

Section 20 - Neighbourhood Directions

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Burnside	General	Roundabout at Humber Green
	General	Explore urban agriculture opportunities near Mayfair town centre
	General	Population trends change over time. No schools in BG. Quadra school is a long way. No connectivity.
	General	Isolation of BG is an issue. Bulk of community heart is in the residential area (single family). No definite boundary to the neighbourhood. Intersected by 4 roads.
	General	Additional multi-family housing in Burnside should not be focused on residents that have significant needs for social services (such as substance abuse, violence).
	General	Do not permit any further use of hotels along Gorge Road as transient or permanent housing for clients with criminal, substance abuse, or serious mental health issues. There are hundreds of hotel beds being used for that purpose in our community now, and we cannot have a healthy, diverse, family-oriented community with that high concentration of problems in the area.
	General	A shift in land use as it relates to car lots on Finlayson Road; This will be part of the local area planning study.
	General	Recommend improvement of city linkages with enhanced pedestrian corridors, bike lanes on Bridge Street and across Point Ellice Bridge, and planning north and south Rock Bay together.
	General	Consider making Rock Bay a LEED neighbourhood, featuring Multi Family housing.
	General	Need for integration of homeless and other parts of BG community over time. Create community for people on low-income, but don't want to create a ghetto. Live work would help create vibrancy
	Map 16	The area west of Jutland, currently classified as "general employment", could be suited to park-recreation, and traditional or urban residential as well (preferably a mix).
	Map 16	Hoteliers' concerns regarding changes to the Gorge area and place designations to ensure hotels can thrive.
	20.2	The village near Mayfair needs an anchoring presence, like a large urban grocery store.
	20.2	Direction regarding transit-orientated urban villages and referencing rapid transit on Douglas Street and planning in the context of rapid transit [in neighbourhood maps]
	20.2.1	Details on the direction to integrate Selkirk Village into the Burnside neighbourhood; Providing a continuous land use connection to draw people there.
	20.2.1	Selkirk Village, please see comments in 20.1.5. Additionally, Selkirk is significantly built out and maximised and does not have capacity for a supermarket that is a main characteristic of a large urban village. It is also difficult to access.
	20.2.12	recommend that VIHA be engaged to work with neighbourhood and City around underutilized lands on the north end of their site in addition to engaging in a master plan.
20.2.13	revitalisation of the Harriet/Burnside corner is welcomed, but this corner is more a transit hub than a small urban village. Declaring a village at this corner will not, in reality, meet OCP criteria but may, on paper, indicated there is a village within walking distance to residential homes.	

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	20.2.2	Recognizing areas where crosswalks are needed.
	20.1.5	Are we flagging these as highways?
	20.1.5	Community concerns regarding Gorge Road being referred to as a significant transportation corridor; Indicating the role this route plays in the City.
	20.1.5	strongly recommend downgrading of transportation corridor of Gorge Road East, particularly from Bridge Street to Harriet. Maintaining Gorge Road East as a significant transportation corridor will retard and diminish the ability to facilitate Strategic direction 20.2.1 and 20.2.5, 20.2.7 and 20.2.9.
	20.2.4	Liked language to integrate two parts of Rock Bay.
	20.1.6	The definition of a small urban village when considering Selkirk which doesn't have stores; The definition is in section 6; guidelines on page 45; conceptual in some areas.
	20.2.5	improving public access must include Greenways paths and the downgrading of Gorge Road to collector status.
	20.2.6.	Park space is significantly lacking, and I'm glad to see it is a priority.
	20.2.6	recommend this include internal pathway (part of greenways)
	20.2.8	this direction should include Burnside Road and should mention ground-level commercial or other streetscape requirement.
	20.2.9	recommend complete redesign/traffic calming/pedestrian-focus of Gorge Road and applaud redesign and walkability improvements to Burnside including a pedestrian crossing at Napier Lane/Burnside and improve lighting at Washington Street pedestrian crossing.
	20.2.3, Map 2	recommend that all of Rock Bay (north and south of Bay street) be considered together for district plan. In strategic directions 20.2.3 and 20.2.4 the OCP has made Rock Bay north of Bay street nameless 'industrial lands' to complement 'Rock Bay'. This is part of Rock Bay.
	20.2.13, 20.14.4	The need for cooperation between the two municipalities is recognized in proposed policy 20.2.13 regarding the possible joint planning of a village at the municipal boundary intersection of Burnside/Harriet. A similar tone of cooperation is not however, stated in reference to the small urban village in Policy 20.14.4.
Downtown and Harris Green	Map 17	Correction for Harris Green.
	20.3	Downtown - felt that the importance of the downtown as a center for Culture needs to be emphasized- it is the " Cultural heart of the region". Also need to define more in the plan the role of the downtown in the creative economy.
	20.4.7	(20.4.7) "Complete the Harbour Pathway and realize the development potential and public realm enhancement opportunities of public lands along the inner Harbour below Wharf Street." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the City's position on its role in achieving these, and how does the draft OCP reflect that? • How does the City proceed with proposed changes in advance of completing this "comprehensive plan"?
	20.4.8.	Page 130: 20.4.8 "Extent" - this is a typo and should be EXTEND.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Fairfield	20.5	Is this Fairfield's vision???? I don't recognize it from the Vision Statement done by the community years ago. Who wrote this? When can the community have a say in their neighbourhood? Regional significance? Is the region contributing financially to our neighbourhood? The James Bay vision states "city wide attraction" and we get "regional significance" - why is the language different when our neighbourhoods border the same local park?
	20.5.5	20.55 There are also landmark sites and buildings there and tourist services (lots of B&Bs and Abigail's Hotel.
	20.6.7.	20.6.7 Does the plan for Ross Bay village mean large great heights and densities in the midst of the traditional residential area? Please reword and give limits.
	General	I have noticed in the last number of years how the atmosphere of Fairfield has been impacted by new homes that don't fit in - boxy, ultra-modern, big garages with houses attached.
	General	Notes on Fernwood: Better connection between Stevenson park and Community Centre. Too many kids. Not many people from other ages. Well is hidden. Springridge commons: wild, comfortable, safe, laid back. Need for youth park in Stevenson park or on site of Faery Tech. Vic West is too far away. Fernwood square – always busy, lots of diversity, comfortable to hang out in.
Fernwood	General	Notes on Fernwood: Small cut through from Grant to Chambers Street is not safe. Drugs. Don't see people of different ages. Bench is nice. Only one bench to sit on. Concern over 6 stories along North Park (discussion talked about need for density) To improve North Park Village: wide sidewalks, composting bins on-street, cross walks, better lanes for cyclists, separation between sidewalk and parked cars. Too many cars. Too noisy.
	General	The Haultain Corners "Small Village Centre" is in a residential area. Belmont is already EXTREMELY BUSY for a road this size. NO MORE DEVELOPMENT at Haultain Corners, unless you implement traffic calming or block off Belmont (ie what was done with Gladstone in Fernwood).
	General	Please consider synchronizing the traffic light signal for vehicles and pedestrians at the Bay Street/Cook Street intersection in the north/south direction. Currently, the pedestrian signal on Bay Street, if not activated by push button ahead of time of the next green phase, will not turn to a walk signal, resulting in pedestrians wanting to cross Bay Street having to wait more than an entire signal phase while vehicles can still travel with a green light. The traffic light signal for pedestrians needs to automatically turn to a 'walk' signal when the vehicle traffic light signal turns 'green' for vehicles travelling in the north/south direction even if not activated by push button. In the case that the push button is not activated the 'walk' signal then automatically turn to a 'flashing stop walk' signal but can be reactivated by push button at any time during that green phase. Please consider synchronizing the traffic light signal at the Bay Street/Cook Street intersection as well as the Bay Street/Fernwood Road intersection if you have not done so already to make the Bay Street

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		crossings more pedestrian friendly. This is the answer I received from Nick Armstrong: Currently Bay Street is coordinated by time of day with other traffic signals along Bay Street. We are working towards coordination on Cook Street in a north direction with Hillside Avenue. At this time, the traffic signal equipment and software that is at the intersection of Bay Street and Cook Street, will only allow a late pedestrian call in the coordinated phase (which is in the east and west direction, along Bay Street); but not a late pedestrian call for the side street (Cook Street - north/south direction). We are investigating the opportunity to make changes to allow pedestrians to put in a call for a walk indication on the side street to provide a better level of service. If this is something that can be achieved, we will implement that feature and create a better level of service for pedestrians at the intersection, while providing an increase of opportunities to safely cross the street.
	General	[re Harbour Neighbourhood Directions]: See earlier comment re the artificial fragmentation of Harbour issues by neighbourhood.
Harbour	General	It must be recognized that the immediate lands adjacent to the marine shores of the harbour are de facto a part of the harbour and need to be planned for in the context of a holistic approach to Harbour management and wellbeing.
	20.12.8	Page 138: 20.12.8 "Develop comprehensive a ,....." this is another typo and should read, DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE.
	20.12.8	(20.12.8) "Develop a comprehensive urban design and redevelopment plan for the lands below Wharf Street." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the City's position on its role in achieving these, and how does the draft OCP reflect that? • How does the City proceed with proposed changes in advance of completing this "comprehensive plan"?
	Map 21	Section 20 – Map 21 – This map is missing a lot of information that would be useful such as: businesses on Catherine Street; Alston North of Skinner; Dominion.
	Map 21	Section 20 – Map 21 – The Galloping Goose trail would be useful to have on this map.
	Map 21	Section 20 – Map 21 – A very large percentage of this map is orange (i.e. Core Songhees Residential). It would be useful to have more definition in the area (e.g. commercial operations such as the Hotel, the Round House and operations along Harbour Road). What is the 2041 vision?
	Map 21	A reference to the basis for these ratings, and/ or an appendix presenting that would be useful.
	General	The Quadra Village as it presently exists reflects many years of joint efforts by the neighbourhood, the City of Victoria and ICBC, including significant financial investments based on our Neighbourhood Plan issued in 1995 and the Quadra Village Design Guidelines and related zoning provisions issued in 1998. The vision for this area has been consistent for almost 20 years, based on wide public consultation and the dedicated efforts of volunteers, supported by our successive

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		City Council liaisons and by much-appreciated efforts from City staff at all levels.
Hillside-Quadra	20.14.	The OCP and all City initiatives, including joint initiatives with other agencies, must continue to advance the vision for Quadra Village while respecting and building on the efforts of residents, businesses, City staff, City Council and ICBC that have achieved the progress evident so far. It would be helpful to have a strong statement to this effect in section 20 page 140 in the current draft.
	General	The James Bay Neighbourhood has, within its boundaries, 3 plans which are integral to James Bay, namely the James Bay Neighbourhood, the Downtown, and the Harbour plans.
James Bay	General	Fix the “Five Corners” intersection insanity by closing at least one street to traffic. Fix the traffic (taxis, buses) mess and danger created by so many cruise ships. Fast track the improvements to Fisherman’s Wharf Park. Fast track the harbour walkway development.
	General	James Bay lacks a specific centre. Create a plaza/public gathering place with all vehicle traffic rerouted. Underneath could be parking and stockpiles of earthquake emergency equipment.
	General	Geographically, James Bay is the most significant neighbourhood in Greater Victoria. Examples of specific key interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plaza five corners ○ Breakwater sea walk ○ Emily Carr Parkway (Toronto Street) ○ Irving Park sculptures ○ Holland Point “metal floating earth-on-water” sculpture (same as the one at Dundarave, West Vancouver)
	20.16	You only mention cruise ships under 20.15.2. So far Victoria City Council has played ostrich with concerns to impacts from cruise ships and their associated passenger Transportation and Mobility. This is very disappointing. The OCP has to include strategic direction for the impact of cruise ships on James Bay and the rest of Victoria. Under 20.16 there needs to be a line, something like: 20.16.11 - work with cruise ship lines, Harbour Authority and neighbourhood associations to reduce the significant negative impacts of cruise ships and their related passenger Transportation and Mobility to downtown. Specifically, regulations for cruise ship passenger buses need to be set, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A minimum number of passengers riding in full size buses (instead of current situation where large buses regularly take three or four passengers every five minutes). ● Higher pollution control standards on buses. ● Maps, signage, encouragement for passengers to walk or take ‘alternative’ Transportation and Mobility. ● Work with bus companies to encourage ‘green’ buses. ● Long term - have cruise ships connect to Victoria electricity grid to eliminate idling cruise ship pollution when in port.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	20.16.8	The plan does not include the necessary discussion of mechanisms to foster better development. For example, for the James Bay town centre there is no discussion of a "pedestrian priority" designation where entire portions of streets would allow for free pedestrian movement and cars would have to yield.
	20.15, 20.16	<p>the vision 20.15 and strategic directions 20.16 look very good, except:</p> <p>CRUISE SHIPS AND THEIR POLLUTION</p> <p>something regarding the cruise ships and their significant environmental impact is needed. the OCP, as far as i can tell, seems to ignore the impact of the cruise ships. there is a small mention in 20.15.2.</p> <p>but there needs to be a line in 20.16 and also section 12 (climate change and energy) stating something like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve and work to reduce the serious negative impacts of the cruise ships and their related buses, taxis and other transportation in James Bay. • encourage environmentally friendly transportation for cruise ship passengers. <p>the cruise ships (and related transportation) cause considerable air, water, light, and noise pollution. the city seems intent to ignore all the pollution, but that is only causing more and more frustration. a better system for buses and taxis needs to be designed, and (half-empty) bus and taxi trips needs to be reduced. other environmentally friendly transportation needs to be implemented for the passengers so that they can get to downtown WITHOUT causing more pollution and disruption to the people living in James Bay.</p>
	General	My understanding from neighbours is that they would like the character of the North Jubilee neighbourhood retained; green space(park) is inadequate and to see the property at the corner of Richmond and Birch improved as it is a central entrance to North Jubilee.
Jubilee	20.18 Map 24	<p>The Bowker Creek watershed is contained within the Oaklands and Jubilee Neighbourhoods (as defined on Map 15). The Bowker Creek Blueprint contains specific actions for the creek through these neighbourhoods – these actions should be incorporated into the OCP as appropriate, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The above and below ground sections of Bowker Creek should be shown on these local neighbourhood maps (Section 20, Maps 24 and 26 o Jubilee – incorporate specific actions for Reaches 6 and 8 (as identified in Appendix B of the Blueprint) o Oaklands - incorporate specific actions for Reaches 10 and 11 (as identified in Appendix B of the Blueprint)
	Map 28	Small Urban Village and a Network of Nodes. The map identifies one small urban village at the

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>Banfield Park/Spiral Café location. Participants all support continued commercial use of these lands; however, it was noted that a number of other small commercial nodes exist within the neighbourhood which are not explicitly recognized in the plan as distinct from the “Traditional Residential” category, which also allows freestanding commercial and mixed use and multi-unit residential up to three storeys. It was felt that the identification of the small urban village as currently drafted was not rationalized – for example – does the community envision and support this location as a place where future more intensive development will take place to the exclusion of others (or to a greater degree than other locations)? Will this location be developed differently than others? Can it become the desired “high street” or “main street” when it is largely one-sided (with Banfield Park on the other side)? It was noted the plan should further rationalize this designation and perhaps make it bigger; recognize the other commercial nodes; or not distinguish between this site and the surrounding “Traditional Residential/Traditional Neighbourhood” designations at all. While not clear on a preferred approach – the group felt that either “more pink or none at all” would be a better solution than the present categorization and hierarchy of land use and urban place designations.</p>
North Park	20.20	<p>Need for centralized community space in North Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that other neighbourhoods (i.e. Fairfield) are provided with focused facilities • Crystal pool does not serve that function • Other spaces promised – in arena / police station – are only available at particular times
	20.21 Map 26	<p>The Bowker Creek watershed is contained within the Oaklands and Jubilee Neighbourhoods (as defined on Map 15). The Bowker Creek Blueprint contains specific actions for the creek through these neighbourhoods – these actions should be incorporated into the OCP as appropriate, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The above and below ground sections of Bowker Creek should be shown on these local neighbourhood maps (Section 20, Maps 24 and 26 o Jubilee – incorporate specific actions for Reaches 6 and 8 (as identified in Appendix B of the Blueprint) o Oaklands - incorporate specific actions for Reaches 10 and 11 (as identified in Appendix B of the Blueprint)
Oaklands	20.21.1	<p>20.21.1 Location of a Town Centre anchored at Hillside Mall.</p> <p>COMMENT: Traffic off Hillside and Shelbourne – concern about shortcuts through the neighbourhood when defining growth and worry about encroachment of the “Town Centre” into neighbourhood even with defined parameters (existing residential at risk around the Town Centre)</p> <p>ACTION: restricting access off Doncaster to Hillside Centre + preserve residential side of Hillside Centre as per previous and existing agreements between the mall and the residents.</p>
	20.21.2	<p>20.21.2 Major transportation corridors located on Shelbourne Street and Hillside Avenue</p> <p>COMMENT: Is secondary arterial (Shelbourne Street) considered a major transportation corridor like Hillside (arterial)?</p>

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		ACTION: Keeping access points to Hillside mall away from Doncaster
	20.22.1	20.22.1 Prepare a local area plan focused on the development of the Hillside Town Centre considering residential and employment intensification and transportation and streetscape enhancements. ACTION: change “intensification” to “diversity
	20.21 – 20.22	I am a little unclear as to the overall plans for the neighbourhood. Aside from some small properties that are around Hillside Mall, a great deal of the densification is to be focused on the mall itself. Beyond that, there appears to be plans to ensure that the properties surrounding it are maintained as what are described as 'ground orientated general residential character'.
	20.22.2	20.22.2 Prepare a local plan focused on the Hillside transit corridor considering opportunities to increase residential densities within walking distance of the corridor. QUESTION: How do sections 20.22.3 and 20.22.2 co-exist? The City is looking for more densification within walking distance of the corridor and the neighbourhood is concerned about townhouses and apartments going in that disrupt the character of the neighbourhood and/or development by neglect. If “walking distance” for example, is 3 or 5 blocks, the whole neighbourhood would be included, given the geography of this neighbourhood.
	20.22.3	20.22.3 Maintain and enhance the ground-oriented traditional residential character in the majority of the neighbourhood. QUESTION: if we are hoping to maintain and enhance the character of the neighbourhood, how does increasing residential densities fit? (section 20.22.2), especially when we are Phase 3 of the local area planning map.
	20.22.3	Comments and discussion also included asking the City to consider the character of this neighbourhood – once it’s destroyed with densification, you can’t get it back. Try to keep options open for potential homeowners by saving the greenspace and light. 20.22.3 can be stated better.
	20.21.4	20.21.4 Large areas of ground-oriented general residential housing suitable for families with children. ACTION: reconsider phrasing that is more inclusive (ie seniors, young couples, singles). Suggest a statement re preference for keeping the houses with private green space around them?
	20.21.4	ACTION: resist infill to preserve private green space option for people who value and look for a little green space in a densified city. Preserve the character of this neighbourhood to set it apart from others in the City. The worry is about development by neglect from either homeowners and/or developers if the City is constantly looking for areas to densify. Identify one that is not!
	20.22.4	The Haultain Corners "Small Village Centre" is in a residential area. Belmont is already EXTREMELY BUSY for a road this size. NO MORE DEVELOPMENT at Haultain Corners, unless you implement traffic calming or block off Belmont (ie what was done with Gladstone in Fernwood).
	20.22.4	20.22.4 Progressively enhance Small Urban Villages at Haultain Corners, Hillside Avenue at Cedar Hill and Cedar Hill Road at Gosworth Road.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>COMMENT: see comment under 20.21.3. Retain existing “ground orientation”, that is, the traditional character in the majority of the neighbourhood. Problem with identification of small urban village for Cedar Hill Road at Gosworth (and Lang) – traffic and lack of safe pedestrian crossing points, as well as lack of parking near businesses.</p>
	20.22.5	<p>20.22.5 Integrate Bowker Creek watershed protection into land use planning and consider daylighting opportunities.</p> <p>COMMENT: Good idea and would welcome the opportunity to do this. This might actually help to solve the traffic congestion at Doncaster entrance and would encourage pedestrians and biking.</p> <p>ACTION: Work with Mall owners to see how this could be accomplished.</p>
	20.22.6	<p>20.22.6 Protect ecologically sensitive areas at the Cridge Centre site.</p> <p>COMMENT: Good planning.</p> <p>QUESTION: Why is Cridge property defined as Urban Residential on the map and not identified with green space? Map 26</p> <p>ACTION: review map and re-draw.</p>
	General	<p>Section 20, Neighbourhood Directions – We understand specific and detailed neighbourhood plans will be drawn up over the coming years and although not a part of the OCP, they will be consistent with the directions set out in it including densification, transit accessibility, etc., as appropriate.</p>
Rockland	General	<p>Rockland Neighbourhood Plan [concerns]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ plan adoption ○ new DPA ○ changes in zoning - impacts ○ history of variances - justification? ○ 1322- occupancy permit? ○ legal precedent re daycare - change to definition ○ supportive housing - is really institutional, not residential ○ letter response.
	General	<p>The RNA suggests that the Planning Department of the City would benefit from careful study of the adverse impact of the recent development at 1535-37 Despard Avenue on the ambience of this popular pedestrian route. This is a street which exemplifies the Rockland character. The poorly designed zoning regulation which has been used by developers to maximize building mass on several Rockland area lots reached its extreme urban core appearance in this unfortunate example. The R1-A zoning regulation requires a minimum lot width of 80 feet or 24 metres per lot for a single family dwelling. This width allows for an adequate spacing of residences, space for generous front yard landscaping and on street parking. The 100 foot wide lot in question is now occupied by two detached buildings which are designated by the planning department to be two</p>

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		semi attached living units in a building. Although the lot is not subdivided, the actual result is two buildings each of which is on a 50 foot lot rather than the required 80 foot wide lot. As several other 100 foot wide lots are found along Despard Avenue, there is a real potential for the nature of the street to be irreparably destroyed by additional closely spaced developments of this type. In other words, Despard could become a street of double the number of dwellings as was originally planned for. The development referred to has installed two wide, paved vehicular forecourts on what is one lot instead of the typically single driveway access to existing lots. This reduces front yard planting areas, street parking possibilities and the number of boulevard trees.
	20.23	Part of Rockland's character is ecological, urban forest.
	20.24.3	Specific plans to address our lack of parkland and to ensure the survival of our existing greenspace are necessary. Rockland's two tiny "parks" can hardly be considered as such – noting that they are "within walking distance" makes a mockery of the City's goals to "link people to nature, help reinforce neighbourhood character, [and] enable outdoor recreation." Though it is not a park, the Woodland Garden on the corner of Craigdarroch and Joan Crescent, which the Association has been restoring for the past 15 years, should be noted in the OCP.
	20.24.5	20.24.5 " Support sensitive infill,..... When Deb Day came to our neighbourhood meeting she mentioned that this sentence is supposed to be present in ALL AREAS, not just Rockland. .
	20.24.5	We are currently the only "Traditional Residential" area to have the strategic direction supporting "infill and intensification." We hope this is an oversight rather than a deliberate plan for Rockland alone.
	20.23, 20.24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough language re special character of Rockland and how it evolved (subdivision pattern) • Why has Rockland been singled out for intensification and infill (Neighbourhood Directions)? Leaves a bad taste. [discussion: sec suites are policy, garden suites need rezoning]
	20.23 – 20.24	Neither the "vision" referred to in this section nor the list of "strategic directions" fully reflects the wealth of information which can be found in the Rockland Plan 1987, which was produced and officially adopted by the City. This Plan incorporated the design intentions of the original planners of this special neighbourhood. It should be referred to and updated if necessary, and its objectives adhered to in future development - especially to avoid decreasing existing open landscaped areas. Use of the term "infill" in this section is contrary to the intention of the Plan.
	General	three storey buildings sound more reasonable than six storeys, but i'm not sure i agree with the development planned for south jubilee. i suspect your plans are an attempt to draw shoppers from oak bay village. again, i think there are better ways to design a community rather than focussing on shopping. i like the green and relatively quiet neighbourhood of south jubilee, and i am not in favour of increased consumer activity here. i'd have to see the actual plans before i agreed with any changes to my neighbourhood.
South Jubilee	General	The words reflect the unique proximity of Vic West to downtown – being adjacent and accessible, yet distinctly separate, a geographic peninsula, that acts like an island relative to the rest of the City of Victoria, surrounded by water and defined by its strong sense of community and diverse mix of heritage and new.
Victoria West	General	Develop a comprehensive neighbourhood plan for Victoria West through a collaborative and

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		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.
	<i>General</i>	Given the projected neighbourhood population growth represented by completion of the above projects, and the projected aging of the existing population, what additional local services will be required to help make the Victoria West Community Sustainable?
	<i>General</i>	There is strong interest in keeping the Victoria West Community intact as a whole, complete and connected community. The current proposed OCP implies a fractured and distinctly segregated community between the Songhees Core Residential area to the east and the predominantly traditional neighbourhood that encompasses the western portion of the community. Victoria West is one complete neighbourhood, is naturally separated from the downtown area by the hard and undulating line of the Inner Harbour and Gorge waterway, and distinct in character and form from our Esquimalt neighbours. While there is an obvious division between the Songhees Core area and the traditional neighbourhood owing to the current state of development and built environment associated with each, this pronouncement can be lessened by more blending of land use designations within the entire community.
	Map 2	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.
	Map 2 20.26.4, 20.26.5	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.
	20.25	Diversity of Land Uses Distinguish Vic West. Participants noted that the vision statements could be enhanced through addition of language that further highlights the diversity of uses in Vic West – from industrial lands along the working harbour to small-scale businesses along Esquimalt Road to high-density mixed-use development – that together inform the unique character of the community. Add new, as follows: Eclectic mix of land uses that reflects and respects the industrial history of the waterfront while celebrating its sustainable transformation and revitalization through mixed use development and dynamic, older mixed neighbourhood areas that together support a diversity of residents of all ages and economic means and businesses that meet locals' needs.
	20.25.1	Suggested replacement for 20.25.1: High density residential mixed use development on former industrial lands in the Songhees Peninsula forms a distinct and unique part of the city's urban core,

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		and serves and as a focus of activity with a diversity of uses for the Victoria West neighbourhood.
	20.25.2	Walkability and Connectivity. The neighbourhood's accessibility to transportation corridors – particularly alternative transportation routes including the Galloping Goose and E&N Rail Trail – is unique and supports greater walking and cycling. In addition to the language of the vision statement 20.25.2 noting connections to downtown, participants expressed interest in supporting greater internal connectivity to link places where people live, work and play, with an emphasis on north-south routes to connect to the waterfronts.
	20.25.2	Suggested replacement for 20.25.2: Transportation links to Downtown Core through the Galloping Goose Regional Trail, Esquimalt Road, Craigflower Road and the E&N Rail Corridor, as well as strong neighbourhood corridors linking the community to the waterfront and providing safe north/south routes for pedestrians and cyclists.
	20.25.3	Suggested replacement for 20.25.3: Large urban village anchored by Westside Village, Vic West Park and higher density comprehensive developments, with additional local-serving commercial areas in the form of small urban village(s) and neighbourhood-scaled commercial and mixed use developments that together enable Victoria West residents and employees to easily access all of their daily needs in the neighbourhood.
	20.25.3	Self-Contained Community-Serving Commercial and Retail. Participants expressed concern with the language of 20.25.3 with respect to Westside Village being identified as an anchor to the large urban village area. It was noted that the community is currently composed of a number of small, neighbourhood-serving commercial nodes and that there is a desire to see the continuation of these uses along with the addition of new people-focused “high street” commercial/retail areas (as planned at Roundhouse, and to a limited extent, at Dockside Green) that will encourage community gathering and where people can easily access their daily needs. While Westside Village plaza offers such commercial and retail services, it was felt that the centre does not reflect the character of the community and is more vehicle-oriented than pedestrian-oriented.
	20.26.1	Complete the revitalization of the portions of Victoria West included within the Urban Core, including Songhees, Dockside, Bayview and Roundhouse sites giving consideration for urban design linkages within the neighbourhood and to the Downtown Core Area.
	20.26.2	Section 20 – Page 152 – Vision – I judge that most people in Victoria West view the peninsula community as unique, eclectic and distinct from other communities in Victoria and desire Victoria West to be self contained and self reliant (i.e. not being a residential community that a person has to travel elsewhere for goods and services). Past developments have focused on primarily providing residential accommodation and as a consequence many areas are “dead” (i.e. not a lot of street activity and interaction between neighbors). I would like something included in the vision for Victoria West that ensure more easily accessed goods and services (i.e. walkable access).
	20.26.2	Enhance urban design to improve connectivity and walkability and better integrate land uses throughout the neighbourhood, with an emphasis on providing connected, looped networks that link places where people live, work and play and that provide enhanced access to the waterfront amenity.
	20.26.3	Strengthen transportation corridors through enhancing pedestrian, transit and cycling priority and consider how the E&N Rail Corridor can best be used as a community amenity and as a connecting element within the community (rather than as a dividing element, as it is at present).

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	20.26.4	I live in the Vic West area and believe that the land and surrounding residential population (growing over the past 5 years) can support a denser mixed use area. It needs to feel like a "center". Right now, the Save On area it just feels like a small outdoor mall / plaza that you drive to, park, shop a bit and leave. It needs to have more density and a greater range of retail and commercial opps as well as residential. It isn't designed well - turns its back to the main streets / arterials - rather than be inviting - hinting at a mixed area that is within. Perhaps gallerias would shield from the elements but all people to see in from the street.
	20.25.5	Enhancing Waterfront Access and Celebrating the Waterfront Amenity. The final two vision statements relate to the waterfront, which was noted by all as a key amenity of the neighbourhood. In particular, it was felt that the vision for Victoria West must more passionately articulate a future where the waterfront amenity is more accessible to the public and where connections to and along the waterfront are enhanced through development as opportunities allow. Replace this: Significant public waterfront access throughout the neighbourhood, including waterfront walkways. With revised, as follows: Significant public waterfront access throughout the neighbourhood, including waterfront walkways, and connections to the waterfront from inland locations to celebrate Victoria West's peninsula setting surrounded by water and unique vantage with views to the Inner Harbour, downtown and the Outer Harbour.
	Map 28	Section 28 – Map 28 – The comments for Map 21 apply here as well. I judge there to be insufficient detail for the OCP to be a useful guidance document. I think the definitions of the various designations/colours to be very vague and could easily be misinterpreted.
	Map 28	Transitioning of designations between the “Large Urban Village” area and the “Traditional Neighbourhood” area should be carefully considered during the Neighbourhood Planning Process.
	Map 28	As a note, other map amendments include editorial suggestions to update the legend to include “Small Urban Village” (if the designation is to remain) and “General Employment”.
All	General	Reference harbour in every neighbourhood direction that borders the water
	General	Neighbourhood directions - particularly helpful to assess what the plans are.
	General	Neighbourhood groupings identified differently from neighbourhood associations.
	General	Differences between traditional residential, which is ground orientated housing and urban residential, which is apartment style housing.
	Map 16 – Map 28	Community focus should be on nodes (town and village centres), not what neighbourhood jurisdiction one falls within. Strengthen and reinforce that concept over traditional neighbourhood planning. Suggest that neighbourhood Maps 16 through 28 (within Section 20: Neighbourhood Directions) should show villages in the centre of the map and bordering neighbourhoods (within a certain radius of the village) for a holistic approach rather than giving direction based on jurisdictional boundaries.
	20.1, 20.3, 20.15, 20.25, 20.11	Burnside, Downtown, James Bay and Victoria West all have marine shoreline areas, but there is little mention of this in the vision and strategic directions for these neighbourhoods. The Harbour area encompasses some of the waterfront of those neighbourhoods, and lists strategic directions

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		that include enhancing environmental quality and restoring ecological functioning, and GWI recommends that there be similar statements for each neighbourhood on the water.
	General	The distinct character of each area of Victoria needs to be preserved. Rockland is an area filled with heritage buildings and green space. To change this would diminish its appeal as a tourist attraction and deprive the City and, indeed, the Province of a precious historical treasure