases of the planning process through a PUBLIC project committee?
		Discussion focused on how LAPs are chartered and started – recognizing the need for community input and a fair and transparent process right from the start..
		Strong support for an engagement plan and a steering committee. Concern over the process for developing a project charter and engagement plan and very strong desire for a steering committee that is open and transparent to the public, and whose members include citizens and businesses in the LAP study area
		The project committee will be very important. REFINEMENT: Is it worth identifying (but not excluding others) certain stakeholders to ensure other perspectives (e.g. development industry, hard-to-reach groups, etc) are included?
	19.6	Need to be realistic from a budget standpoint about what is possible (i.e. engagement, background research, etc is expensive).
	19.5	Need clarify that project committee is “advisory” and must play a role from the beginning – move “project advisory committee” before “project charter” in list of mandatory items to indicate that the committee will be involved in developing the project charter
	19.5	Community involvement in every LAP phase was desired – including design of the project charter and the engagement plan.
		Extent of engagement for each local area plan could be based on characteristics of local area (i.e. village centre – local focus; town centre – more citywide focus)
		In addition to the individual suggested refinements, the resounding overall message resulting from the collaborative session was a call for a comprehensive, neighbourhood-wide plan to be developed through a process that is based on a program of consultation with, and participation by, all stakeholders.
		Want to ensure that planning is coordinated with Saanich and BC Transit (e.g. Shelbourne Corridor, Foul Bay connection to UVic)

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	19.5 p. 125	Discussion of developing an engagement plan to identify the stakeholders, engagement techniques, targets for engagement, and hard to reach groups
	19.5.3 p. 125	The involvement of other communities bordering the City of Victoria needs to be considered.
		Public engagement. The current public engagement strategy tends to allow 5-8 people to have too much influence on what will happen in a neighbourhood. Is that addressed in the OCP? Staff responded that it is not a completely broken process but there are issues that need to be addressed. Chapter 19 looks at local area planning and provides more details how they will figure out operational parameters.
		Concern was expressed to ensure a meaningful and truly representative role for community individuals and groups in defining the project charter (terms of reference) for LAPs.
		Discussion on the possibility of 'design charrettes' to envision car-oriented centres as more walkable, vibrant urban centres. Interest in having visual examples of development and public realm improvements that help create an urban village character (whether it is in the plan or another document).
		Not sure if clarity on wording about roles is right because it could cause conflict. REFINEMENT: Roles need to be identified; Perhaps clarify responsibilities.
		Selection process: who decides?
		Will there be a "secret" committee? This can be good because input can be provided that would otherwise not be given.
		Critical to have consistency and City direction across local area plans - that this be a City-led process with committee participation in the process. Generally like this direction.
		Must ensure that the citizen and committee involvement is genuine. Recognized that City has done so much work on meaningful engagement. There is the trust required for this to happen and this is a good time to advance this approach.
		The community individuals and organizations are key in the implementation role of the local area plans. There are several delivery aspects that require many organizations to be involved in realizing the plans objectives. Important to build participation and ownership in the plans.
		Important to have key landowners and developers involved in the process, to make additional effort for their participation/ involvement
		Trust is the key issue - Concern over who leads and proper role of citizens; want clear definitions and clear roles. Part of this was assumptions or confusions about the role of the Neighbourhood Association – are they included as "one among many" on the project committee or are they the primary representative of citizens, businesses etc. Concerns here for equity, legitimacy, effective representation.
		Transparency and credibility are vital, particularly in the formation of the project committee. Process is just as important as the end results
		Range of community resources available – some neighbourhoods with very few volunteers and others with extensive, experienced volunteer networks
		Idea of the stated minimum LAP process requirements and deliverables was supported
		Recognized there are many optional elements that may be appropriate in some LAPs.
		Having a project charter and engagement plan for the planning process is useful at the outset. It makes sense to define the desired and consistent deliverables for the area planning process.
		Recognize limitations and constraints of time and resources
		- in order for this plan to work, specific planning will need to be done with Hillside Mall. What plans/thoughts

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		are in place to engage the owners of such properties (and to a lesser extent Mayfair as well) to ensure that future and further development of the properties is in line with the OCP? What is the vision for the property itself?
		Is the next round of community planning in Victoria West targeted to be a “rational process”, wherein all the projected land use changes through to 2041 are to be identified in 2011, or an “incremental process”, wherein all the currently approved change agents (projects) are reviewed to create a current planning window of some 10 -15 years, and the plan is updated for the same window length in say 5 years?
		GVHA is committed to working with the City of Victoria to maintain and update the Harbour Plan and take a comprehensive approach with other stakeholders.
		Recognized that staff must have ‘working discussions internally, but strongly put that all committee meetings need to be open to public and on public record. Default would be for public meetings, with only moving to private meetings when absolutely valid (e.g. legal or land ownership issue). Otherwise community trust in City Hall is endangered.
		Want as much public involvement as possible – recognized there is a financial limitation put there by Council (expectations for timeframe of plan completion within a set budget).
		Support for proactive identification of stakeholders and participation of hard-to-reach groups such as urban poor, in areas like North Park, and single parent families.
		Recognized that Council is the ultimate decision maker.
		Want to ensure that engagement is achievable, considering budget constraints, etc.
		Like this structure with flexibility. Choosing from a menu of engagement options and choosing what is most appropriate for the community.
		Confidence in the City’s genuine efforts in this area has increased significantly.
		Ensure that key landowners, developers, stakeholders have directed efforts to include them in the plan
		Great array of effective social media tools to choose from. Important to include age diversity in the engagement menu, so that it’s not ‘just the usual suspects’ giving their input and direction. Be creative with the tools used.
		Like this approach of having a engagement menu to choose from.
		Concern over role of Neighbourhood Association’s – just one voice but should have meaningful role.
		Like the idea of toolkit and charter with key elements specified.
		Recognize history is not good here – the City has often shown confusion between “engagement” and “public relations” spin. It’s not so much about “techniques” as about actually listening to what people are saying during engagement and visibly adjusting the behaviour of the City accordingly. From media and private comments, the recent Blue Bridge process represents a “worst case” of how not to do it.
		Reference was made to “secret committees” including the OCP CAC. Not about whether the choices were good or the committee has worked well, it is about proper due process for how committee members are selected, what is their role, and how transparent is their operation to the public.
		19.6 Too many engagement games - need informed considered input - your plan ignores community associations - those who have local expertise
		More detail about the local planning process is needed. I believe this is the aspect that is most likely to fail and it will render the entire plan impotent.
		I would like each community to drive their own plans with support by the city. It seems the city is working the other way. The unique areas seem to be forced to conform with City wishes.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		There should be a strong emphasis on the value of neighbourhood associations. The OCP should include these associations as important partners, vital to the areas and to the city as a whole.
		Consultation with neighbourhood organizations (e.g. Fernwood Neighbourhood Resources Group, FCA etc) in order to obtain input from residents of that specific neighbourhood...rather than simply a "city wide" community plan consultation.
		Involve residents directly in any and all planning that involves Victoria harbour. Do not under any circumstances allow GVHA, or its industrial "stakeholders" to control or unduly influence this process.
Plan Amendments	19.8	19.8 Be explicit: local area plans supersede neighbourhood plans.
		Suggestive language vs affirmative language in the OCP - if Local Areas Plans are not affirmative, eg, policies backed by law as opposed to mere suggestion, then the imperative is that the OCP contain affirmative language. The OCP/LAP should be worded so that clarity is given on height, setbacks, and neighbourhood feel, including materials and character.
	19.8-19.11	Concern with Section 19.8 – 19.11 Plan Amendments (note typo 19.8 repeated). Need to better define how the local area plan will be put in alignment / consistency with the OCP. The wording of this section is confusing/ not clear and needs to be revisited. What does it mean to say 19.10 'amend existing local area plans over time to align them with the broader objectives policies of this plan including policies respecting the content of local area plans'. Confusing.
		More clarity on the implications of an LAP with respect to neighbourhood plan and OCP amendments thereafter
		The discussion centred around the two approaches: adoption by resolution which some felt provides the necessary flexibility to keep development moving, versus adoption into the OCP itself as a by-law, where changes require due process (a public hearing with notification). The argument for the latter is that if the plan is to be taken seriously, it must not be waved aside by the Council of the day without some attention and due process. Our history is that Local Area Plans are summarily ignored, sometimes only weeks after they are adopted by resolution.
		If the plan is not realistic enough to gain approval as a by-law why are we investing effort and money in it? One of our current Councillors has described the process in public as essentially a public relations exercise to give special interests the impression their issues have been addressed, while leaving Council the flexibility to give developers what they need to move ahead on projects on particular sites. While this is historically accurate, it is a waste of everyone's time. The planning process should do the heavy lifting early when particular properties are not in play, deal with the conflicts and move on with a realistic plan we can collectively live with and stick to for a reasonable time frame (say, 5 to 10 years.) Proper signalling to both developers and residents will save a lot of time, money and grief.
		Adoption was mentioned as the "elephant in the room" issue for local area planning. It is far from a procedural or technical issue only
		There is really little difference if the local area plan is adopted by bylaw or by resolution. It is fine to have either, however it is important from a trust perspective to be clear at the outset. The current approach is not clear. Which sections are by bylaw? Which by resolution? Choose one or the other. This will become an issue in future unless it is clarified now. This will become an issue in future unless it is clarified now, and one or the other is selected.
		How will various scales of planning be co-ordinated? There was much wonder and discussion about this. It was

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		clarified that local area plans (LAPs) will be done with extensive community consultation, and when completed, the results of the LAPs would, if needed, update Neighbourhood Plans (also a type of LAP), in a public hearing process, other adjacent or overlapping LAPs (like corridor plans), and the OCP.
		If, in this “new model,” Rockland is one of the “urban places that face the potential of major change in residential and economic land uses,” how are we to trust that the values in the Rockland Neighbourhood Plan will not be ignored? If, in the name of “consistency,” the objectives and policies of our Plan are to be “integrated” with densification and transit corridor goals, what will happen to the integrity of the Rockland Neighbourhood? The 400 metre Fort Street transit corridor represents a substantial part of Rockland. Its proposed re-development requires greater clarification of specific land use. Should we look for density provisions in the form of parkland in Rockland? What do we get in return for the loss of our historic buildings and ambience?
		Challenge is to bring the sub-OCP plans into line. Will neighbourhood plans ever be updated?
	19.8 p. 125	This framework is inconsistent with the view that the OCP is the overarching land use and sustainability bylaw in the City. Policy 19.8 essentially says that local area plans are the tail that can wag the dog. I recommend deleting this policy.
		Clarified proposed adoption process. No strong objection.
		General support for ensuring consistency between OCP and LAPs.
		No clear resolution on best approach to adopt local area plans
		Main issue was whether there would be any weight given to something that was passed by resolution
		Discussion about whether new OCP and clearer directions would help address existing issue around following local area plans
	Figure 2	We acknowledge Figure 2: Plan Linkages and note that no changes to the nature of any of these documents, their scale/scope, method of adaption, or timeframe are mean to be changed through the OCP Process. The Local Area Plans, for instance, will remain adopted by resolution and will be created in alignment with the OCP in the future but will not themselves become part of the OCP bylaw.
Measuring Success		Chapters 6 and 7 each conclude with a section on measuring progress. For consistency and to identify those policies or effects that are metrics that can demonstrate whether OCP goals are being met, I recommend including measuring progress sections in each chapter.