

Section 6: Land Management and Development

GENERAL COMMENTS

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Approach		Balancing social, environmental and economic issues as a rationale behind the framing of the OCP.
		It is good that the City is controlling/determining growth locations.
		Like directive approach to the City's future intentions.
		Taller buildings (up to six stories) and increased density are part of the solution; i.e., having high-density town centers and core area zoned for six stories is a reasonable choice given overall goals of the OCP
		Question the use of growth as a basic premise for designing the OCP. Need to decide on the appropriate level of sustainable growth, rather than just planning for growth without any limits.
		Stop mentioning growth. It's not sustainable.
		Economic land uses and rapid and frequent transit corridors should be organizing principles for land use framework (growth distribution) and location of urban place designations.
		Like the villages, rapid transit corridor.
		I like the environmental influence in several of the topics. We have such a beautiful city; it can only remain so if we require all future development to follow "green" principles.
		We need denser, more walkable communities.
		I like the idea of having more diverse housing within neighbourhoods (townhomes, duplexes, etc) but they should be restricted to 3 stories in areas outside of the urban core.
		There is a need to examine the context and challenges related to the sustainability framework. The City plans should encompass complete communities.
		The summary mentioned sustainable 3 times but growth 18 times which is absolutely irresponsible planning. Population grow is not sustainable. It reduces green space, increases the City's overall ecological footprint, increases risk of food shortage, exacerbates traffic congestion, drives species extinction, degrades livability of the City and so on. Population growth only enriches developers & land speculators while impoverishes the existing population - just as the Songhees were marginalized and shipped off to reserves.
		Green stuff is great, but affordability should always be primary. The the greenest bells and whistles just make the rich buyer feel good, but if one truly cares about our resource use and the environment, there is nothing greener than density. Never forget, the greenest city in north america in terms of energy and resource use is Manhattan. None of those old apartment blocks have expensive cutting edge green features, but they do have the greenest feature of all: density and walk-ability.
		Not to be a broken record (ok I'm fully content being a broken record) but guess which communities use the lowest amounts of water per capita? The densest ones! Instead of fighting density tooth and nail then spending millions on ways to reduce water usage, how about not just allow density, but encourage and support it, and let the environmental problems solve them selves. Or better yet, use the increased tax base actually afford even better green projects than could be imaged now.
	Absolutely need more dense areas. However, we also would benefit from fewer people settling here....There will be a huge impact on our infrastructure with more people.	
Clarity/Future		Not clear on what items are changes in proposed density/dev. Areas compared to 1995 plan.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Trends		While the growth of seniors in our population has been included, I think the economic realities of that are not. We will need more rental space than condos and high value single family dwellings; and, we will need more socially challenged facilities and medical services than is now reflected in the OCP.
	Overview	Would be interesting to juxtapose land use designations on current zoning in order to understand what will be different
	Overview p. 38-40	Questions about distribution of office space: will large floor plate office buildings be relocating from downtown core to large villages? That could benefit Quadra Village.
		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?
		<p>1) What is the scope for new commercial and residential construction within Development Plans already approved by the City within Victoria West?</p> <p>a) Dockside - including Work/Live and Live/Work. b) Railyards - including Work/Live and Live /Work. c) Bayview – including senior’s residences. d) Round House – including residential and commercial. e) Alston/Bay/Tyee – including residential and commercial.</p> <p>2) Given the developments outlined above, what is the projected addition to the City’s Commercial and Residential Tax Base and Population related to these projects?</p> <p>3) 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?</p> <p>4) Where and how should these additional services be located and constructed to strengthen the viability of the Victoria West Community Centre.</p>
Area Specific Comments		No grocery store within walking distance in Burnside Neighbourhood
		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Implementation		Will the OCP change the way land use planning has been done in the city?
		Create community-based and built projects in different areas (designed and built by the community) – involve neighbourhood associations in the process

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Questions also arose over HOW to create the desired change, while keeping valued existing local area amenities.
Land Use Conflicts / Transitions		The tension between industry and residential components in communities within the City; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a dialogue with residents about the interaction of residential and industrial.
		These policies (food systems) could be in direct conflict with the desire for increased density. Indeed, I have heard members of the public use backyard biodiversity and food production capacity as arguments against infill. I recommend including a policy in this Chapter that makes explicit the City's role in the region as the Core that welcomes built density, while at the same time incorporating food production where safe and possible. This might be most appropriate by converting lawn space to food production rather than thwarting increases in density in appropriate locations. OCP policy may also recognize that it is more effective for regional food security to protect farmland in rural areas from housing development pressure and to place that housing in already serviced areas such as the City.
		Land use conflicts must be more than 3 words strung together. OCP is absent with regards to understanding impacts - social and environmental.
		Section 18 refers to "densification" and "intensification" as desirable goals for development in Victoria. That this type of development in Rockland should be a planning focus of Victoria Council is a matter of grave concern to the RNA. Generally, one can be sure that "densification" and "intensification" equals reduction in green space and consequent de-oxygenation. Site coverage zoning regulations were established to ensure an appropriate percentage of building footprint to open space in Rockland. The Rockland neighbourhood, by virtue of its large lots, provides a far greater proportion of open space with carbon dioxide devouring possibilities than other suburban residential zones. Large landscaped Rockland lots enhance downtown high density dwelling with the clean air benefits of adjacent green space.
		The city is too obsessed with "open space" and mid-block pathways even when they serve no purpose. In the suburban environment most people at planning are from, there is large availability of land so it's often an easy choice to include large Parks, Recreation and Culture and green space, why not? But in a dense urban environment, every scrap of land is precious and the benefits of the possible uses of that land have to be weighed. Already most all our "open space" downtown is quite under-used, we are over-capacity when it comes to open space. Mid-block paths are great, when they link up and lead between places people actually walk, city hall doesn't seem to understand that last point, but it's hard to understand when you don't live and work in the city so I don't entirely blame staff. Songhees had a pretty good plan decades ago, a dense mixed low-rise area that would feel like a bustling sea-side village, what we some how got were cheap tacky retirement condos set inside lakes of grass. Future development in that area really needs to take more of an urban-village form and less of a gated suburban retirement park form. Consider turning some of the vast fields of mowed and watered lawn into town-houses and shops, while at the same time turning some of these fields into more intensive Parks, Recreation and Culture that encourage their use (playgrounds, play fields, benches, picnic areas).
	Do not ruin our environment by allowing duplexes, townhouses, apartments and secondary suites in residential areas. Vic West has more low-cost housing per area than any other town of Victoria's size in the country. It is a nationwide problem. More housing we create, more homeless move in. Scatter low-cost housing in other municipalities.	
Planning Integration		Coordination with Saanich planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is OCP linked to Saanich land use directions • Land Use policies along Shelbourne Street

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Douglas Corridor planning
		Integration with Jubilee master planning exercise – is OCP too late
		Need a map of Victoria in the context of the Capital Regional District to illustrate regional issues, like transportation systems, etc
		It is essential to have a continual dialogue with federal and provincial governments about their land use and other needs to retain, and possibly increase, jobs.
Development Viability		Provincial regulations regarding wood construction for buildings up to four storeys and the economic values that drive this construction.
		Economics of 6 stories – Does this work for the development community
		Concern about buy in from development community in terms of where development is slated (Douglas St) and where the development community is interested in having it happen.
		Quadra Village already has urban village design guidelines and zoning in place since 1998 but no developers have been willing to invest congruently with them – why? Key point: We need to collectively understand why and make sure this OCP does not have the same flaws Key point: our experience is that parking requirements have scared away many quality proposals by people not willing to gamble that Council will eventually provide relief to what staff are correctly quoting as the requirements; we are an inner city neighbourhood well served by transit and within walking distance of major malls, employment opportunities and downtown; the kind of people who are interested in our neighbourhood are exactly those who do NOT use or need a car. It appears there may be different rules applied for the downtown than for Hillside-Quadra in this regard, and word of this gets out and frustrates developers with quality ideas. We have heard residents and business owners in our neighbourhood argue many times that historic parking requirements are now out of tune with the current reality in our Village and certainly with the future intentions of the City, based on what it has heard in consultation on the new OCP
		We suggest the addition of a point we will call 3.14: Assist in the development of affordable housing by efficient and effective approval processes during planning, rezoning, and building permit stages.
		Infrastructure Assets Management, 11.5 – The cost to relocate “overhead wiring to underground” is often borne by new development. As it is clearly desired by the city, it should be considered part of any amenity contribution package negotiated with the project proponent. Expecting this amenity without recognizing its value is unacceptable.
		Landlords and home-owners face a kafka-esq horror-show of zoning and building code rules when they try to do things "by the book". Make things easier, relax the rules to the bare safety minimums.
		Concern on small properties may not be able to achieve either height or density maximums
Housing		Prioritize growth for downtown core over mayfair and hillside town centre. We need to build out downtown first.
		More housing stock! More variety. Make rental construction profitable again through a mix of relaxed zoning and tax breaks.
		Higher density living structures require regulatory support for quality of experience for owners/occupants.
		Affordability is a serious issue in Victoria regarding housing. The OCP should include zoning decisions that would encourage the provision of affordable housing for lower-income or middle-income families.
		The belief that Victoria has to resolve both the housing affordability problem and the homelessness/street people

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		problem for the whole of the CRD is misplaced. Improvements in housing affordability cannot be achieved without access to more land, or movement towards greater urban density. Improvements undoubtedly also require the use of fiscal instruments that are only available to higher orders of government.
		I don't believe that accessibility has been addressed much. I would support policies and/or plans for accessibility for our city - I know the building code doesn't address accessibility for commercial buildings of a certain age and older. I also know that many units are not built for accessibility. I know universal design is encouraged in specific applications or density bonusing agreements. I think as our city ages, it is going to be key to address this issue. Why not be a leader?
Strategic Focus		Strategic focus in food production – most can buy from regional producers. Food production in neighbourhoods: be opportunistic but don't interfere with residential densification.
		By including multiple economic development policies – some without spatial or regulatory levels or implications which distracts from key and important land use policy statements – examples under CED.
Emergency Management		S.17 needs to provide strategic direction for built environment for addressing seismic hazards.
		Land use planning for at risk areas and other jurisdictions using this in their emergency planning; Some of this type of planning work has happened in Japan.
Harbour		While developing this elegant and meaningful approach to land neighbourhoods, the OCP has failed dismally to understand and make the best of its Harbour. Relegating the Harbour to a pretty backdrop to what happens on land, the OCP is failing its citizens. The OCP has failed to look at the Harbour as a vital engine of economic strength and has failed to grasp the role the Harbour offers Victoria. When businesses are located on the Harbour's edge because their commerce uses the link between land and water, Victoria's well-being and the Harbour's meaningful vitality is assured. If the City continues to diminish the Harbour to an attractive backdrop, the City will lose the real potential of its principle amenity. Businesses, residences and other city features that do not require the link of land and water should be placed anywhere but on the shore.
		Need an improved grasp of how to relate to and enhance the Harbour.
		A vision of a revitalized harbour area is not reflected in the Plan. The Plan ties the City to old technology and an inhospitable environment with unknown chemical pollutants creating airshed difficulties and no healthy or beautiful gathering place for residents.
		The Harbour is not addressed in the Plan in any cohesive way and there is no commitment to a working harbour. We strongly echo the sentiments of the Victoria Esquimalt Harbour Society that there be a thread running throughout the Plan that any activity at the water/land interface must require commercial access to the water. The Harbour needs to be thought of as a unique asset with a distinct set of values making a large contribution to the character and function of the City and region.
		The Harbour, although mentioned 66 times, is not understood or dealt with well.

OVERVIEW

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Overview	Overview	Section 6 of the draft OCP addresses land management and development. The OCP acknowledges the variety of settlement density in the region within this section, and is on the urban end of the continuum. The forecast growth in the OCP is in keeping with regional projections and the City's urban place designations largely correspond with the growth centres identified in the RGS. Based on existing projections, forecast growth is greater than the capacity under the existing zoning for ground oriented and apartment units. In response to this, the OCP aims to accommodate future growth and employment within the downtown core and its surrounding urban villages, employment districts, transit corridors and town centres. This strategy is in keeping with the focused growth concept that is intended to underlie the RSS.
	Overview	Add in TOD in certain parts of plan
	Overview	Urban densification based upon the connected village centres concept, or “decentralized concentration”, will have important environmental benefits associated with automobile use, airshed emissions, and greenhouse gas reduction. Greater emphasis on walking and bicycling as transportation modes will have positive effects on health and well-being.
	Overview 8.4 p. 62	Strengthen policy on “sense of place” through more direction than new DPA alone. Make the identity of Victoria as a City of Gardens (as per Thematic Framework) more prominent. The sense of place in parts of Victoria that are traditional residential is “garden suburbs”.
	overview text	Explicitly connect the benefits of walkable communities to Community Well-being as well as Placemaking, accessible affordable housing etc. Also: incorporate the concept of healthy communities in overview text. And how exactly is the concept of family changing?
	Overview	Overview Section: the statement on compact land use patterns - to minimize the need for new infrastructures is somewhat contradictory, in that, densification seems to be the overriding goal of land use plans.
	Overview	Urban densification based upon the connected village centres concept, or “decentralized concentration”, will have important environmental benefits associated with automobile use, air-shed emissions, and greenhouse gas reduction. Greater emphasis on walking and bicycling as transportation modes will have positive effects on health and well-being.
	Overview p. 24	I recommend including an explicit statement under (1) Keep Urban Settlement Compact supporting urban containment boundaries in the region. There are many reasons why these boundaries make sense, but from a City of Victoria perspective they make most sense because they create the impetus for infill development and compact walkable communities. They are, to an extent, the reason why we do not have a hollow urban core.
	Overview	Interest in lessons learned about how other cities achieve / plan walkable communities.
	overview text	Incorporate the message that density is good not bad; EIA should be measured per capita.
	overview text p. 82-83	Align investments in infrastructure and development proposals in text.

OBJECTIVES

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Specific Objective Comments	Objectives P. 32	Section 6 – P. 32 – Item 6(a) notes the extra 20,000 people who are expected to be in Victoria in 2041. As noted above, I highly recommend that OCP indicate which communities are envisioned to house these extra 20,000 people. For example, I estimate that 5,000 to 10,000 of those people could be located in Victoria West and we need a vision and plan that deals with this dramatic shift in Victoria West population.
	Objectives	I really like objective 6(d), which I think needs to be reflected in the vision or a “higher profile” position in the OCP.
	Objective 6(e)	Objective 6(e) - Rock Bay I like the objective- it would be nice to make reference to shore ecosystem restoration as being integral with this objective
	Objectives P. 32 - Broad Objectives: 6(e)	Rock Bay as an area of intensive employment – as point out by Burnside Gorge Community Association (BGCA) in our response to the draft Downtown Core Area Plan Rock Bay is bisected by Bay Street. It does not end at Bay Street. This distinction will become important when the “Rock Bay” referenced in the draft OCP becomes the focus of this “incubator” idea. Also, this designation does not allow for live/work arrangements or flexible buildings that can be readily repurposed as needs/demographics change
	Objectives P. 32	Section 6 – P. 32 – Item 6(f) notes that town centers and urban villages will become progressively more complete. I love this objective; however, I don’t see much in the rest of the document that would support this. I recommend this be fleshed out to describe what the “complete” state looks like relative to the current situation. The implication is that these “towns” and “villages” will grow. It is important to know by how and how much.
	Objectives 6 (f) p. 32	If the town centres and villages are highly successful, why would people come downtown? Consider rewording to communicate need for balance in success.
	Objectives 6(f)	(f) Urban academic research generally finds that people will not walk further than 5 minutes to amenities like groceries. 15 minutes is too far.
	Objectives 6 (g) p. 32	Reword to state: “That all city neighbourhoods, including Downtown and Harris Green,...
	Objectives P. 32 - Broad Objectives: 6(f) Town Centres/Urban Villages	the idea of services being met within a 15 minute walk from home is admirable but, in Burnside Gorge, in light of the car-centred reality in this neighbourhood and the geography involved, this would only be realistic with multiple town centres and much more pedestrian focus
	Objective 6(d)	The downtown core area should continue to be the central business district for Greater Victoria, and the entertainment and cultural heart of the CRD region.
Possible Additional Objectives	Objectives	The “Objectives” lack reference to the harbour, which seems like a glaring omission.
	Objectives	While developing an elegant and meaningful approach to land neighbourhoods, the OCP has failed dismally to understand and make the best of its Harbour. Relegating the Harbour to a pretty backdrop to what happens on land, the OCP is failing its citizens.
	Objective	Downtown Core Area viability is a prime objective.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	p. 42-44	
	Objectives	Better linkages between land use and transportation throughout the plan
	Objectives	The plan to increase population density in the downtown core area and in “village centres” that are connected to the downtown core by efficient, and timely, public transit systems is developed from the perspective of building a livable city while minimizing environmental externalities.
	Objectives	The solution appears to be a greater concentration of higher density residential development in close proximity to work places along with the continued preservation of the special qualities of suburban neighbourhoods such as Rockland.
	Objectives 6.20-6.21 p. 44-45	Strong interest in protection of unique character of neighbourhoods.
	Objectives broad comments Move to every chapter	<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>
	Objectives broad comments	Two members felt the concepts of directing growth within and around nodes (town and village centres) and connectivity to areas/neighbourhoods should be strengthened.
Implementation (of Objectives)	Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a mechanism to ensure that density is shared across neighbourhoods? Can there be a measure of density in order to compare with other traditional neighbourhoods? • Add density as an indicator to the OCP? But Rockland will always be low due to lot sizes.
	Objectives	It may be more useful for the City to target realistic land use changes over say a five year period, and to work up a budget of projected Tax Revenue increases associated with it, than to try to produce a static plan for the whole area which gradually falls out of date as assumptions change. This assessment of projected revenue flow changes into the City’s coffers should have a matching component of projected infrastructure cost increases to strike a balance over time.
	Objectives	Questions raised about the need for Victoria to achieve growth: it may be more sustainable to limit urban growth.
	Objectives	Compact densification is sustainable. Relatively greater population density is needed to support the village centre concept re: amenities and commercial activity (e.g. fill empty storefronts in Quadra Village).
	Objectives	a) Are new residents liable to be seeking downtown residential? More likely that new residents will be seeking affordable housing in small or medium urban centres. Downtown housing unlikely to be affordable. D) Similar to above, rent in downtown area is prohibitive to many support services. Currently major arts and entertainment events not focused in downtown area. E) Does Victoria have the intellectual and labour capacity to support intensive, high-tech enterprise? Need to critically evaluate the future of traditional industry in this region, and the

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		future of employees of traditional industry.
	Objectives	Mixing zones might help [meet objectives]: commercial, residential, educational, recreational and agricultural all together; homes and offices above shops, urban agriculture, and more locally-focused producers and retailers.
	Objectives	Remember, in order to accomplish any goals by 2020 or whenever we need to take decisive action immediately and continue to take every moment and opportunity between now and then. All future buildings should have very high (preferably platinum) LEED standings.

PLACE BASED LAND USE MANAGEMENT

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Place Based Land Use Management	Policy 6.2 broad comments	Permissive vs. Mandatory Language One of the reasons citizens are disenchanted with OCPs is they see them ignored, as a bylaw, time after time. This can be avoided with the use of more mandatory language in areas where there is widespread agreement. For example, policy 6.2 states "...City's local area plans and land use ad development regulations when updated, should consider the form, place character, use and density guidelines provided in Figure 7..." Given that Figure 7 is already permissive or uses language like "approximate," which allows for deviation, it is appropriate for policy 6.2 to say "...will consider." Whether the guidelines in Figure 7 are followed exactly is a matter for staff and council. But at least they will be considered.
	16.1, 16.2	more substance vis a vis use of land and measures of liveability - environmental metrics are absent.
	p. 33	There is no mention of the Harbour. There is reference to 6.1.1 Marine and 6.1.12 Marine Industrial but our single largest bit of geography gets no mention at all. There is no consistent plan for where water meets land and no language indicating a commitment to a working harbour. The City should add an overriding concept to the Urban Place Guidelines that states that any potential use or change to harbour adjacent land require commercial access to the water. Additionally, the harbour must be planned and managed as a holistic resource. Harbour planning needs its own section in the OCP where City policies are articulated and the resource is managed in a unified way.
		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.

URBAN PLACE DESIGNATIONS

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Map 1 – Overall Comments		The map largely perpetuates the existing land use pattern. It is hard to see how the plan's lofty goals and detailed prescriptions are reflected in the map
		Generally speaking, the Plan seems to capture the CURRENT major land use designations and commitments (where there are Master Development Agreements in place) and is lacking in vision for future development within Victoria West that will enhance the connectivity within the community, and relationships between Victoria West and other neighbourhoods in Victoria.
	Map 1 p. 34	Map 1 Urban Place Designations is too similar to a zoning map.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Map 1	Urban place designations follow zoning too closely
		Planning should focus on future land conditions – not existing built environment.
	Map 1	OCP Map 1 does not communicate the priorities of the OCP as clearly as it should. Need to have a map that summarizes the key concept that the City wishes to see growth focussed on the core 50%, villages 40% and other areas 10% - needs to clearly communicate this priority for development/ redevelopment to absorb the additional population over the next 30 years. Think user-friendly, clear summary for the landowners, users of the OCP.
	Map 1 and Map 2 p. 34 and p. 43	Difficulty discerning between Map 1: Urban Place Designations and Map 2: Local Area Planning Phasing, and how they fit together.
	Map 1	The level of flexibility is also good because it isn't too prescriptive, allowing the market to dictate what is needed.
	Map 1	Neighbourhood Planning. In general, the discussion regarding the urban place designations quickly moved to the neighbourhood planning scale, with an emphasis on envisioning land use at a finer grain than is possible at the OCP and city-wide scale. The discussion was one of "more colours" rather than fewer, with the idea that a finer grain of designations would better reflect the unique mix that is characteristic of Vic West. For example, the mix of light-industrial, commercial and harbour-oriented uses at and adjacent to Dockside Green are not distinguished on the draft map; the unique heritage-focused community retail at Roundhouse is not explicitly recognized on the map and the individual neighbourhood-serving commercial nodes along Esquimalt Road and Catherine Street are not reflected on the map – all as a result of the plan being crafted at the city-wide scale. While this was certainly recognized as a constraint inherent in the OCP-level planning, the group's desire to work at the neighbourhood scale is testament to their commitment to the future of the neighbourhood and desire to participate in a neighbourhood planning process.
	Map 1	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
Information on Maps	Map 1 P. 128	Direction regarding transit-orientated urban villages and referencing rapid transit on Douglas Street and planning in the context of rapid transit [in neighbourhood maps]
	Map 1 p. 34	Include a caption for Map 1 that makes it clear the UPD are present and future in nature.
	Map 1	What about schools? Can we map them on OCP maps?
Village Terminology	Map 1	I have been looking at the map that is featured on your brochure that was sent to households in Victoria. "Shape Your Future Victoria". I have noted that you have used strange names for little urban areas that have developed over the years: Ross Bay Village, for example. I remember when it was green houses and finally was built into a commercial area, eventually becoming known locally as "Fairfield Plaza" , also, you have a yellow dot nearby called Five Corners Village. This area was and is still known locally as Five Points, going back to the days when Oscar Street was open to Moss Street. Also, I note that the end of my street is now known as Fairfield at Irving Village Who decides these designations?
	Map 1	I would like to see Upper Cook St Village renamed North Park Village.
	Map 1	North Park Village is the chosen name for the village on Cook Street in North Park by most residents.
	Map 1	Several inconsistencies I noticed about place names - Ross Bay Village (so-called in the OCP) in Fairfield actually has a sign in the retail area called "Fairfield Plaza". Also, North Cook Street Village (as named in the OCP) is actually called North Park Village on the flag poles in the area. Best to re-name these areas in the OCP to correspond with what residents know and how they refer to them.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Map 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Westside Village should be Vic West Village Banfield Village should be Craigflower Village
	Map 1	Village Names - Street quadrants are a good start. Instead how about villages names after people who did so much in the community. Not elected or appointed people that paid to develop the city. They are recorded and remembered. People who did so much and did it for free or on a mostly free basis; unsung heroes. This, I think, would add a sense of history and “esprit de corps” to each village/community. An added focus and depth to each special area.
UPD Terminology		Can we use a better term than “General Employment”?
		The descriptors need to be reviewed and revised. Why are the malls “Town Centres” and downtown is not? How does “business” differ from “employment” as a land use class? It looks like several “Core Inner Harbour/Legislative” areas are neither in the Core, on the Inner Harbour, or government related. Some “Core” areas are not in the core, e.g., Core Songhees, Core Residential.
	Map 1 Figure 7	<p>“Core Songhees Residential”, “Urban Residential” and “Traditional Residential”.</p> <p>These designations all imply in their names a homogenous residential character rather than the diverse mix of uses and built form intended for each area. It was suggested that these labels could be amended to better reflect the diversity of commercial, retail, residential and business/light-industrial uses as permitted / accommodated in each. Specifically, it was requested that the urban place designation for “Core Songhees Residential” be revised to “Core Songhees Area”. “Traditional Residential” could perhaps be better labelled “Traditional Neighbourhood”.</p>
Map 1 Map 8 p. 74	Define school designation and requirements.	
Changes to UPDs - General		Expand the villages so that they are big enough to become real places that can have “character” and support human interchange.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1	There has been consistent input that the OCP requires “more colours” – even on the OCP level. One need only take a look at other highly successful neighbourhoods within Victoria proper, such as James Bay, to see more definition in terms of land use designations on the level of the OCP, and the Fairfield designations to see the gradual integration in land use areas that facilitate the transition between drastically distinct designations. The current designation “Core Songhees Residential” is too broad to provide any meaningful vision of integration into the neighbourhood.
	Urban Place Designations- Transitions	Transitioning of designations between the “Large Urban Village” area and the “Traditional Neighbourhood” area should be carefully considered during the Neighbourhood Planning Process.
	Map 2	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.
		Jubilee hospital, Hillside and Mayfair Malls are other possible areas where there could be more density to provide accommodation for staff.
James Bay UPDs		Fisherman’s Wharf is definitely a “small centre”. Might the park also be preserved, natural area, creek? Why is the Royal Jubilee Hospital considered “General Employment” rather than “Institutional”?
Jubilee UPDs	Urban Place Designations	Concern that the traditional residential form and character as expressed through ground oriented housing on Chestnut St. and Fern St. will be overwhelmed by being surrounded by Urban Residential designations.
	Large Urban Villages	Potentially reconsider the boundaries of Jubilee Village.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Map 1 p. 34	
	Large Urban Villages (Jubilee Village)	Feasibility of a Jubilee urban village with hospital grounds across the street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally would be greenspace on south side of the street and buildings on north site • Need design responses to ensure sunlight penetration
	Large Urban Villages (Jubilee Village)	Grocery store is not integrated into the village – more a of a regional, auto oriented store
	Urban Place Designations	Jubilee as centre for regional growth – should it be a town centre?
		Change designation of Jubilee Village from Large Urban Village to Town Centre centred on Royal Jubilee Hospital as its employment anchor.
	Urban Place Designations South Jubilee	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.
	Large Urban Villages	Recognized the uniqueness of having a linear urban village along Fort St
	Large Urban Villages	Comment that Stadacona Village and Jubilee Village are not complete functioning villages like Quadra Village or Cook St. Village. Uncertainty about what can be done to create more pedestrian oriented uses and pedestrian access in villages in North Jubilee.
Fernwood UPDs	Urban Place Designations	<p>LANDECA Holdings Inc. owns the properties at 1271 and 1275 Bay Street. Our properties are located in Fernwood, at the key intersection of Bay Street and Fernwood Road - a site that acts as a gateway to the Fernwood Village core to the south and that is impacted by the major transportation corridors of the two adjacent streets. The history of land use at this corner is commercial mixed-use, with commercial on the ground-floor and residential above, and has evolved from a small neighbourhood grocer to a developed corner store and now to our current business office.</p> <p>When completing our due diligence research prior to purchasing our properties, we engaged in detailed discussions with the City of Victoria to best understand the current zoning designation and its potential to support future redevelopment. Specifically, the current C1-CR zoning allows for mixed-use development with a maximum density of 3.0:1 FSR (referencing the C2 Density regulations). We are therefore concerned that the proposed designation of "Traditional Residential" does not accurately reflect the potential future use of the properties as permitted under existing zoning. The "Traditional Residential" designation – while it allows for "mixed use along major roads" - indicates total floor space ratios up to approximately 1.0:1 FSR and built form up to 3 storeys. We recognize that to achieve 3.0:1 FSR on the site, development variances with respect to setbacks and height would be required; however, we are concerned that any such future application to develop under existing zoning could be met with opposition if the "Traditional Residential" designation is applied to the properties through the OCP. We note that the adjacent properties to the west are developed with 4-storey multi-unit residential buildings, which are of a scale and form suited to the Bay Street corridor. These lands are designated in the draft OCP as "Urban Residential", which allows up to 6-storey buildings and "low to mid-rise mixed use along major roads". Given the key intersection of Bay</p>

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>and Fernwood, we would anticipate that the more urban form of development contemplated under the “Urban Residential” designation would be suited to the corner properties.</p> <p>We therefore request the City extend the adjacent “Urban Residential” designation to our properties to continue this pattern of land use to the SW quadrant of the intersection of Bay and Fernwood to more accurately reflect the potential redevelopment as permitted under existing zoning and which could result in a more appropriate response to the intersection from a form and density perspective. While the “Urban Residential” designation indicates densities of only up to 2.0:1 FSR, it is more characteristic of the form of development anticipated and appropriate for this urban intersection location. We believe a future development application under our current zoning would be more compatible with the “Urban Residential” designation.</p> <p>With this vision and potential in mind, we respectfully ask that you revise the draft “Traditional Residential” designation of our two properties to “Urban Residential”, in keeping with the designation of the properties adjacent to the west, and more suited to the potential land use opportunities at the high-traffic, urban intersection as permitted under our current zoning.</p>
	Small Urban Villages	Look at extending Fernwood urban village beyond map on footprint
	Small Urban Villages	Need more office space to support businesses in Fernwood
	Small Urban Villages	Consider Fernwood as large urban village instead of small? [discussion about appetite for 6 storeys)
	Small Urban Villages	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).
Oaklands UPDs	Small Urban Villages	<p>20.21.3 Location of small urban villages at Haultain Corners, Cedar Hill Road and Hillside Avenue and Cedar Hill Road and Gosworth Road.</p> <p>QUESTION: Why small urban village identified at Cedar Hill Road and Gosworth? Why not “corners” designation. We believe part of the “red is currently zoned as single family” – is this indicating to potential buyers and/or developers that these residences are to become commercial properties?</p> <p>ACTION: Reconsider small urban village designation. Intersection is a danger for pedestrians; traffic is constant and often congested. The expansion of commercial will be difficult. The existing businesses already have trouble getting people in and out of their premises.</p>
	Small Urban Villages	<p>20.22.4 Progressively enhance Small Urban Villages at Haultain Corners, Hillside Avenue at Cedar Hill and Cedar Hill Road at Gosworth Road.</p> <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>

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Small Urban Villages	QUESTION: when looking at small urban village designation at Cedar Hill Road and Hillside – why is that designated a small urban village when it’s amongst the Urban residential development (ie 3 stories height vs 6 stories height in large urban residential). Which set of rules apply?
	Urban Place Designations	With regard to “town centre” Hillside Mall, there seems to be a mixed message. See p. 23, 33 (section 6.1.9), p. 37 Town Centre, seems to suggest density and taller buildings but the map on p. 149 shows retention of traditional residential.
	Urban Place Designations - Transitions	- how likely is it to have single family residential buttressing a town centre? In my experiences and coming from Vancouver, it is likely that the density will need to be 'fanned' out to say Doncaster. Is there discussion around how this property is to be retained to it's current usage? How likely is it for single family residents to want to be next to a town centre
	Urban Place Designations	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'.
	Town Centres	20.21.1 Location of a Town Centre anchored at Hillside Mall. 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) 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.
	Urban Place Designations	20.22.6 Protect ecologically sensitive areas at the Cridge Centre site. COMMENT: Good planning. QUESTION: Why is Cridge property defined as Urban Residential on the map and not identified with green space? Map 26 ACTION: review map and re-draw.
Hillside Quadra UPDs	Urban Place Designations Map 1, Map 8, Map 22	Key point: on the map of Hillside-Quadra, the OCP should separate institutional, open space and private development lands by colouring them differently
	GPC May 12 - Minutes	Concerns from the North Park/Hillside/Quadra community regarding the University of Canada West lands which is identified as greenspace, as is the S.J. Willis School lands; the lack of control over the uses of school lands.
	Hillside Quadra Neighbourhood Action Group Formal Submission	The playing field of the former Blanshard School is privately held and in play for private development, but it shows in the OCP documents as public open space and both it and the University Canada West sites are named “Blanshard School”
	Hillside Quadra Neighbourhood	Key point: The OCP shows residential development for the playing field at Blanshard School – wrong, wrong,

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Action Group Formal Submission	wrong! The plan needs to accurately name and describe sites and their current and intended uses.
	Large Urban Villages - Quadra Village	We have already largely achieved in Quadra Village what the draft OCP envisions for “large urban villages” throughout Victoria. Our Quadra Village, located within walking distance of downtown and astride major transit routes, is an early example of such an "urban village", and with the success of local businesses providing groceries, restaurant meals, specialty retail, entertainment and health and social services our Village already reflects the trend away from suburban-style auto use. The thinking of the 1970s, when a high-speed one-way couplet was proposed for Quadra and Fifth Streets to maximize the flow of autos through our neighbourhood, has been thoroughly and properly put to rest for decades now. With LRT coming for the Douglas Street corridor, only two blocks from our Village, there is neither the need nor neighbourhood support for going backwards now. Our every effort should be to strengthen and nurture our successful Village, not destroy it in the name of outdated notions about transportation “needs”.
	Large Urban Villages - Quadra Village	We once had a complete village and we are getting back there but have a little ways to go – the OCP is correct to encourage this (Quadra Village)
	Urban Villages	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 City Council liaisons and by much-appreciated efforts from City staff at all levels.
	Urban Villages	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 p. 140 in the current draft.
Vic West UPDs	Urban Place Designations	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.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Map 1	The area currently identified as Core Songhees Residential” on the North West corner of Esquimalt and Catherine Street should also be designated “Urban Residential”.
	Small Urban Village	Small Urban Village and a Network of Nodes. The map identifies one small urban village at the 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.
	Small Urban Villages	Victoria West small village centre area - I would like to see the boundaries of this village extend from Belton Road to Russell Street.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1	Hereward and Dominion streets should also be better designated to support positive, mixed-use development, rather than remain on the fringe between two Municipalities. “Urban Residential” would be an appropriate designation for this corridor. Catherine Street should be given similar treatment as a significant vein running North – South through the community.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1	A local resident reflected that a two year planning process that was focused on the Alston, Bay, Tyee triangle was undertaken in the recent past, during which a consensus was forming to establish “a main street approach, including some residential with appropriate commercial and service businesses that would service the residents” and maintain employment for the estimated 500 workers who are employed by current businesses in the area. The main street concept would be applied to Bay Street, identified as it is currently designated (“Large Urban Village”) and limited to the land directly adjacent to the Bay Street. The remaining area that is currently proposed as “Large Urban Village” and that is fronting onto Alston (i.e the North East corner of Wilson and Alston Streets following Alston past Edward Street) should also be designated “Urban Residential”, again to better integrate the land use designations within the community and to soften the transition between the “Large Urban Village” and the “Traditional Neighbourhood” to the West.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1	Given the comments mentioned above that are specifically referencing the Alston, Bay, Tyee triangle, it is recommended that the total area bounded by Alston, Bay and Tyee be designated “Large Urban Village”.
	Urban Place Designations	There continues to be significant tension regarding the Westside Village Shopping Centre. One community member envisions it being “bulldozed” in favour of a mixed commercial/retail/residential development that extends along Tyee, Skinner and onto Craigflower. Westside Shopping Centre is seen as an inward facing mall, more aligned with a conventional suburban shopping centre than a vital, pedestrian oriented plaza. The general sentiment about Westside Shopping Centre is that it should be opened up by establishing a main street along Bay

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Street (i.e. placing retail store fronts facing into Bay Street with one or two stories of commercial above) and strengthening the vision with a single row of retail/commercial on the other side of Bay under the same “Large Urban Village” designation as it is currently proposed – though with a narrower “Large Urban Village” that follows Bay Street rather than extending to Alston as described under the Alston, Bay, Tyee Triangle section above. It should also be noted that density from the Westside Shopping Centre was transferred to the Park Condominiums (same owner/developer) to enable the significant height of the Park.
	Urban Place Designations	The area surrounding the Roundhouse should be recognized as a “Small Urban Village” given the widely understood interest in creating small commercial hub at that location.
	Urban Place Designations	Mary Street, south of Esquimalt appears to be disjointed in terms of land use designations. Again, it appears to reflect current reality. Is that the vision for the street in 30 years?
	Urban Place Designations	Consistent with the comment regarding under the More Colours section above, Esquimalt and Harbour Roads should be recognized as “Urban Residential and/or “Small Urban Village”.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1, Map 8	The Community Gardens at the Railyards should be recognized as “Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks and Open Space.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1	The Roundhouse should be identified as “Core Historic”.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1	Concerns regarding the naming of the “Core Songhees Residential” designation as not adequately representing areas within that designation that are significantly divergent from “Residential” would be mitigated by introducing more colours into the proposed area. Core Songhees Residential may be adequate for those areas that are intended to be residential. Suggestions provided above relating to other possible designations of places within the currently proposed “Core Songhees Residential” would facilitate this refinement and enable the City to maintain the name as an appropriate designation
	Urban Place Designations Map 1	There is some confusion regarding the exclusion of the Da Vinci Centre as a recognized commercial outfit with a pay parking area. There has been no expressed interest by the community to phase that building out and replace it with a facility that is “public” with a stronger relationship to the park. It should be designated “Urban Residential” to strengthen the integration of various land uses within the community, and help to create a transition between the “Large Urban Village”, and the “Traditional Neighbourhood” to the West.
	Urban Place Designations Map 1, Map 8	The “Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks and Open Space” designation for the area west of new Johnson Street Bridge should be expanded to include the area north of Esquimalt Road.
	Map 1 Map 8 & 9.3.6 p.74-75	Map 8 is missing a park space in Rail Yards – check master agreement. Add the seniors’ centres and community centres to Map 8 as community facilities
	Urban Place Designations - Transitions	There are concerns about applying the “General Employment” designation within the boundaries of Alston, Bay and Tyee roads. This area lacks transition between this designation and the adjacent “Traditional Residential” areas.
	Urban Place	There is an interest in removing car lot or storage from land use designations associated with the Victoria West

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Guidelines	Community. The community has evolved from a car lot location to a vibrant community requiring more relevant services and amenities.
	Short Survey	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.
	Urban Place Designations	There has been significant interest by the community regarding sensibly scaled and appropriately programmed space at 800 Tye. While the designation of this address may remain "Urban Residential", particular attention should be placed on this piece of property during the development of the Neighbourhood Plan to limit the scale and narrow its land use designation.
	Traditional Residential	There does not appear to be recognition of future possibilities for how the traditional neighbourhoods, also under considerable transformation within the Victoria West community, should be incorporating some of the other designations to accommodate evolution over time. The strip of land following Craigflower Rd for example should be recognized as potential for "Urban Residential" to accommodate higher density and future small scale commercial development.
	Large Urban Villages	Another area of significant discussion within the community is the area identified as "Victoria West Village" in the draft OCP. Specifically, the community does not recognize the Shopping Mall as the hub of the community without significant redevelopment. "Westside Shopping Centre does not define Vic West" said one community member.
	Urban Villages	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.
Harbour (and Adjacent Lands) UPDs	Urban Place Designations Map 1	The impact of ignoring the requirement for marine commerce uses is clearly illustrated in Map 1 Urban Place Designations. The map shows a range of most of the Designations listed strung along the waterfront from Ogden Point to the Gorge Waterway. A tour of the eastern shore from Ogden Point to the Selkirk Trestle will illustrate the issues. Ogden Point to HMCS Malahat – Marine Industrial – suitable for use as a deep sea dock area or other appropriate marine uses. Fishermen’s Wharf – Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks & Open Space – no requirement for marine uses, sites vulnerable to land based development Fishermen’s Wharf to James Bay – Core residential and Public Facilities – no marine use included. South Shore James Bay – Core Inner Harbour/Legislative – allows marine transportation and recreation but does not require it. Other uses possible along waters edge. Causeway- Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks & Open Space- no requirement for marine use. Ships Point to Johnson St Bridge – Core Inner Harbour/Legislative – allows marine transportation and recreation

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback	
		<p>use but does not require it. Other uses possible along waters edge.</p> <p>Johnson St Bridge to Fisgard – Core Historic – no marine use allowed</p> <p>Fisgard St to Rock Bay – Core Employment – allows marine industrial but does not require marine use. Building configuration allowed and other factors will almost certainly lead to non-marine development in the area.</p> <p>Ralmax Property – Marine Industrial – allows but does not require marine oriented heavy industry</p> <p>East Shore Selkirk Waters – Industrial – allows heavy industry but has no marine requirement.</p> <p>It is clear from the tour of the eastern shore of the harbour that there no requirement to maintain waterfront lands for marine use. In the upper harbour areas there is a general bias that will favour non marine industry and business. The standards for the Rock Bay area allow buildings to 10 stories, mixed residential and a wide variety of commercial and other business uses. Marine utilization requires a business that operates on the water with revenues coming from the business. Normally this business cannot compete for land with a developer allowed to develop multistory buildings on the site.</p>	
Burnside Gorge UPDs	Village Centres	<p>The idea of a village centre has long been a wish for residents and businesses alike. The problem is, with six arterials running through our community, where do you put one? It has long been known that the Association desires dialogue with the Vancouver Island Health Authority about the under-utilization of the Gorge Road Hospital site and conceives of this as an ideal hub. Conversely, almost no one can envision a village hub at the Selkirk site. Seeing this formalized in the draft Plan as the Large Urban Village for Burnside Gorge was disheartening. It meets almost none of the criteria set out in the Plan. There is no supermarket nor any opportunity for one in the next thirty years as the build-out has just recently been completed. There is no transit service into the site nor would this be appropriate. There is limited commercial activity. It is primarily multi-storey offices and residential and is largely vacant of people on the streets outside of weekday, business hours. While we have not landed on an alternative location for a pedestrian or commercial hub, we want to ensure that this appearance of a “Village” in the Plan does not preclude other, more viable, meaningful options.</p>	
	Village Centres	<p>Large Urban Village – anchored by a full service supermarket. The Selkirk development has only recently been built out so there will be no redevelopment here for decades. There is no room to accommodate this physically at this location. The Association has made our views known to the City and Cornell Babie about the former Cornell Motors property at Douglas and Finlayson. There is much more opportunity here for redevelopment and a realistic meeting of OCP objectives for a Large Urban Village</p>	
	Urban Place Designations	<p>Concern that Rock Bay is being split from rest of BG neighbourhood. Need to create zoning that will bridge both sides (e.g. live work). Scattering uses might work well?</p>	
	Urban Place Designations	<p>Consider changing Gorge Road from Urban Residential to Large Urban Village, or change the mix of uses for Urban Residential in urban place designation.</p>	
	Urban Place Designations	<p>Hoteliers’ concerns regarding changes to the Gorge area and place designations to ensure hotels can thrive.</p>	
	p. 128-129	<p>Urban Villages</p>	<p>Need to concentrate village along Burnside Road to give it a more urban feel. Lower speed limits, as in Banfield Village</p>
	Urban Place Designations	<p>Urban Place Designations</p>	<p>Related to this planning process, but not specifically addressed by it, is the desire for Burnside Gorge to develop our potential as a tourist destination as well as enhancing the neighbourhood for current and potential residents.</p>

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		We have tourist accommodation that was created as a convenience when Gorge Road was Highway 1A. Let's try to leverage the existence of these facilities with a reason for travelers to explore the neighbourhood.
	Urban Place Designations - Transitions P. 128, 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.
	Urban Place Designations Burnside	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).
		Need to concentrate village along Burnside Road to give it a more urban feel. Lower speed limits, as in Banfield Village
	Large Urban Village P. 33 –	Large Urban Village – anchored by a full service supermarket. The Selkirk development has only recently been built out so there will be no redevelopment here for decades. There is no room to accommodate this physically at this location. The Association has made our views known to the City and Cornell Babie about the former Cornell Motors property at Douglas and Finlayson. There is much more opportunity here for redevelopment and a realistic meeting of OCP objectives for a Large Urban Village
	Urban Villages	The idea of a village centre has long been a wish for residents and businesses alike. The problem is, with six arterials running through our community, where do you put one? It has long been known that the Association desires dialogue with the Vancouver Island Health Authority about the under-utilization of the Gorge Road Hospital site and conceives of this as an ideal hub. Conversely, almost no one can envision a village hub at the Selkirk site. Seeing this formalized in the draft Plan as the Large Urban Village for Burnside Gorge was disheartening. It meets almost none of the criteria set out in the Plan. There is no supermarket nor any opportunity for one in the next thirty years as the build-out has just recently been completed. There is no transit service into the site nor would this be appropriate. There is limited commercial activity. It is primarily multi-storey offices and residential and is largely vacant of people on the streets outside of weekday, business hours. While we have not landed on an alternative location for a pedestrian or commercial hub, we want to ensure that this appearance of a "Village" in the Plan does not preclude other, more viable, meaningful options.
	Urban Place Guidelines	Concern that there is no residential in Rock Bay in order to build community around homeless and Rock Bay Landing shelter [discussion that OCP and neighbourhood plan clearly ID rock bay as industrial, and not residential].
	Urban Place Designations P. 128	A shift in land use as it relates to car lots on Finlayson Road; This will be part of the local area planning study.
	Large Urban Villages	Selkirk Village is already built out. Needs drugstore, dentist office, health offices. One of the buildings was supposed to have retail on the ground floor. Nothing is open after hours.
Fairfield UPDs	Urban Place Designations Map 1 p. 34	Replace the Urban Residential UPD on Dallas Road to Traditional Residential: concerns over legal implications.
	Urban Place Designations- Transitions	Larger development in transitional areas permits a greater degree of latitude of architectural expression and creativity which creates a tangible benefit to the community. The larger developments along Cook will also allow for a suitable transition into the areas the OCP has recognized as Large Urban Villages (Cook Street Village and North

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Cook Street Village). It will also lend itself to the areas the OCP has recognized as Core Residential and Urban Residential along Cook Street.
	Urban Place Designations-Transitions	Given the latest changes to the Draft Downtown Core Area Plan of a maximum density of 5.5:1 in Area C along Fort and Yates, the draft OCP should be reworked consider the higher density for the transitional areas along Fort and Yates.
	Urban Place Designations-Transitions	Similar to the way the newest changes to the Draft Downtown Core Area Plan propose a higher maximum density and height along the east side of Blanshard Street in Area B which accommodates a transition moving east to lower density and height, there should be a higher maximum density along the East sides of Fort at Cook and Yates at Cook to allow for a similar transition, rather than the currently proposed abrupt transition.
	Urban Place Designations-Transitions	The arbitrary and sudden transition from Downtown to the residential fabric is not conducive to an attractive urban corridor along Fort at Cook and Yates at Cook. There are nodes along the Cook Street edge of downtown that could and, arguably, should be developed as more dense urban intersections providing service and amenity to the surrounding neighbourhoods.
	Large Urban Villages	The Cook Street Village looks better than it ever has and is more vibrant and interesting. Victoria is finally becoming a real urban place – you can't stop change – just do it with respect for the environment and the aesthetics of what is already here.
	Large Urban Villages	The Cook Street Village was devastated by Castana. We lost heritage on Sutelj Street and Cook Street development did not conform to setbacks away from the trees crown. This type of development must never happen again. It has changed the character of the area and newer developments are following the established guidelines of the DPA 13 and making the village what it should be...part of the neighbourhood. When the city worked against the guidelines and forced Castana on us - it has made the planning process very difficult and the current OCP is suspect to many of us.
Urban Core UPDs	Urban Place Designations - Transitions	Concern about scale of buildings on Blanshard and closer to DT core – worried about shadowing impacts on existing buildings

URBAN PLACE GUIDELINES (Figure 7)

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Urban Place Guidelines	Urban Place Guidelines Harbour	Your namesubmits that the City add an overriding concept to the Urban Place Guidelines that states that any potential use or change to harbour adjacent land require commercial access to the water. Additionally, the harbour must be planned and managed as a holistic resource. Harbour planning needs its own section in the OCP where City policies are articulated and the resource is managed in a unified approach.
	Urban Place Guidelines	The VEHS submits that the City add an overriding concept to the Urban Place Guidelines that states that any potential use or change to harbour adjacent land require commercial access to the water.
	Figure 7 p. 35	In Figure 7: Urban Place Guidelines (Section 6: Land Management and Development), the difference between “place character features” and “built form” is not apparent.
	Urban Place Guidelines	P. 35 section 6.2 Re the need to “ consider the form place character, use and density guidelines provided in fig. 7, providing finder grained policy and regulatory guidance in response to local context and development opportunity.”

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Figure 7 6.2	Comment: How can we ensure that the “development opportunity” does not outweigh the “local context”? Some larger developments so far are not really suitable for the context.
	Urban Place Guidelines	Generally speaking, there needs to be more focus on specific land use. Victoria has many unique neighbourhoods and we need to embrace and cultivate their differences instead of trying to make them homogenous. The gradual densification of housing throughout all of the neighbourhoods is a blanket approach that is a slap in the face to associations who have sincerely worked to develop neighbourhood plans which seek to preserve and enhance the very best attributes of their communities. The City’s desire to force all neighbourhoods to comply to the same regulations will result in the destruction of much of the beauty and character of particular residential areas.
	Urban Place Guidelines p. 35-41	Use metres as the standard for built form in urban place designations – not storeys.
	Urban Core	Height designations in historic core (10 storeys) Songhees (22 storeys) should be more exact
	Urban Place Guidelines	Why isn’t green rainwater management mentioned in the other designation beyond core employment
	Urban Place Guidelines	I love the idea of walkable communities. any new buildings on main streets should have commercial below.
	Urban Place Guidelines	Encourage shops and features which appeal to the general public around Parks, Recreation and Culture and squares, such as cafes, art galleries, open kiosk shelters, museums, book shops, libraries, and other venues which attract a broad range of the public, are free or affordable, and encourage use of the park or square that they are adjacent to (through outdoor displays, seating, etc...)
	Figure 7 column re: “place character”	What is “steady...tree planting”?
	Figure 7 Place Character Features	Growth could be accommodated with better urban design in order to avoid skyscraper look and feel; use of terraces and roof-top gardens
	Figure 7 Place Character Features 8.18 p. 63	Wording of policy 8.18 needs work regarding “formally planted trees”. Not sure what is meant by “formal” – regular spacing, unity through landscaping?
	Urban Place Guidelines	Do not identify specific industries or businesses to support. That limits the City to old decaying technology. Example → some Harbour lands are identified as industrial and/or marine use. This is good – but the plan goes further and identifies type of business. Wrong so wrong. This is done in several spots throughout plan.
	Figure 7, p. 41	Recommend Industrial, General Employment and Urban Core Employment have appropriate zoning for live/work arrangements and flex buildings.
	Urban Place Guidelines P. 94, 13.8	Adding a bullet that captures the idea of live/work, mixed-use development, particularly in high employment areas.
	Urban Place Guidelines	Need land use balanced between residential, office industrial and agricultural
	Figure 7 Place Character	Planning needs to be creatively focussed on human scale, use-focussed rather than simply utilitarian, answering the sole question of “how do we fit the largest number of people into the smallest amount of space

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Features	
	Figure 7 column re: "uses"	Also put the uses in the same order: this helps to make the chart reader friendly.

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
General Development Guidance – Possible Additional Policies		General Development Guidance - There should be a statement recognizing the need to consider environmental values and conservation of valued and sensitive areas. Actually I would prefer a statement regarding an objective of sustainable development with full consideration of economic, social and environmental values in development planning and design. The original Docksider Call issued by the City may have a good example of this language.
		Section 6 Land Management and Development, needs to encourage private landowners (both residential and commercial) to use Low Impact Development (LID) to manage rainwater.
		Will DCC's still be collected "to help cover the cost of expanding or improving transportation (such as roads, pedestrian and bicycle access), water, sewer, storm drainage and parkland to accommodate growth."?
	6.2 (p. 35-41)	Add an additional item under General Development Guidelines on p. 42 and in the Traditional Residential, Urban Residential, Core Residential and Core Songhees Residential sections of the tabled in 6.2 (p. 35-41), stating something like: Strongly encourage a minimum standard of accessibility in all entryways and shared space for all new multi-unit development, including electronic door openers that allow elevator access to all building levels, including parkades.
		Mapping hazard areas and the location of at risk buildings; concerns related to possible development in at risk areas; Buildings of a certain scale require geotechnical work; concerns related to making a statement in an area of provincial jurisdiction; a study to identify hazard areas.
	17.10 p. 115	Policy should focus directly on physical resiliency – consider zoning concessions for development that achieves post-seismic standards?
		Suggestion that density not occur within 10 feet above sea level. Planning for weather impacts in the next 40-50 years with respect to sea bluffs and Ross Bay Cemetery.
		While we appreciate that City Council has approved changes to the R1-A zoning by-laws covering semi-attached and attached dwellings as a result of submissions from the RNA, this represents reactive rather than proactive planning. It would be advantageous to include in the OCP a requirement that the planning department is observing and appropriately dealing with unsatisfactory zoning outcomes.
	11.2 This policy is weak and would be stronger if more explicit: Where land use change increases density, apply development cost charges to pay for infrastructure improvement costs including parks.	
General Comments		Victoria needs to become more open minded regarding building bylaws and codes. There are lots of counter-productive rules and regulations on the books here which make creative and innovative new building ideas somewhat stifled. For example, rules about how many steps can lead up to your front porch, or what percentage of

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		the square footage can be for a rental suite.
		I find it hard to see why development at Moss Rock was permitted. I was told initially two-storey buildings are monstrous and will block some views from the rock. They have blasted a lot of the rock and are driving over the park to deliver soil. These two million dollar homes in no way contribute to affordable housing, and they are enormous and a huge energy cost.
		Multi-use buildings - benefits/negatives. How to promote complex structures.
		Encourage roof-top gardening, the reserving of south-facing areas for gardens, aesthetic sidewalk gardens, food gardens instead of lawns, chicken keeping, beekeeping, and similar activities and resources for individuals, communities, organizations, and developers.
	Objectives	There is no discussion of undergrounding utilities when new development occurs so that wider sidewalks (free of utility pole obstruction) can be built
	Amenities	Roundhouse/Songhees development – I am concerned about the public space and services being proposed for the Roundhouse. My concern is that the public space created in large private developments can be off-putting and less than ideal community spaces. I would like to see the “publicness” (the invitation and sense of welcomeness) of these spaces encourage through services, a well-designed space and other attractions.
		Clarify use of schools for hubs vs preserving kids for schools.
		P. 42: General Development Guidance 6.4 Guidelines specified may be varied.... as character defining elements of a heritage site or heritage conservation area. “Alternative guidelines” should be well monitored for greatest respect of the heritage building.
District Energy (6.6)		6.6 Give consideration to minimum development densities necessary to support ... Q: What about maximum densities defined, so projects won't be so big.
		General development guidance, Section 6.6, should encourage energy efficiency, not just district energy.
	6.6	Bonus Density p. 42 6.6 Give consideration to “minimum development densities necessary to support What happened to defining the possibility of caps to a maximum beyond which one doesn't go?! Please write in that limits also exist and can be defined. too.
		I would have thought that all of these were great ideas if they didn't include asking the private sector for the feasibility of anything renewable or clean. The private sector does not want any of this, as capitalism does not embrace anything that doesn't maximize its profits.
Density Bonusing (6.7)	6.7	p. 42 6.7 Re amenities, I've seen so much given to developers and very little for the city and neighbourhood. 1. Recently I asked for a financial evaluation re the new Mount St. Anglea proposal. This concept was brought up in the community discussion. This is consistent with Plan Administration p. 119 18d. 2. Also so much blasting near an 1865 brick structure could be harmful to the thick walls. The Humboldt Valley has regularly been blasted for some years now. Could there be a cumulative effect?
		Similarly, Section 6.7 should offer density bonuses for energy efficiency, as is done in the District of North Vancouver.
	6.7 p. 42	Reword to indicate the consideration of amenities will balance the needs of the city as a whole and those of residents in area that is impacted by density. Also include statement about transparent valuation of development proposals re: bonus density.
	6.7; 6.9 p. 42	Density Bonus Policies 6.7, 6.11

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		See my comments under 10 Plan Administration below. In particular, I recommend returning to a focus for amenity density bonusing for affordable housing with amenities prioritized either in the OCP or in neighbourhood/corridor/action plans so that the amenities obtained by the City and citizens create fundamental infrastructure and do not slip into majority decoration such as waterfalls on the side of buildings.
		Clarity needed for areas where additional density is being suggested and concern related to destabilizing neighbourhoods; primacy given to maintaining current buildings.
P. 42 –6.7/6.11		Density bonus. It is not clear in the language whether bonusing in specific area/community would allow for that money/bonus to be explicitly used in that community. This should be explicit or at least a heavy percentage weighted/allocated to local community for density bonus.
		Public amenities – what is being put in place to ensure that public amenities that are provided by developers are suitable, desirable and protected. As an example, in reference to The Union project, Anthem proposed that Theatre Alley will be a public amenity that will be provided to the public. However, without vitality and visual interest, it's projected that Theatre Alley will be ultimately be locked 24/7 and become nothing more than egress for the building residents.
Density Bonus 6.7 p. 42 18.18-18.9 p. 120		Bonus Density - discussion re how this development tool can benefit the arts, e.g. public art as an amenity for a bonus density to a building.
Density Bonus 6.7 & 6.11		6.7 & 6.11 – Increased density is noted as something that is desirable to “achieve the development objectives of this plan” but is still being considered something for which applicants must pay significantly. We believe more discussion of the planned bonus density program recommended in the Downtown Core Area Plan report to the GPC on March 17, 2011 is required. The provision of amenity contributions may add to the cost of new housing, something that runs contrary to the stated objectives of this plan.
Density Bonus 6.11		p. 42 6.11 Establish density bonus provisions.... This should come with financial evaluations. 1. Could there please be an active regular policy of having financial evaluations of what is given vs what is received back as part of the info for decision making.
Density bonus		The rationale for a two-year transition period for Density Bonus from 50% to 75% of increase in land value for collection by the City was explained. It was suggested that this transition plan would not have the intended consequences, as property owners will likely retain the change in value regardless of whether the City collects 50% or 75%. The difference would only affect the sale price of a property.
Density Bonus 18 (d); 18.8-18.9 p. 119-120		I understand that the CAC had a fruitful discussion about density bonus. I am a proponent in urbanized areas if three factors are present: a) fixing a maximum uplift or increase in density by bylaw i.e. an OCP or neighbourhood plan, which shows that there has been a community discussion about what is appropriate for that neighbourhood or location; b) generating a list of priority amenities set out in the OCP/neighbourhood plan, which again shows that there has been a discussion about if an increase in density, what specifically is needed in this neighbourhood; and c) setting out a clear formula for calculating the value of the uplift in density and the value of the amenities. Landowners/developers who opt into the density bonus program should be providing 50-60 percent of the increase in land value to the community in the form of amenities.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		I recommend expanding the policies on amenity density bonus to set out the three factors I have outlined above, and making the commitment to them through the local area planning process more explicit, with a prioritization of affordable housing as the primary desired amenity in all areas.
	Density Bonus 18.1, 18.9.4	18.8 – Density Bonus is now under discussion within the Draft Downtown Core Area Plan. While amenities are attractive to the industry and community alike, we disagree with the city on how those amenities should be provided. We do not understand why the industry would be asked to provide not only an amenity but according to 18.9.4., also its ongoing maintenance. Clearly, community amenities, their provision and maintenance, are the responsibility of the city to provide. Occasional amenity or housing contributions may be negotiated with particular proponents but those negotiations must be reasonable and the creation of a long-term commitment to a city-owned amenity is not reasonable.
	Density Bonus	Options to achieve affordable housing objectives including embracing density, working with senior levels of government and bonus density.
		Charging stations, showers, bike facilities all sound good but they are things the tenants have to pay for and only serve to raise the cost of space, thus cost of living/doing business in the city. Instead of demanding buildings add such amenities, reward them for it in density or tax breaks. Stop adding costs to development so people can afford to live and do business in the city!
Site Assembly (6.8)	6.8	6.8 “Encourage the assembly of logical development sites that enable the best realization of permitted development potential for the area. Wow! Who gets to decide what is a “logical assembly” and what is “best”? The developer will want large density and prize areas. My bets are not on the local inhabitant having much say in these definitions. NB: This is a loophole with a hole big enough for a moving truck to go through.
	p.65	When trees are said by the developer’s arborist to be hopeless, then council should request their own choice paid for by the developer as a second opinion. This should be added to p. 65, Neighbourhoods and districts.
	6.8	Section 6.8, who will encourage assembly of development sites?
		I am concerned about the scale of many recent developments. Jutland/Selkirk and the Humboldt Valley come to mind as sites that may have been better served with smaller building lots. I especially would like to see an effort to maintain small lots in small urban villages and urban villages.
		There is not discussion of incentives for larger scale development through land assembly (including use of public streets).
		There is not discussion of incentives for larger scale development through land assembly (including use of public streets).
Site specific amendments (6.9)	6.9 p. 42	It should be noted that policy 6.9 removes any mandatory nature from the OCP as a whole. If the policies are crafted correctly than any appropriate use should be enabled, which would do away with the need for policy 6.9.
		Comment: There is too much latitude here for much more density in unsuitable places. Staff reports sometimes pick on a couple of small points as broad objectives for developments which are not suitable in size or kind to the site. Who decides what is appropriate? This is “spot zoning” again.
		Maps and limits are useful and needed for planning, but often result in over-rigid and inflexible planning. Less constraints and sticks, more freedoms and carrots.

URBAN CORE

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Urban Core General		Clarity needed around height / density in Core Area designations – need to highlight these are a generalization of DCAP
		Height designations in historic core (10 storeys) Songhees (22 storeys) should be more exact
		The OCP must be consistent with the final result of the Downtown Core Area Plan and its new base floor space ratios.
	p. 42	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.
	6.12	6.12 – Though we understand the theory behind mid-block passageways, we ask if any research has been done on those that presently exist to see if they are working as planned. Removing a large section of land for these passageways creates a large expense. The city should ensure this large expense is relative to the benefit gained on our relatively short city blocks.
	6.10.2	See p. 42 6.10.2 densities and towers. Do we have to increase so significantly? A great deal is made in various places about the need to provide for large population with a resulting increase in density. One tower can be impressive. Place more beside it and "vertical clutter" with lack of human scale happens (as in the Humboldt Valley). Heights of 10 stories in parts of downtown seem high and having 20 or 24 makes us be "Chicago wannabes." A city can "grow up" without literally growing so far up.
		I'm concerned about the share of population that Victoria is projected to absorb in the urban core in relation to the Regional Growth Strategy.
	6.10.5 p. 42	Reword to: "Enhancing capacity to significantly increase the population..."
	6.10.7 p. 42	Reword to: "Increase land use capacity for employment particularly..."
	6.13 p. 44	Remove "clean" and change to "advanced technology".
	6.1.10 p. 33	Word in text at bottom is unclear and awkward: "five mixed use sub-designations"...but the list reads as long there are six. Break into two sentences with separate statement re: Core Employment.
		PANDORA AVENUE AND ROCK BAY – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the OCP doing to encourage development in these areas, over and above place designations? • Concern over residential uses pushing out industrial businesses from Rock Bay • Ensure that we do not end up with areas that are focused on single or homogeneous uses – mix of uses is vital
		as the towns / villages are being formed in the downtown core, it is important to realize that many of the low income seniors are living from cheque to cheque even though many of them are living in not-for-profit housing situations (ie. gvhs and church organizations). if the city is looking to support businesses to move into the "new" neighbourhoods, the businesses must not be "high end" / specialized (ie. market on yates type of stores) or they will fail to meet the needs of the seniors on fixed incomes.
		Concern that the downtown core area would overshadow and overwhelm aspirations of North Park neighbourhood
		The OCP clearly identifies opportunities for creating exciting new developments with public spaces in areas north and east of downtown.
	Additional parks and open space need to be provided within Harris Green and the Downtown to offset increased growth and density and to provide amenity space for residents.	

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Discussion of scale of buildings in the Downtown Core Area and Large Village Centre (up to 6 stories) and whether it was appropriate
		Was topography of city taken into account when planning heights in DCAP
	6 (d) and p. 42-44	The downtown core area should continue to be the central business district for Greater Victoria, and the entertainment and cultural heart of the CRD region. Maintaining this comparative advantage will not be easy unless public transportation linkages are upgraded, both in quality and in timeliness. This will require major investment contributions from senior orders of government.
		Limit high rises in the downtown core. Don't permit higher buildings even with the offer of public space. Wind tunnels are easily created. Remember Christchurch, NZ - their core was decimated by the earthquake.
		Allow businesses to be open after work hours and patio seating for cafes and restaurants. This discourages loitering by homeless people. Atrium's Habitat is a good example - the homeless have moved further down since the increased use of patio.
		Housing, environment - Increasing density in urban core would also make sense in reducing need for more commuting to work and thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Logical areas identified are Harris Green, northern fringe of downtown, and the Upper Harbour area once former industrial lands have been remediated.
	6.10.5	make sure that a good portion of it is affordable housing. A diversity of people downtown is important. A lot of these policies sound great, but are too vague for me to know what they will mean when put into practice.
		Ensure that development in the downtown core isn't limited to height or scaled down in architectural appeal because one member of council determines that she isn't fond of tall buildings. We need people to live and work downtown!
	6.12.	Downtown does not lack open space. It does lack the essential spatial definition provided by continuous streetwalls.
		Interest in developing more green spaces in the downtown core, particularly as the City projects an increase of downtown residents by 10,000 by 2041. The plan for a large waterfront park accessible to several neighbourhoods in the northern city section was well received. The plan for a 'courtyard' space off Douglas St as a 'haven' from an expected busy and dense transportation corridor is sensible. However, the development courtyard spaces should not be at the expense of more desirable green spaces.
		Support amendment to increase setbacks to 6 m along the east side of Douglas Street fronting the core for building heights over 15 m. We would like to see this policy expanded to encompass any development within the Historic Core and Chinatown, especially for those development projects that include heritage facades. This would mitigate negative visual impacts from the street of height variances granted within Old Town and Chinatown would not have.
Core Business		Core business area. Does not mention residential with rationale is the city is trying to keep downtown region to revitalize the heart of the region. Want to hold on to that. Residential is easy to encourage, downtown retail and office is harder.
	Figure 7 – "density" p. 38	Reword text to be clear that 6:0 FSR is the total and would include 3:0 FSR of residential component.
		There are businesses in the other designations that belong to the core business designations, its confusing
		raise taxes on above ground parking plant food trees and food gardens require green roofs on those tall buildings
		Why is core business limited to such a small area of Victoria? This is not reasonable if you are hoping for growth. I strongly support mixed use buildings and underground parking, but not the geographic boundaries indicated on this map. Recommend including street-level public spaces incorporated into building designs.
		I don't like the idea of more 24 story buildings downtown, but if concessions must be made for the rest of this to be done, then the set-back upper stories may be a worthy compromise... These buildings must be very seismically and environmentally sound, with very high LEED ratings. They should also not degrade the skyline of the Inner

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Harbour.
		Not enough focus on public spaces. Core business area, to be vibrant, needs to include public use – easy way for business folks to enjoy/use downtown.
		Good heights, 3-5 story street-wall is a must with excellent street interaction (no set backs, no cave-like entrances!) but once again a 3:1 density is ridiculously low if we want a vibrant downtown. What is the fear of density?
		While I strongly agree, this district, not being governed by old city historic characteristics, should be able to accommodate buildings that reach up to 30 floors. This is a great opportunity to shape a backdrop “skyline” for Victoria, which preserves old town characteristics and celebrates density in a new urban village.
	P 40 Core Business and Employment	20 and 24 stories is way too high; we are Victoria and don't have to be so high. In some places 10 stories is too much as well. We are not trying to compete with Chicago, are we?!
Core Employment		Employment is spread over the whole core area, are you referring to core industrial employment or manufacturing?
		Rock Bay should also be recognized as a long-term walking corridor along the harbour, with ocean-based recreational opportunities. It is primarily suited to commercial and employment districts, but must be a vibrant harbour area as well.
		Rock Bay serves an important role. Victoria should be careful not to alienate or limit the type of industrial work that can be performed in this area.
		More specific definition around the Core Employment designation.
	P. 32, 6E	Rock Bay developing as an intensive employment area; concerns related to how that would develop and careful word crafting to ensure it is not solely for work.
	6.13	Urban Core, Section 6.13. Why is Rock Bay, with its long and expensively-reclaimed shoreline, proposed for uses that have no need for, or benefit from, water access?
		Agree with the development scheme to support land use policies for light-industrial use with limited residential in the Rock Bay area. Comments were offered that if residential construction were allowed in this area, the ensuing price increases would squeeze out light-industrial operators. Street level commercial in Rock Bay so that it doesn't become a dead zone. We also support ground floor commercial in the Rock Bay area.
		Concern that houses in Rock Bay are forgotten due to focus on industrial/commercial.
		Make Rock Bay a green district, with live work. Current designation doesn't mention residential. Need residential to give it life.
		Clarify land use designation below Capital Iron. Need to protect possibility for docks, moorage to support working harbour
		In the Core employment District, residential should not be allowed on the water's edge. In support of the working harbour lands directly adjacent to the water must be used for activities that require connection.
	P. 35, Figure 7	Core Employment: should have live/work and flex buildings;
		Heavy industrial needs to go somewhere too.
		You are missing what people need to live/work etc. More than buildings, structure and form needed.
	I'm not sure about the 20 storey structures. They seem too tall.	
	Need a mix of amenities in this area so that they are open after 6 pm to avoid the risk of what has happened in the Selkirk area. Leaving work in that area after 5 pm is sketchy and not safe waiting for the bus on Gorge and Garbally. Everything is closed and deserted.	

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Home-based businesses and business growth in Rock Bay moving forward along with the Economic Development Strategy.
Core Historic		The Legislature and Empress Hotel clearly belong to the core historic area, designations are confusing, there are too many designation, try to combine some of them
		This limits the potential for business growth in an important part of Victoria’s downtown, close to the inner harbour. Why is public art included in “core historic” priorities? These do not necessarily compliment one another. Civic buildings do not need to be located in historic area. These should be located in areas with ample and accessible parking options. High limitation is not reasonable for potential growth.
		OCP wording is “missing teeth’ when it comes to protecting local heritage. Concern over how the OCP will actually serve to protect Old Town from a legal perspective that gives clear direction to land use and development decision making
	Map 1	Why is the Empress Hotel in the “Legislative” zone, and the Legislature is not?
	P. 38	Core Historic – buildings are up to five storeys meaning height restricted or commercial store height;
		Story limits are unnecessary: the key constraint is that new construction is complementary.
		In many old cities, there is a concentration of activity that really makes the place feel vibrant. In those places, it’s the relative narrowness of the streets, and the relationship between the streets and the buildings that contribute to the “historic feel” of the place as much as the old materials and construction techniques. Having buildings close to the sidewalk is very important, but it’s not enough by itself. I think part of the drab feel of Douglas street is that it is much too wide. What is maybe more important than the absolute width of the street is is the ratio of street width to building height that provides a certain amount of visual “containment,” which can make activity feel more concentrated and vibrant. I think the height limit of 5 stories is too low for the wide streets downtown (Yates, Fort, and especially Douglas). I also think that there should be a lot more residential here. Part of keeping a place vibrant is having people there 24 hours a day. Also, there is nothing “historic” about busy traffic and parked cars everywhere. Especially in this district, every time sidewalks and roads need to be upgraded or repaired, pedestrians should be given priority over cars.
		I very much believe that we must conserve and compliment historical buildings. While doing this, however, we must aim for more sustainable buildings with quality architecture, green roofs or roofs with photovoltaic cells / rain water catchment, and a high LEED certification level. In addition to more plazas, I also approve of more pedestrian only alleyways, like Trounce and Fan Tan Ally. If feasible, I would even recommend making part of downtown Government St. pedestrian-only, at least on, say, weekends or evenings.
		Need an historic district/protection or we will become just another city.
		Density is way too low and heights are too low. If these rules were applied retroactively many of the finest buildings in “old town” would need to be cut down. Many old town buildings are over 5:1 density and 7-8 floors. 3:1 density and 5 stories does not reflect the spirit or history of our city and instead perpetuates the modern myth of “ye olde small town Victoria”.
	DRA will find it difficult to support the OCP unless it contains clear and strong policy direction that protects the integrity of Old Town and China Town.	
	P. 38 Core Historic Absolute encouragement here to have “new compatible construction.” There should not be rivalry in density and height. Up to five stories is competition for MSA for example. Please put in	

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		acknowledgement that some other buildings deserve to be better respected both for looks and in context of their physical safety.
		Policy 8.13 reads as though low building forms are only envisioned along the waterfront and not throughout the rest of Old Town and Chinatown.
Core Inner Harbour Legislative	P. 38	Core Inner Harbour / Legislative Buildings up to approximately 10 storeys east of the Empress Hotel to Blanshard Street, and south of Belleville Street – how far south and concerns how it fits contextually with iconic buildings in the area. Nothing above the eaves of the Empress Hotel.
		The identified Core Inner Harbour / legislative zone has residential as part of mixed use development adjacent to harbour activities. GVHA strongly opposes allowing mixed-use residential in areas such as the Reed site and areas around the inner harbour which fall within this zone. An example of where this does not work efficiently is with the Shoal Point development adjacent to Fisherman’s Wharf, Songhees development adjacent to the north west part of the Inner Harbour
		This is a wish-list. Not all things compatible. Don’t tie City, through OCP, to old technologies and pollution (noise, effluents and emissions)
		Something needs to be done with Belleville Terminal and the parking lots along the harbour. I don’t have the answers, but I don’t see it really captured in your plans.
	Map 1 and P. 33, 6.1.10	It is noted that the designation termed “ Core Inner Harbour/Legislative is a land-side geographical reference to an area of the City, much of which is not directly related to activity in and adjacent to and/or related to Victoria Harbour
	P. 38	Core Inner Harbour / Legislative where buildings are from one to five storeys – if this area captures the location of the development proposal for 257 Belleville; This proposal falls into this area.
	Urban Place Guidelines p. 38	The manner in which the inner harbour district is redeveloped is of vital importance. Providing pedestrian access to the waterfront via the harbour pathway, reassigning the Ship Point and Wharf Street parking lot areas, reconfiguring the Belleville Street ferry terminals, and upgrading the causeway require coordinated effort variously with the Province, the Provincial Capital Commission, and GVHA. All redevelopment plans must meet with City of Victoria approval, even though other players may be land-owners. The City must control what happens to its “jewel”.
	Figure 7	Designation 11. Core Inner Harbour/ Legislative Re BF: While appreciated in its own right, this land-side planning construct relates only indirectly to the planning and management of activities related to Victoria Harbour Re PCF: See comment above re consolidation of items re harbour pathway. Re Uses: Much of the lands designated as “Core Inner Harbour/ Legislative” are in fact
		Belleville Terminal must be upgraded and expanded to allow ferry service to the downtown core
		I do not want a mega-yacht complex! We need to keep these areas open to our wide and diverse public.
		A public transit ferry service could be experimented with, taking passengers, for example, from Esquimalt to James Bay to Downtown, or Esquimalt to Colwood. Perhaps a co-operation could be made between BC Transit and Victoria Harbour Ferries... Keep harbour-side Parks, Recreation and Culture as they are, and do not allow the heritage value of Fisherman’s Wharf to be further degraded.
		Pointless height limits for dubious and questionable matters of personal taste, and forget about density limits. If a building a can look good, provide an important function, forget about the density. Stop using height and density as the most important zoning metrics.
		Buildings higher than 10 stories should be allowed in the district east of the empress, as there is major street routes and transit servicing this area.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Priority should be given to public space and park areas as this is our tourism gateway. Activities supporting harbour Transportation and Mobility should also have support as our working harbour is part of Victoria's unique personality.
	6.24.3	Consider seeking 'minimum' parking space required for lands adjacent to Inner Harbour below Wharf Street.
		A vision for the renewal of the City and PCC owned parking lots is the key to creating a beautiful and healthy inner harbour area. The Plan should envision the City owning more of the inner harbour area.
		The recreation of the inner harbour district is of vital importance. Providing pedestrian access to the waterfront via the harbour pathway, developing the Ship Point and Wharf Street parking lot areas, reconfiguring the Belleville Street ferry terminal, and upgrading the causeway require coordinated effort variously with the Province, the Provincial Capital Commission, and GVHA. All plans must meet with City of Victoria approval, even though others may be land-owners. The City must control what happens to its "jewel".
		<p>Some of the waterfront lands on Belleville and Wharf Streets were purchased with funds made available under the Greenbelt Protection Fund Act. Lands purchased with those funds were intended to be preserved as greenbelt "in perpetuity", a fact that to all intent and purposes is ignored in the draft community plan. They appear to be identified for industrial use instead: not even a continuous public waterfront path is envisioned there.</p> <p>Suggestion: Honour the spirit and intent of the Greenbelt Protection Fund Act in word and deed by ensuring that those waterfront lands are identified as greenbelt park lands on the community plan.</p>
	Core Inner Harbour / Legislative Figure 7 - "built form" p. 38	Clarification is needed re: "south of Belleville Street".
	Core Inner Harbour Animation	The Inner Harbour should be more public. Prime real estate should not be a parking lot. Compare with other cities - Wellington, Chicago, Copenhagen.
	Core Inner Harbour / Legislative	The draft OCP had very little coverage on the ferry terminals in the downtown region. Improvements should be made to the Ogden Point terminal and the two Bellville Street Ferry terminals to provide better facilities and services to the disembarking passengers. Suggestions were made to use the former wax museum building owned by the Provincial Capital Commission as a ferry terminal.
	Core Inner Harbour District	<p>Steps have been taken to ensure that some properties will be maintained and preserved as, "heritage" but more needs to be done to prevent undesirable changes being made to Victoria's special character. For example -people don't generally come to see our tall buildings. They like assets such as our scenic vistas and smaller-town characteristics. Consequently, permitting high buildings around the parliament building area is a retrograde step regardless, whether or not the Royal BC Museum decision-makers are involved in planning. The goal should be to develop a spacious, harmonious whole, preventing a hemmed in-effect caused by tall buildings constructed with little if any setbacks.</p> <p>Suggestion: Tourism is a major force here; the goal to make Victoria a walkabout city should be paramount in developing our new community plan. An area located outside the periphery of down-town could be zoned for high buildings. Tall structures would not be erected anywhere else nor will exceptions be permitted. Protect all scenic</p>

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		views by means of zonings including street-end vistas -the harbour view at the western end of Fort Street for example.
Core Residential	Core Residential	Goes too far north on Quadra - that's not core.
	Core Residential	Less focus on parking needs! More low income housing options!!!!
	Core Residential	Have the public green space include food plants
	Core Residential	Density and building height limits should be higher here. Rooftop gardens and balconies should be encouraged.
	Core Residential	Residential should be designated for the entire downtown core, try mixed uses in the entire core instead of separation of uses
	Core Residential	Height restriction is not reasonable for anticipated growth. Should permit more uses in this area since it has potential to be part of Victoria's business community.
	Core Residential	Rockland and areas east of Beacon Hill Park should also host more densification.
	Core Residential	Blagh blagh keep everything an unsustainable class-exclusive suburban wasteland. We can all buy some reusable bags and make sure our SUV is a hybrid and feel like we're progressive in our 1.5:1 density unaffordable neighbourhoods.
Core Residential	Preservation of historic buildings in this area is valuable with the mix of more dense modern development will add texture to this area	
Core Songhees Residential	Core Songhees Residential P. 34 Map 1	Section 6 – P. 34 – Map 1 intent is great in that it shows the town centers and urban villages so that I can get a sense as to where the “progressive” completion will be and how people will be able to access goods and services close to their homes. However, in Victoria West there are no urban villages shown in the Core Songhees (orange) area. I know the vision is for Bay View, Dockside Green and Railyards to have shops and services, such as the Round House. I highly recommend that the vision that is expressed in those developments’ MDAs be shown on this map so that everyone can easily see the “progressive completion”.
	Core Songhees Residential	Concern that 22 stories along Esquimalt Road is too high. Current high allowances were a result of long negotiations for bonus density, and consideration of making other buildings low on the site. 22 stories, with bonus density, will be higher than that
	Core Songhees Residential	There was significant objection to a building height of 22 stories be included within the designation of the entire area south of Esquimalt Road. The 22 storey designation is seen as an inappropriate “starting point” for future development along the south side of Victoria West.
	Core Songhees Residential designation	I’m all for tall buildings in the core business and core employment designations, and even in the core residential area on the other side of downtown. But here 22 stories is WAY too much.
	Core Songhees Residential designation	2.5:1 density is insulting waste of land. With housing prices through the roof, untamed sprawl consuming the landscape, and useless ornamental lawns sucking up water, why do we continue to cling to these entirely suburban ideas of regressive density limits? Is it because most of staff at city hall are suburbanites with no understanding of what makes a vibrant URBAN setting??
	Core Songhees Residential	We certainly heard the neighbourhood comment extensively on a number of issues would like to draw attention to some specific concerns that we believe are easily remedied. The label for the area containing our property on the map and in the corresponding chart is “Songhees Core Residential”. This has caused confusion for numerous people and resulted in extensive discussions. It does not really reflect the uses described for the area by categorizing as residential what is in fact a mixed use area. This concerned many area residents (including ourselves). In addition in

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>the actual list of uses for the area “retail” has been omitted. We understand that it is included in commercial but further clarity would be beneficial.</p> <p>We appreciate that you will address our concerns with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-label “Songhees Core Residential” as “Songhees Core Area” 2. Under the “Uses” section for this area the addition of the word “retail”
	Core Songhees Residential designation	Should be a greater emphasis on making this area more diverse
	Core Songhees Residential designation	Ideally this housing will be a mixture of high, low and middle income families in order to create a vibrant, inclusive and dialogue-opening environment in which everyone can take advantage of quality infrastructure. I hope that these developments, the rowhouses especially, will have aesthetical diversity and environmentally sustainable architecture. I don't understand the density ratio given, so I can't comment on it, but I approve of dense and compact residential spaces, some or many of which should encourage sensible consumerism, and extended family / co-housing co-habitation for a better community vibrancy and inter-connectedness of age, class and ethnic diversity.
	Core Songhees Residential designation	The deadly “condo enclave” quality of Songhees could be somewhat ameliorated by encouraging ground floor retail uses.
	Core Songhees Residential designation	Retail and restaurants should be allowed in that area if not commerce, its too commercial for an area that is part of downtown, include mixed use designation
	Core Songhees Residential designation	The Songhees and new development currently lack street appeal, and has the feel of a suburban district with few store fronts and services other than lawns and residential towers. Traffic merely passes through.
	Core Songhees Residential designation	More commercial development at street level would create a needed activity that is currently lacking. This area is currently very sleepy and feels too much like a retirement community.
	Core Songhees Residential designation 6.14	one of the more underdeveloped areas is currently Songhees, it lacks a street appeal to draw both tourists and residents to the area for enjoyment.
	Core Songhees Residential designation	plant food gardens and trees tax the parking lots
	Core Songhees Residential designation	City has not balanced completing uses – this OCP doesn't either. Can't pretend that 'quality' living area is near noise industry. Need standards – industry must adapt. Current use categories are fine – but the technologies are 50 years old – and not 'green'
	Core Songhees Residential designation	Songhes Residential should be combined with core residential
	Core Songhees	In the interest of placemaking, the Songhees should be considered as potential for self-sustained area with

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Residential	residential, employment, services and food.

TOWN CENTRES AND URBAN VILLAGES

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Town Centres and Urban Villages		Greenways – use them to build villages around
		I am not necessarily for some density increase in the neighbourhood, but I see concerns that the city is putting plans in place that do not appear to be consideration what is logical and likely - that development and density without sufficient thoughts on how traffic will flow through them. Doncaster might appear to be a safe bet to be considered as an artery.
		Urban place designations should not shift offices and commercial to the villages – we need a healthy downtown and there is much reason for concern about its current state and trends
		What is the hierarchy? What happens to Rockland? Does this mean that development will happen in all village centres?
	p. 44	Add an item under Town Centres and Urban Villages on p. 44 that reads: Require development within Town Centres and Urban Villages to include two or more uses, and facilitate this type of development through zoning.
		Also, please provide definitions for “town centre”, “village” and district.
	6.16	Development permit areas are often opposed to densification. 6-story new developments must be the priority.
	P. 45	Mixed use development regarding town centres. Is there a lot of use separation on the plan as a whole and town centre as shown on P. 45. It's very encouraging for new, but not a lot of attention is given to mixed use commercial/residential. The idea is village centres (P. 37). Will go up to six stories including a mix of uses and will provide vibrancy and life to neighbourhood.
		A number of the villages are located on major thoroughfares – impedes livability of those areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create green / pedestrian corridors parallel to thoroughfares • Keep thoroughfares to the edge of villages
	Questions and discussion of the pros and cons of the whole village centre concept, and the realities of what can be done to encourage them to develop. The role of the market and businesses was emphasized, and the need for placemaking through pedestrian-oriented land uses and streetscaping. The example of Stadacona Village, which is heavily car-oriented, was explored to talk through challenges, and creative solutions.	
	Building on existing commercial hubs with mixed use developments.	
Town Centres		Town Centre implies mixed use, you have basically designated single use shopping centres, it should be called what it is, retail centre, or commercial centre
		Tourist accommodation in village centres makes sense in the Mayfair Mall area but not a fit in the Hillside Mall area.
		The use of the term “Town Centre” is interesting and ambitious in the context of maintaining a strong “downtown” within the core area municipalities. We are also concerned about the potential for oversupplying commercial space and the negative impact that can have on the stability of each nodal area

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Town Centre: live/work should be added;
		- in order for this plan to work, specific planning will need to be done with Hillside Mall. What plans/thoughts 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?
		20.21.1 Location of a Town Centre anchored at Hillside Mall. 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) 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.
		no new construction over 6 stories
		Densification focus should be greater for large urban villages than centred around shopping malls
		Transit hubs should be conspicuous and near the center of these areas.
		Should encourage employment at these areas. Consider locating a government office at Mayfair "Town Centre"
		Need a couple more developed areas for retail etc.
		A broader discussion around the definition of town centre and the relationship between an employee section and transportation centre; having this discussion with Saanich.
		in town centres make sure it is a mix of 3, 4, 5 and 6 stories, with an emphasis on keeping sun and nature part of what we see. If it were all 6 stories it would start to feel too much like Vancouver. Make plans for parking that include guest parking. Make sure all buildings have bike rooms. Make sure all residents have one parking space and that there is lots of guest parking.
		In contrast, redevelopment plans for Saanich’s Hillside Major Centre will be largely dependent on redevelopment plans in Victoria’s Hillside Town Centre, which dominates the south end of Saanich’s Shelbourne Corridor.
Urban Villages		Would like to see urban centres become vibrant, and a part of every neighbourhood. Oaklands has Haultain corners, but it could be so much more (i.e. Fernwood Village, Cook Street Village). What about neighbourhoods like Jubilee and Rockland? They have no real "gathering areas". Also want to make sure recreational opportunities exist near urban villages/town centres. And please don't let the single family home become extinct!
	9.21.1; 9.21.5 p. 76 14.32 p. 103	Work/live - for artists living in village centers- this concept has been added in the plan and was supported by the group.
		Small villages – support for these and their scale. Large villages are building community around shopping, and this is problematic.
		QUESTION: What types of businesses are encouraged with small urban village vs large urban village? What types of business are encouraged with “corners” designation?
		Mixed use and retail uses in villages is desirable but the City has limited powers.
	P. 45/ Section 6	The definition of a small urban village when considering Selkirk which doesn't have stores; The definition is in section 6; guidelines on p. 45; conceptual in some areas.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	6.17	The proposal of traffic calming near urban villages is to be applauded. For this and many other reasons provided throughout the OCP, Burnside Gorge will be seeking the downgrading of Gorge Road as an Arterial to a Collector. We will and have actively reached out to the Tillicum Gorge Community Association to further support this initiative.
Large Urban Village	P. 32, 6E	Large Urban Village and the role of visitor accommodation and the implications of that.
	20.24.2	Stadacona Village at Oak Bay Avenue This is an important and busy intersection with very little, if any, land to expand on (assuming the commitment to “community well-being” would prevent the loss of the tennis courts on the north side of Pandora). How is a “large urban village” appropriate for this site? Planners cannot create villages; they evolve with shops and pedestrian-friendly places.
		Like the direction of the OCP in this regard. Would like to see that the character of the individual villages is maintained and that they are not expanded too large so that the villages do not loose their small feel.
		Humber green – large urban village only includes “frequent transit” not “rapid” (p. 42)
		I want vibrant, walkable, liveable urban centres/vllages so I can walk out my door and get everything I need in the centre where I live.
		I believe the town centres and urban villages should be a mix of 3, 4 , 5 and 6 stories with enough space between buildings to allow for light. I don't want Victoria to turn into Vancouver. We have lovely blue skies, oceans, trees, we want to keep the neighbourhood feel in most places, and even in town centres, ensure they are not filled with buildings that block the sky. This is part of a good health plan.
		Having more village centres is something that this city needs. Increased community involvement and less time spent commuting to get basic goods and services
		Some good ideas, but each of those villages have very strong community associations that fight EVERY new development tooth and nail. Look at the recent development crippled and cut down by regressive (and developer incompetence) in the cook st village area, ad that was only 3 stories, BELOW the height of buildings in the area! And once again, pointless density limits. Forget about density limits, if anything impose a density minimum onto our limited and precious land. This city is obsessed with height and density as if they were evils that have to be carefully managed.
		Sounds good, but please try to take note of which areas are already working well and to have low or complementary impact upon them.
		Good ideas, will be fought by over-powered community associations. Once again, paranoid obsession with harmless density. If the roads and sidewalks can handle things, let anything go.
		Why would you want to protect those in village centres from vehicular problems more than you protect residential streets?
		Large urban villages need full-service supermarkets
		This is a great concept and should be pursued vigorously.
Small Urban Village		Identifying the use of accommodation in small villages and the suitability of hotels in this designation; a Bed & Breakfast accommodation more suitable.
		Even the small urban village areas should be directly on dedicated pedestrian and cycle routes, and frequent transit service stop should be located there.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		I love it!! Think of where the farmer's market / public assembly space, etc. will be in the Small Urban Village - will it be in the park? Maybe Small Urban Villages should also have a small public square.
		Why a pub? Why not a restaurant? Why not a hardware or office supply centre? The absence of hardware and office supplies get me into the car more than lack of pubs.
		Why can't a small urban centre have a pub or a health office? Why the arbitrary use limits? If there's demand in the neighborhood, let the demand be met.
		I think this is a great idea. We need more vibrant neighbourhoods and a focal point for citizens to gather, shop, eat and drink and access public transit. Specifically, I would like to see the Cedar Hill Village and Haultain Corners have more shops, restaurants, cafes, and services. I'd like to see more distinct neighbourhoods like Toronto has. Development of these villages in Victoria should not be hampered by overly strict zoning bylaws and City Hall red tape.
		I like the village plan for the city - workable and delightful.
		Hopefully these areas, as all of the Urban Villages, can incorporate local small businesses to fulfill most day-to-day needs, and recreational activities.
		Why do small villages have to remain small?
		Where will Victoria produce tangible products? If we don't add to the GDP, we are unsustainable...
		Wonderful that communities can obtain funds to make improvements to, for example, Haultain Corners. Even more support would be great.
Figure 8	Figure 8 6.15,	"A minimum complement of community and business services and public amenities appropriate to each level of the hierarchy of villages and centres" - this statement as well as Figure 8, should include "health, social and harm reduction services." These should be outlined in detail for each "element" – with a new column added to outline which amenities are needed for each element – e.g. Since this plan spans a 30 year period - ideally, Town Centres should have a specialized harm reduction service, and Large Urban Villages should have a specific site for harm reduction supply distribution.
	Figure 8 P. 45,	...we need to plan on how to achieve this while our population grows. Some of this is articulated in Figure 8 on p. 45 of the plan. Yet in the table provided, along with the lists of amenities in the section on Town Centres and Urban Villages, essential amenities are missing. In particular, we believe that alongside a "full service pub" and "retail," social services and harm reduction services need to be included, alongside health services. It is essential that we plan realistically acknowledging people will have access to illicit drugs, and as a community a supports harm reduction and public health, the inclusion of "harm reduction services" must be articulated in this plan. The need for these services in other town centres in our community (ie not only in the downtown core) was something that was articulated in the OCP community circle and focus group.
	Town Centres	Amend Town Centre designation to include significant employment destination as a defining characteristic in addition to destination retail.
	Figure 8	Replace "community-oriented goods and services" with "resident-oriented G's & S's"
	Town Centres and Urban Villages 6.15 p. 44	This makes a lot of sense and there was unanimous support for it in our group at the local area planning workshop. (Figure 8)
	Figure 8 p. 45	Figure 8 is visually and reader friendly.
	Figure 8 9.10 p. 75	Guide the development of Recreation Services Delivery Strategy in relation to Guidelines for Village and Town Centres in Land Management and Development.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Align the distribution of recreational services with locations of greater urban densities.
	Figure 8	Integrate social services with communities, not concentrated.
	Figure 8	Lack of grocery store is a main challenge. Tourists also want something. Nothing beyond Market on Yates. Grocery store is proposed for Cornell Building.
	Figure 8	The plan to increase population density in the downtown core area, and in “village centres” that are connected to the downtown core by efficient, and timely, public transit systems and, wherever geographical proximity and traffic volumes warrant, to each other, is sensible from the perspective of building a liveable city while minimizing environmental externalities. The plan, which essentially involves a hierarchy of central places, is consistent with emerging patterns in the CRD region. Village centres should be integrative, multi-purpose, and capable of providing a reasonably wide range of services [retail, personal, community]. It is vital to consider elements which will encourage family-centred development, including schools, parks, play spaces etc.

URBAN AND TRADITIONAL RESIDENTIAL

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Urban and Traditional Residential		From a more broad perspective, we note general concern with how the “Urban Residential” and “Traditional Residential” labels imply a homogenous, residential character and that perhaps the terms “Urban Mixed Neighbourhood” and “Traditional Mixed Neighbourhood” – or something like these – may more accurately reflect the broad mix of uses allowed in and intended for each of these areas. The inclusion of the word “Residential” in both labels could be misinterpreted, particularly as future applications for mixed-use or stand-alone commercial development could be considered in conflict with the “Residential” designations. We offer these observations as general feedback on the draft plan.
		Revisiting the C1 zone where it is randomly placed outside of urban villages and issues associated with this.
	6.20 p. 44	This policy statement is great!
		Differences between traditional residential, which is ground orientated housing and urban residential, which is apartment style housing.
Urban Residential		Placed-based land use management, item 6.1.6. I do not think that “detached” housing has a place in this description of Urban Residential uses.
		There should be MORE areas of urban residential. Especially along Dallas road.
		height variances could be given to certain exceptional projects that are beneficial to the surrounding environment.
		Sounds fairly reasonable, but the density limit is once again paranoid and unneeded.
		Burnside Gorge community concerns related to hoteliers along the Gorge wanting to reinforce their place through the OCP; this area identified as Urban Residential.
	Try to encourage sustainable practices such as food gardening in these properties.	
		3 stories is too dense. The traditional residential areas are not sustainable and should be frozen.

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Traditional Residential		Multi unit buildings should be up to four stories
		height variances could be given to certain exceptional projects that are beneficial to the surrounding environment.
		In addition, the question came up about why is townhouse part of the traditional residential neighbourhood? If this is a guiding document, the definition that includes "townhouse" puts the character of our neighbourhood in jeopardy.
	6.1	Name "traditional residential" needs to be changed. Suggested "low density ground oriented" to remove bias toward "single family" and any definition of what a "traditional" family is/was. Also suggested consider including term "established" somewhere to reflect that these already exist in pretty much the form they would stay in
	6.20	6.20 – Regarding Traditional Residential areas, we agree infill is an excellent choice here. We also understand the Village concept for planning. Our only caution here is that significant amenities like the Inner Harbour, Dallas Road Waterfront, and Beacon Hill Park are not being viewed as city-wide amenities that many people would like to live near.
		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.
		Large front yards are a waste of space. The only time people spend there is to mow the lawn. Smaller front yards allow for larger back yards, which is where people usually prefer to be. Small front yards can be just as visually attractive as large ones, if not more so. I would like to see setbacks in the city's residential neighborhoods cut at least in half. Canadian cities from Montreal east tend to have much smaller front yards, and residential neighborhoods tend to have a more vibrant feel on the street.
		With limited space and anticipated population growth, it's necessary to consider proposals for denser residential areas. Taller buildings are a great way to accomplish this. Garden suites will artificially inflate the price of already unaffordable homes and contribute to the lack of residential parking availability. There is nothing to be gained from limiting such a huge region of the City to minimal growth for the next 30 years. This area should include areas or allow for business development - this large residential area should allow for neighbourhood shops.
		The map suggests a clean Victoria and a dirty Victoria. With no standards anywhere, for residential living, the density should be spread equally, to equally share the impact costs of higher density on all residents.
		Not every part of a city needs to be some european style 5:1 density pedestrian eco-paradise, rich people need isolated places to live as well and will often demand large wasteful single-family homes, that's a reality. Many of these neighbourhoods are quite attractive and worthy of preserving, Fairfield is a gem for instance. At the same time, any district of a city not growing, adapting, changing to meet the demands of the region is simply pushing those "burdens" onto the rest of the city. I think it's quite possible to relax density limits, allow far more multi-unit buildings, and allow more urban setbacks in many parts of our "traditional" residential neighbourhoods without sacrificing what makes them lovely.
		What additional land use pressures or targets are identified in the OCP that will cause rezoning to occur within the next 30years in the area currently zoned Traditional Residential in Victoria West?
		The present promotion by Council of the construction of "garden suites" could grossly increase building footprints while reducing open, landscaped space for trees and other vegetation. Why, if it was originally determined by the authors of the zoning by-law that a certain percentage of site coverage was good planning, is it desirable to increase site coverage arbitrarily by as high an amount as 25 percent of the area of rear yards?
		Additional issues arising out of any major increase of living units throughout the suburbs by means of the

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>construction of secondary suites and garden suites are</p> <p>A. In a laudable attempt to save some green space, there is no requirement for additional off street parking associated with these units. Assuming most will produce one or two additional vehicles per unit, the narrow streets of Rockland neighbourhood could become congested with parked vehicles and subject to an inappropriate increase in traffic.</p> <p>B. Any increase of population throughout suburbia will consequently increase the daily flow of private and public transportation from the suburbs to the workplaces in the city centre.</p> <p>In addition to these problems, an increase in population and the effect of increased vehicular traffic add to the potential for heightened air pollution that would have already resulted from the loss of landscaped areas</p>
		Intensification/densification: concern for garden suites, secondary suites and intensification of housing

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYMENT DISTRICTS

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Industrial and Employment Districts		<p>P. 102 14.18- Office headquarters are supported with big possibilities. To accommodate “our share of population” we are losing quality of life in human scale with no amenities. .</p> <p>Request: Please reduce heights as a given.</p>
		An ongoing debate at the CRD regarding regional plans versus local area plans and settling the differences; the statement that hospitals should be centres of regional growth because of job activities.
		Other imported products, particularly large items, will price themselves out of the market. The land base needs to be there for clean local industry to fill the vacuum.
General Employment		Be more specific, what is general employment, should be separated into commercial, light industrial/industrial, institutions etc
		There is general confusion about the significance of the “General Employment” designation and other mixed-use development designations.
		General Employment: should have live/work and flex buildings as a planned possibility.
	6.22 P. 45 -	Burnside Gorge agrees with the desire for a site-specific master plan for Gorge Road Hospital. Two things we would like acknowledged: that the development master plan actively engage community residents and the Association and; that there is significant underutilization of the Gorge Hospital site since it's change in use and that the City and Association should engage in a discussion with VIHA in better and communal use of lands on the northern part of the site (unused parking lots and green space).
		Anticipated population growth of 20,000 and these are the areas where you will permit/encourage employment? You'd better offer more to your residents, Victoria, or you're going to lose them.
	Do we really need to worry about density limits in industrial areas?? Really? Who's delicate tastes are we offending? Build at 20:1 density, who cares so long as Transportation and Mobility infrastructure can handle it. Double the density of the whole bloody city, re-build the tram system, enjoy being a truly progressive and green city	

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		rather than a wasteful suburban retirement community with a thin coat of green-washing.
		no more heavy industry on waterfront
		What is the plan for Gorge Road hospital?
		The Gorge Hospital as an employment designation to preserve that opportunity.
Industrial		Why restrict height so much?
		Why limit to 4 storeys? Need performance zoning.
		IF a 5 story industrial building was ever built, I think the city would explode. It's very important to worry about such things!
		Check out land use designation for Budget Steel. Should be marine industrial, not just industrial, as many of those businesses also rely on marine transport.
		A similar situation exists with the lands North of the Bay Street Bridge. These lands designated Industrial rather than Marine Industrial are vulnerable to removal from the marine stock. At the present time one of the major users of Victoria Harbour, Steel Pacific, could be removed by CRD who wish to build a bio-solids plant on the site. The CRD has no use for the water thus depriving Victoria's harbour services of one of their main customers.
		The future vision of Ogden Point; The Greater Victoria Harbour Authority is engaged in a Master Plan with their vision of Ogden Point as a port and employment centre.
		The challenges of Ogden Point as a port in the midst of a residential neighbourhood and hearing from staff on how that affects transportation.
		P 41, table 7, indicates that industrial land may be approved for use as "community social services". The concentration of Victoria's industrial land is in Rock Bay. The Rock Bay Landing shelter and transitional housing should be an anomaly as a "social service" and there should be no more of these services placed on that industrial land base. Focus the future use of the industrial land in Rock Bay on advanced clean technology and green enterprise, and ensure it also has a pedestrian-friendly harbourfront in the long term. Burnside Gorge cannot take any further concentration of social services in the neighbourhood, and particularly not along Gorge Road.
		Industrial (particularly in Rock Bay proper) should have live/work and flex buildings as a planned possibility. Community Services should not be a designated industrial use;
		As the only community with industrial zoned areas, BGCA has serious concerns with community services being a designated use in industrial areas – this should be the anomaly and zoned by variance not the norm.
		Figure 7, p. 41 Strongly recommend the removal of 'community services' from uses for lands designated Industrial Use. This is an inappropriate, unsupported and unfounded use for an industrial areas
		Add arts and culture sector to Industrial UPD.
		Similarly the plan does not address the incompatibility of Ogden Point with the surrounding James Bay community by imposing "performance based zoning" that would require noise, air pollution, and traffic vehicle limits on the use of the site.
	The problem with the wording of this policy, is that it implies traditional industry. The marine industry doesn't have to have a heavy negative impact on other land use properties (dare I say people?). The industries, be they light or heavy or marine industries, need to modernize, to meet new community expectations of a healthy environment. If they cannot, then the City must act. Performance zoning may be key. I worked in the R&D world for many years. The City cannot do anything to get an R&D establishment to intensify. The City has enough of a challenge to run a	

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		planning department - and now the OCP suggest they direct industry. Too ambitious - and plain old scary.
		Concerned about taking the waterfront lands along the Upper Harbour and alienating them from harbour industrial uses such as the Point Hope Shipyard etc. Like agricultural land, harbour industrial land is a precious asset. No one is making more of it and if one looks at Dockside Green and Railyards, Victoria has been reducing the quantity of this asset. Furthermore, the above plan neglects to show Point Hope Shipyard as an employment area. It is included in the "white" uncategorized category. Why? Is the long term plan to rid the shoreline of harbour industrial land and replace it with residential users. I also note that Ogden Point and the Outer Harbour is considered "white" or uncategorized.
		More is necessary to support a sustainable City.
		Industrial lands. There are benefits for mixed use but also challenges such as noise.

WORKING HARBOUR, MARINE AND MARINE INDUSTRIAL

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Working Harbour, Marine and Marine Industrial	6.25	LM & D, 6.25 - add "residents".
		Continued success of Ralmax enterprises and other waterfront industry in the Upper Harbour is dependant on water transportation. It is vital; therefore, that the ever diminishing supply of waterfront industrial land be protected against encroachment of non-industrial redevelopment. Modification of the Official Community Plan must ensure that the "Working Harbour" concept includes protection of existing industrial land and related waterway access.
		In summary the plan fails the harbour in that it does not recognize the pressure that can be developed to deny marine oriented activities access to the water they require. Some mechanism needs to be found to assign value to harbour marine use and deny waterfront access to uses that do not require the harbour.
		Why not support the protection of marine ecosystems and the vitality of all areas of Victoria Harbour under the purview of the City of Victoria?
	6.25, 7.25, 10.11	In order to avoid unfounded and unrealistic expectations, it would be useful for the OCP to somewhere note that notwithstanding the misleading name, the GVHA has no authority over any aspect of Victoria Harbour beyond the boundaries of the 4 harbour-front properties and adjacent water lots which it owns and manages as a Non-profit Society. As such it is in fact just one among the many business partners with an active interest in the welfare of the harbour.
		Regarding development and planning for lands adjacent to the inner harbour and other foreshore areas, consideration must be made for the predictions scientists are now making about sea level rise...this will have a huge impact on waterfront infrastructure and development.
Marine	6.24.1, 6.24.2, 6.24.3, 6.26	Establish set distances that residential development can occur from the water's edge: Also merits application on all areas of the Upper, Middle and Inner Harbour. (wider range of uses)
	Figure 7	Marine Designation: In that foreshore is correctly defined as inter-tidal areas, Uses should properly be altered to read, Marine open waters and public foreshore and backshore areas".
		The term shoreline is no longer an acceptable descriptor of marine shore boundaries. In tidal waters, the land-water

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		interface ebbs and peaks twice daily, and varies continuously both laterally and vertically in between. As such there is no static identifiable “shore line” ? More appropriate terms for this in the context of harbour and coastal management would be “shore zone” or “land-water interface”.
	Figure 7	Working Harbour Designation: Working Harbour- much of the noted marine traffic, marine industry, open water areas, moorage, and water oriented recreation characterize areas of Victoria Harbour well beyond that area defined in the draft OCP as the “Working Harbour:
		Encourage BC and international recreational boaters, not mega-yachts. Don't let the GVHA get in the way of the City's or the permanent users of facilities' interests.
		No density limits on the water?? Is the water safe without a restrictive density limit? I'm afraid to go near the water now without city hall assuring me densities will never go above an arbitrary number.
Marine Industrial		Should be a greater area.
		Also encourage the traditional small business fishing industry.
		Without performance zoning, this section represents the maintenance of outdated technology and ongoing unacceptable social and environmental costs on residents.
		Gotta watch those densities! Keep those buildings sprawling and taking up as much land as possible, there's plenty to go around!
Working Harbour	P. 32, 6.1.2	This is more reinforcement of the central importance of the harbour in Victoria’s economic mosaic! In this regard we note that many of the water dependent industrial, marine and air transport, commercial, institutional, and recreational uses apply to areas of Victoria Harbour well beyond that area defined in the draft OCP as the “Working Harbour:.
		The definition of the Working Harbour developed by the Greater Victoria Harbour Authority (GVHA) provides an overriding concept that should be added to the Urban Place Guidelines. This concept defines the Working Harbour as a place “where commerce requiring the connection between land and water takes place”. With this proviso there is no question as to the suitability of a potential use for any waterfront location. It either requires access to the water or it does not. If the latter, development should be prevented, if the former any marine use can be considered . In this way the City is free to define the form of use, industrial, transportation, tourism or other, but constrained to allow only uses that require access to the water.
		the need to recognize the importance to public/recreational use and environmental values in the the Working Harbour Area. There is a disconnect between Section 6 and 10 re this - see below
		Urban Place Guidelines Working Harbour - I feel that these guidelines need to recognize the importance of public access, viewpoints and environmental values within the working harbour - in particular the Songhees walkway area and Point Ellis Park - Railyards area. Also restoration potential in Rock Bay when redeveloped. This is captured generally in Section 10.10 to 10.13 in Environmental Management but not evident at all in the Figure 7 guidelines. At the very least public use of foreshore areas within the Working Harbour should be recognized in these guidelines.
	6.24	Policy 6.24 (p. 46) – identifies support of marine air transportation – with no discussion of pollution (noise and emissions)
	p.46	P. 46 – The harbour plan, which is the plan that most affects all harbour residents, is to include a partnership with an non-public organization (GVHA) while not including residents of the harbour
		As stated in a letter dated July 5, 2010, GVHA believes that the OCP needs stronger language to preserve and

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		enhance the working harbour. We would welcome the opportunity to work with you develop that language.
		Include the adjacent uplands as part of the definition of harbour lands
	P. 46, sections 6.24 - 6.25	The notion (see p. 46, sections 6.24 - 6.25) that one should “maintain and update the Harbour Plan in partnership with the Greater Victoria Harbour Authority, senior levels of government, and business and community partners” leaves out residents living adjacent to the harbours, who are the largest group of taxpayers with a major stake in what happens around the harbour. This is fundamentally wrong.
	6.24.3 p. 46	Section 6.24.3 – it is a poor use of the lands adjacent to the Inner Harbour.
	6.25 p.46	Section 6.25 – Greater Victoria Harbour Authority (GVHA) is a landlord, not a harbour authority associated with the federal government. These two definitions should be set out clearly. This clause does not include the residential community, which is a major contributor of taxes.
		the working harbour destination is outdated and confusing it should be marine, industrial etc., mixed use should be invited
	P. 46 - 6.24.1	This limit on residential development should apply to the entire harbour. Residential properties do not require access to the water. Only those uses that require access to the water for their operations should be permitted.
	6.24.2	Section 6.24.2 This is the only place in Section 6 where public recreation is an acknowledged use for the Working Harbour area.
		I especially agree with marine residential and marine industrial uses. Perhaps a study should be done to find the optimum use of marine air Transportation and Mobility which does not negatively impact other harbour traffic and the health of nearby residents.
		Victoria Harbour is NOT a busy congested harbour (which has been asserted). It could be a much more active harbour, with enhanced industrial and recreational uses; however, all uses must become environmentally friendly or neutral.
	6.24.2	Policy 6.24.2 suggests buildings are subservient to float planes. People and residences should determine location of float planes, not the other way around
		I do think that the Victoria waterfront needs to be identified as a one comprehensive planning area covering multiple ownerships
		Live-aboard boats in the harbour are a concern.
	6.24.2 p. 46	Section 6.24.2 – The interests of the residents around the waterfront need to be protected. If float planes takes priority, then the statement in 6.24.2 should be modified. The last study done on the harbour was 10 years ago.
		Plan should NOT be identifying which industries are supported. OCP(and City) has not examined the trade-offs. Cannot deceive residents. Must declare impacts.
		Enjoy endless complaints when people move within sight of a working industry.
		Protect and encourage the working harbour, airport and marine industries while integrating the harbour with the recreational needs of Victorians and visitors.

TRANSIT CORRIDOR PLANNING

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	6.27 p. 46	Reconsider the metrics for LAP studies – 800 metre radius is huge and will need tremendous staff resources.
Transit Corridor	20.22.2	20.22.2 Prepare a local plan focused on the Hillside transit corridor considering opportunities to increase residential

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Planning		<p>densities within walking distance of the corridor.</p> <p>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.</p>
		<p>Transit corridor planning does not refer to the use of streetcars or other rail transit that has been shown to trigger investment in mixed use development. Bus-centric BC Transit may not be keen on this idea, but it works, and streetcars should be considered as part of Victoria’s sustainability and reinvestment strategy.</p>
	6.27, 6.29	<p>Of particular interest are the proposed Centres, Villages and Transportation Corridors that are contiguous with corresponding areas of proposed planning and redevelopment in Saanich. It is expected, for example, that redevelopment plans for Saanich’s Uptown Centres will eventually merge with similar redevelopment plans for Mayfair Town Centre in Victoria, creating a substantial area of planned redevelopment shared between the two municipalities.</p>
		<p>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</p>
		<p>Better identify Rapid transit nodes</p>
		<p>Locate public building along public transit corridors</p>
		<p>Transit planning to have Shelbourne Street as a major transit corridor and more of an urban residential focus along that route; Some designations can be revisited depending on local objectives; some densification areas along Shelbourne Street already.</p>
		<p>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.</p>
		<p>The transit corridor around Safeway as an existing opportunity for a more dense village without encroaching into the neighbourhood.</p>
		<p>Douglas Street Rapid Transit Network – limit driveway access to Douglas Street</p>
		<p>The North Jubilee neighbourhood is surrounded by heavy traffic on Fort Street, Richmond Road and Begbie/Shelbourne with Bay Street intersecting as well. Another traffic generator is the Royal Jubilee Hospital campus with the campus also being a magnet for further density in our area.</p>
		<p>Rapid transit and where the turn-around would be located. BC Transit is engaging in further public consultation before these details are worked through; technology limits the possibilities; Belleville Street is the furthest south they are contemplating.</p>
		<p>Rapid transit as it loops into villages and matching the need for residential density.</p>

PUBLIC FACILITIES, INSTITUTIONS, PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks and Open Spaces		Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks, Recreation and Culture and Open Spaces should not be lumped together! They should have completely different built form, character, density, etc.
	Map 1 Map 8	There is a parcel of land next to Bastion Square that is supposed to be reserved as park space. Please change the map for urban place designations
		Parks, Recreation and Culture generally don't have many buildings, but do rec-centres and the like really need a limited maximum density? Shouldn't these buildings be as dense as possible to save as much space as possible? Why even mention density here? Pure paranoia.
		Strongly agree, but I support relaxing the regulations regarding commerce in park areas so they can host cafes and festivals.
		The once delightful roof-top garden on the Canadian Coast Guard site (adjacent to Dallas Road near Huron Street) was destroyed within the last few years. Tastefully landscaped with rose bushes and benches, it was a special place where pedestrians rested before continuing their sea-front walkabout. Suggestion: That the site be retained as public open space even if need be in its current dilapidated condition. Incidentally, the City gave the developer of the high condominium complex (Huron Street) variances in exchange for public washrooms with showers he was to supply. The washrooms subsequently built at ground level of the building adjacent to the waterfront public parking lot were open to the public initially, but after a short time kept locked and available for exclusive use of residents only (who do not need them because each condominium doubtless has its own). The Harbour Authority subsequently built public washrooms at Fisherman's Wharf adjacent to that parking lot. Consequently, it appears that the Huron development owner's obligation to supply appropriate compensation has yet to be met. Suggestion: That the Coastguard roof-top garden be suitably landscaped at the expense of the owner of the Huron residential complex and retained for public use.
	Objectives	Outdoor venues often discourage the public to enjoy their public space because the event is loud and restrictive to the space. Consider a specific site designed for this use and not our parkland.
		The City needs to define the word park lest questionable statistics mislead citizens into assuming that there are more parks in Victoria than there really are. For example, the Spring, 2011 edition of Contact, the City's PR publication, announces a special event that, "encourages people to create temporary parks and open spaces out of downtown parking spots". This brings to mind the old saying, "making a silk purse out of a sow's ear". A spade is a

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		spade; boulevard trees are boulevard trees they are not a forest; a parking spot is a parking spot not a park.
		Designation is not an issue - lack of facilities is an issue. City's credibility is not good here because it has essentially privatised some facilities that should be public.
	9.13 p. 76	Concerns related to the possible use of school land; retaining these facilities for educational purposes.
	P.s 105 and 106, 15.8 and 15.9	Keeping existing schools and maintaining the population to achieve that goal; would a change in population result in a change in school use?; First priority is to keep children in schools and if this is not possible, looking at alternate purposes for these facilities.

LOCAL AREA PLANNING (MAP2)

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Map 2		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.
	Map 2	Map 2 - it would be more useful if Small Urban Village, Large Urban Village and Town Center areas were distinguished on this map as they each have separate development guidelines
	Map 2	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.
	Map 2	The corridor has taken precedent over the village centres, which isn't consistent with previous direction/work. REFINEMENT: Language needs to change to reflect this.
	Map 2	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.
	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 6.13 P. 44 -	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.
	Map 2 p.43	Section 6 – P. 43 – Map 2 – Local Area Planning Phasing shows Victoria West being in three phases (Phase 2 (mustard); Phase 4 (green) and Phase ? (no colour)). This does not support the holistic and integrated planning noted earlier in the OCP. I judge that most people in Victoria West want the whole community planned at once rather than in a piece meal fashion.
	Map 2 p.43	Section 6 – P. 43 – Map 2 – The schedule for planning in Victoria West indicates it is NOT Phase 1. Assuming a) that a large percentage of the 20,000 people moving to Victoria will reside in Victoria West and b) that a lot of the development to accommodate them will happen in the next five (5) years then I highly recommend that Victoria West

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		be included in Phase 1 planning (i.e. neighbour plan).
	Map 2	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.
	Map 2	Should there be an area specifically added for the harbour/downtown? This had been included in previous plans
	Map 2 P. 43 – Local Area Planning Phasing (Map):	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.
	Map 2	Area north of Bay Street is still Rock Bay.
	Map 2	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'.
	Map 2	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?
	Map 2	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)
	Map 2	Provide OCP growth targets for each “Phase” of local area planning
	Map 2	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

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		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.
	Map 2	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
	Map 2; Plan Types, Scale and 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
	Map 2	Does Map 2 belong in bylaw or implementation strategy
	Map 2	Does this belong in bylaw or implementation strategy?
	Map 2	Priorities on map 2 recognized, but concern expressed about the length of time until later priorities were accomplished.
	Map 2	Phases should not be determined by city planning but by the market forces
	Map 2	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
LAP Plan Scope	Map 2	Developers are more likely to drive the timeline than City Planning department.
	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
	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
	6.21	Add quality of life as an item in policy 6.21, to account for personal well-being
	6.21	Environmental metrics are missing from lists. Walkability is also missing.
	6.21, 6.23	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.
	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, 6.23	The severity of the language is too light. REFINEMENT: e.g. Change “generally consistent” to “should”, “must”, etc.
	6.21, 6.23	Concern about extensive scope diminishing strategic emphasis of LAPs; need to focus on core issues
6.21	List of Plan Scope elements was generally favourably viewed.	

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	6.21	Encourage waste free behavior: wide-spectrum recycling facilities, energy efficiency, water catchment and recycling, composting, and clean home energy production.
	6.21, 6.23	It was recognized that additional elements might be appropriate locally
	6.21, 6.23	General support and specifically liked the standardization / customization balance.

RAIL CORRIDOR

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Rail Corridor		Increase rail service, both local and up-island, in sensible directions and times of the day.
		red herring issue
		Consistent with the lack of visioning that appears within the draft OCP, the potential of the Rail line and surrounding areas has not been fully recognized. Once it has become operational, there should be accommodation for anticipated service requirements of pedestrians and cyclists who will use this route.

MEASURING PROGRESS

Sub-topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Measuring Progress		Measuring progress. Why are these four measures the only ones recommended? Each OCP objective should have a performance measure and target.
	6.31 p. 47	Measuring Progress Policy 6.31 I appreciate these targets and they are a good benchmark for evaluating policies. Given the timeline of the plan and the potential for an increase or decrease in population growth, it is perhaps more accurate to tie City of Victoria growth to the region's growth as the aim is to maintain the Core as the employment centre and growth the residential in the Core. The most realistic targets to compare total regional population growth with Core growth would be that the Core capture 10% of the region's cumulative new dwelling units and the City 20%.
	p.47	OCP is focussed on structure and form. Where are measurable environmental and social impact features Section 6 – P. 47 – Measuring Progress – This section is great and really defines for me what the previous section was saying. I was disappointed that these “Measuring Progress” performance indicators were NOT included in every section of the OCP. I highly recommend that every section of the OCP include “Measuring Progress” performance indicators. I judge this would be an excellent management tool for the OCP.
		Measuring Progress 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.