

Public Feedback: Chapter 8 – Placemaking

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Overview	overview text	<p>The one omission in the OCP that surprised me was the lack of recognition that (1) the City of Victoria is located in the traditional territory of the Songhees/Coast Salish First Nations and that (2) the City rests within the context of the rich history of the Coast Salish. I recommend that this be the first p. in the OCP before the introduction in recognition of that Constitutional context.</p> <p>If the City's lawyers have recommended against including a statement of recognition, it is important to underscore that the Douglas Treaties cover this area and simply stating a fact, that this is the traditional territory of an indigenous community, does not change any legal entitlements under the common law or section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1984.</p>
	overview text	The Plan Vision lacks a physical vision for the city. A vision for urban form could be written as the introduction to the Placemaking chapter.
	overview text	A statement is needed to better recognize the significance of Victoria's built form, which people come a long way to see.
	overview text	<p>I support the approach, format and long-term (30 year) approach. I think that the OCP needs to place much more emphasis on design excellence (similar to the City of Toronto's waterfront plan).</p> <p>Victoria's urban design, architecture and landscape architecture combined with its coastal landscape setting is the central, core attraction for residents, visitors, businesses, tourists and investors. It is essential to our city's competitive advantage and quality of life. I don't think that the OCP can over-state the need for building on our past heritage and insisting on excellence in future design: and spelling out how the City of Victoria will achieve this.</p>
	overview text	<p>The 2041 Vision should, in my opinion, reflect Victoria the place: the current 'generic' vision statement is seemingly transferred from the Sustainability Strategy - and to be blunt could apply to any city.</p> <p>If the overall Vision can't be changed, then Section 8 should spell out the OCP's aspirational, specific goals for Victoria as an urban environment – as a place to live, visit, work and invest. In addition, I suggest that this section should be moved forward in the document to become Section 6, both to emphasize its importance and set the stage for 'Land Management and Development' (as an aside - why not the usual 'Land Use and Density'?).</p>
	overview text	Two members felt Section 3: Vision, Values and Goals is uninspired and reads like the vision for any other city. Urban design, heritage conservation and the Vision for City Image policies (p. 62

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		in Placemaking) should be included within the Vision. The Waterfront Toronto Plan was cited as an example that champions design excellence as part of a sustainable development framework.
	overview text	Applaud the statement in Placemaking (p. 60) of broadening Victoria's image beyond a capital city with an iconic inner harbour.
	overview text	We particularly appreciate the way that heritage value is embedded throughout the document, not as a gloss, but as a foundational piece for making planning decisions that relate to the community's heritage values. The City aligns well with provincial policy in this area.
	overview text	Arts and Cultural Plan - discussion on the next steps and timeline of the Arts and Culture Plan, explaining how the details of the broad goals in the OCP will be refined and more detailed strategies on Arts and culture will emerge through this cultural planning process.
	overview text	The Overview jumps around: maybe start with setting, then historical morphology, then the existing urban form and image? You might want to remove reference to the 'iconic' architecture of the Royal BC Museum (given that the current rezoning application would radically change and envelope the existing structure).
	overview text	I think the amount of jargon and editorializing ('beautified', 'softened', 'human scale' 'social vibrancy' 'social arena' etc) could be reduced here. I know what you are saying, but I think it's a bit of a turn-off for many.
	overview text	P. 61, Overview: state who the people are (referring to the statement "These will be the places that matter to people with a diversity of....").
	overview text	The Overview finally makes reference to Victoria being the provincial capital. This fact should receive more prominence in the OCP. Starting each Objective with "That" is unnecessary and weakens the statement.
	Figure 11 and 13	As discussed at the Panel meeting, the 'matrix' established in Figure 11 is confusing – and made even more so by the 'Victoria Thematic Framework' in Figure 13. I would recommend simplifying the former (as suggested at the meeting) and removing the latter.
	Figure 11	I do think that the Victoria waterfront needs to be identified as a one comprehensive planning area covering multiple ownerships.
	Figure 11	The first step to enhancing the waterfront is for the city to take ownership of it. And then, use the land for a public place. I can't think of one City owned waterfront property that is worthy of anything except being a stinking parking lot. Clean it up, expropriate if need be. But take possession of what should be the crown jewel of Victoria.
	Figure 11	Just to repeat what was discussed at the meeting you should make a unique case for the arts in the study. In Figure 11 for example it could be its own Principle. Heritage is covered in 2 of the other points and culture is adequately represented in item number 10.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	Figure 11	It would be helpful to provide an explanation of Figure 11 in document
	p.61, 8 (c) Glossary	the definition of innovative as it relates to new buildings; considering replacing this word with sensitive. Background on why this word was selected; misunderstanding of the terminology; an agreement to use both the words innovative and sensitive.
	8 (c)	Thank you for calling for “innovative responses to existing form and character.” Much better than the imitative variety of contextualism.
	8 (c)	HCA do more than just designation of individual buildings. They provide the backdrop for the interpretation of the area and newer developments cannot overpower the heritage aspects.
	8 (c)	Don't let heritage conservation take away from innovative new architecture and concepts
	8 (h) 8.48	In Fernwood to be specific, there should be more places either the Cornerstone for kids to eat at, especially because our school is so close. I would like to see some local concerts in the summer, or art shows. Getting the community involved is very important.
	8 (g); 8 (h); 8 (l) 8.39 8.47	I think they should get more people doing murals and paintings over graffiti and try and get a better rep for street art. Recently fern wood aloud people to paint all the telephone poles on fernwood road which was really cool, I took part in this activities and it was a great experience to meet local artists.
	8.27 8.47	Fernwood Square is a place for people to come and relax and enjoy the happy energy of the neighbourhood. It gives the area a sense of family. I think every part of Victoria should have a place like this. Cook St. Village is another great example of this. With lots of bakeries and cafes keeping people busy and entertained along with a sense of belonging to the community. Cook St. Village is definitely one of my favourite places to go in Victoria.
	8 (g) 8.27	A good place for a park or court is not near busy streets. No one likes to hear the rumble of traffic when they're playing, or even just lying down in the sun. Not being near busy streets can make it a difficult place to find sometimes, which is where the signs come into play. A nice sign though. A sign that is friendly and inviting. Not just a regular high up, metal, thin sign. That will just blend in with all the others being ignored. Having a big, low, wooden sign would be much more welcoming to the average person passing by, which is where it counts.
	8 (l) 8.48	Victoria as it is right now is very devoid of things for youth to do, it's often described as “A place for the newly wed and nearly dead”. The main points I have thought of to make it better for younger people is to make it not just a monumental town, as it's already seen as, but to make it

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		rather inspiring as well. It may have a lot of history entwined within its architecture and such but is that really the main thing that youth want in their home? There's no sign of a verging future, only dwelling in the past. Not to say that our history isn't important but it seems to me that it's the only thing we flaunt about.
	8 (g); 8 (h); 8 (l) 8.39 8.47	Generally young people don't like it when you make something with a set purpose, like statues of Emily Carr or Captain Cook, what I think would be really good for this town is some sort of monument to dedicate to whatever we please! Like a blank block of smooth rock or something for people to leave a masterpiece on or a little doodle, like a canvas for the masses. That way it has no set future and we can shape and mould it however we want and it would be able to change with the times.
	8 (h); 8 (l) 8.48	The one thing that I would like to see change is the winter. There seems to always be something going on in the summer, be it a festival, market, or celebration. Even if there isn't anything big going on, there will always be something exciting to do. I love the street performers and buskers on Government St. or at the Inner Harbour. Street vendors fill the street with neat things to buy/look at or amazing food and scents. There's no where else I would rather be on a warm summer day than downtown Victoria. The tourism is nice as well, I love knowing that so many people are having the same positive experience as me. The British Culture is very strong in Victoria, which is really played up in the summer for the tourists, be it afternoon tea, or a horse and buggy tour around the city. If it's the aboriginal culture you're looking for as well, you'll find it everywhere. We really take pride in Victoria's history and culture.
	8 (h); 8 (l) 8.48	So what could be done in the winter to make it just as exciting as the summer? Festivals and events downtown, there's nothing better than blocking off Government St. from traffic and filling it with food and entertainment, a little like what happened for Tour de Victoria this past weekend. We should find some sort of a winter festival, like what they do in Quebec. Sure it's not cold enough to build ice hotels or pour maple syrup on snow, but I'm sure that there's something that could attract people. We could play into our history and maybe decorate Government St. up like it would have been 100 years ago. People between the ages of 13 and 24 don't really care what's going on, as long as they have something to do and it's for a good price, if not free. Maybe there should be certain discounts for adolescents just to get them excited and doing something.
	8 (g); 8 (h); 8 (l) 8.48	Victoria is a nice city as it is, especially downtown, I love the atmosphere at the inner harbor in the summer because of the people and activities. I like the look of the cobblestone on Government street and I think that side walks should look like that all over the city. I also like how

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		almost everything in Victoria is within walking distance and it's usually a nice walk because we're not surrounded by big concrete building and there are always really interesting shops and they're always really colorful.
	8 (h) 8.47 8.48	All the neighborhoods should have something like Fernwood square where there are bulletin boards posting all of the activities going on in the area, and should also have a few coffee shops.
	8 (h) p. 71	Another suggestion I have is to create a better atmosphere in our current villages/squares, like the feeling we get at Cook Street Village or Fernwood Square. I believe that having a sense of a close knit community is key to feeling that you live in a safe and respectful neighborhood.
	8 (k)	Not sure I understand how "arts, culture and heritage" can be "integrated in design features in public and private spaces..." Could you explain and give an example?
	8 (l)	"That heritage and cultural values are identified, celebrated and retained thru community engagement." Not sure I understand this one either.
Vision for City Image	8.1	<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 views by means of zonings including street-end vistas -the harbour view at the western end of Fort Street for example.</p>
	8.1	Victoria has too many low buildings downtown, giving it a cramped and crouching feeling. Again, it's about SCALE. I find the downtown core very incoherent, compared to say, the area around the foot of Burrard in Vancouver (cruise ships docking and public waterfront).
	8.2	Growth could be accommodated with better urban design in order to avoid skyscraper look and feel; use of terraces and roof-top gardens.
	8.2	Need to explain 'what a positive contribution to the skyline' entails

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suggest new Section 8.4 – “complete and infill central Victoria’s urban form through development of vacant or underutilized lots”. - as I mentioned when we reviewed the Downtown Plan, I think the density/ height forecasts are based on overly optimistic growth forecasts and border on creating height for height’s sake. - As mentioned at the meeting, I understand the City will develop a more coherent building height policy. You might want to look at the landscape-based height envelopes set for Brisbane and Wellington NZ.
	8.2	What exacting is a “positive contribution to the skyline, or a negative one”? Meaning is unclear, vague.
	8.2	Victoria is such a lovely city. I hope that as it develops it doesn't become too much like Vancouver with buildings that overwhelm the skyline. I love the 'human scale' of this place and believe that it helps foster better communities and happier people! Making it safe for people to travel by bike or by foot will be a worthwhile goal!
	8.2	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!
	8.2	Pointless height limits for dubious and questionable matters of personal taste, and forget about density limits. If a building can look good, provide an important function, forget about the density. Stop using height and density as the most important zoning metrics.
	8.3	I think a brief explanation of development permit areas would be helpful. What are they? How do they work? What are they intended to accomplish? It would be easy to infer, incorrectly, from this sentence that a development permit area can be citywide and that within a development permit area, no development permit is required.
	8.3; 8.7; 8.14	Further, we look forward to the opportunity to review draft Development Permit Area designations and guidelines as they become available should they be considered for application to our properties. At present, our properties are not within a Development Permit Area and therefore we request direct consultation should a DPA designation and specific guidelines be applied to our lands through the OCP.
	8.3	Clarification on the City-wide development area for intensive development; Proposed for multi-unit residential and commercial; work required for a specific definition.
	8.4	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”.
	8.4	Strong interest in protection of unique character of neighbourhoods.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	8.4	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.
	8.4	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.
	8.4	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.
	8.5	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.
	8.5	Downtown does not lack open space. It does lack the essential spatial definition provided by continuous street walls.
	8.5	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.
	8.5	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.
	8.7	Need an historic district/protection or we will become just another city.
	8.7	Heritage conservation areas and an interest in creating a development permit area along Cook Street and Dallas Road.
	8.7	The RNA suggests that the Planning Department of the City would benefit from careful study of

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>the adverse impact of the recent development at 1535-37 Despard Avenue on the ambience of this popular pedestrian route. This is a street which exemplifies the Rockland character. The poorly designed zoning regulation which has been used by developers to maximize building mass on several Rockland area lots reached its extreme urban core appearance in this unfortunate example. The R1-A zoning regulation requires a minimum lot width of 80 feet or 24 metres per lot for a single family dwelling. This width allows for an adequate spacing of residences, space for generous front yard landscaping and on street parking. The 100 foot wide lot in question is now occupied by two detached buildings which are designated by the planning department to be two semi attached living units in <u>a</u> building. Although the lot is not subdivided, the actual result is two buildings each of which is on a 50 foot lot rather than the required 80 foot wide lot. As several other 100 foot wide lots are found along Despard Avenue, there is a real potential for the nature of the street to be irreparably destroyed by additional closely spaced developments of this type. In other words, Despard could become a street of double the number of dwellings as was originally planned for. The development referred to has installed two wide, paved vehicular forecourts on what is one lot instead of the typically single driveway access to existing lots. This reduces front yard planting areas, street parking possibilities and the number of boulevard trees.</p> <p>We acknowledge the creation of development permit areas to provide design control for such semi-attached and attached dwellings but we question whether these provisions will adequately preserve the Rockland character and, in fact, if such a zoning use is appropriate for the Rockland neighbourhood. We reiterate our position, in accordance with the Rockland Plan 1987, that the best protection for the neighbourhood is a blanket development permit area requirement for all development in Rockland.</p>
	8.8	Concern about scale of buildings on Blanshard and closer to DT core – worried about shadowing impacts on existing buildings.
	8.9	In 1965 there was an attempt to design higher buildings on the higher points of land. When this happened, there was a down zoning process to respond to the community outrage. I am happy that the Rockland crest has many more trees in the yards of existing homes and I can see the castle from many vantage points in Beacon Hill Park and my home instead of modern highrises. I think the idea of higher buildings on higher land is an antiquated idea. Keep human scale in our future.
	8.10	<p>More use of maps and diagrams would help clarify what is being said - e.g. 8.10</p> <p>Map 7 (Heritage) was not included – could this have more relevance / usefulness than simply ‘red flagging’ everything within a 90m radius?</p>

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	8.11	8.11: "Protect views of distant vistas,...". Does this imply that we will no longer see developments similar to the one at MOSS ROCK? Allowing this development has ruined the geographical landmark of Moss Rock.
	p. 62	P. 62 wording of item 8.2 – "design tall buildings" or <i>tall buildings should be designed</i>
	p. 62	P. 62 "Vision for City Image" under Villages and Nodes implies that designating development permit areas will "encourage unique character and sense of place." Good design is not guaranteed (and is often hobbled) by these regulatory hoops. This row should reference the need to maintain human scale, provide pedestrian and cyclist linkages to surrounding areas, and mandate creation of places for human interaction (parks, squares, etc.) in the villages.
	p. 62	P. 62, Buildings and sites, should add an item that says "Recognize the need for design and construction of attached housing that affords residents privacy and quiet enjoyment of their homes."
	p. 62	P. 62, Natural features and green spaces, should add (a) reinforce Victoria's image as the City of Gardens, (b) protect trees and other notable vegetation, and (c) plant and maintain street trees.
	8.8, 8.23	8.8: "Locate the City's tallest buildings in the area,....." AND, 8.23: "Design the tallest buildings,...." What about a plan that includes a footprint that MAXIMIZES THE GREENSPACE AROUND TALL BUILDINGS? This softens the impact of the building's size, promotes greenscape and decreases the psychological oppression of this type of building.
	p. 62; p. 64	Section 8 There should be stronger wording around protection and enhancement of natural features throughout the placemaking section. Perhaps the urban design element of Natural Features and Green Spaces could be expanded to Natural Features, Green and Blue spaces to more adequately address the aquatic and marine features throughout this section. Suggested wording under specific placemaking principles could include: o Vision - Identify, protect, enhance and conserve natural features, heritage and significant trees, creeks and aquatic/riparian habitat o Connectivity – add "improve wildlife corridors and greenways to connect large and small patches of habitat (i.e. parks or riparian areas along creeks, urban forest in boulevards)to allow urban wildlife movement"
Response to Context	8.12-8.13	"Old Town" and "Chinatown" are noted in policies 8.12 and 8.13 but are not identified on maps.
	8.12; 18.13	Policies within Response to Context, Neighbourhoods and Districts element (p. 63) are specific to Old Town and Chinatown, but not other areas of the City.
	8.12	

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>* The vitality and importance of Victoria Harbour is either noted or implied at least a half dozen times in the earlier sections of the OCP. Ironically, in doing so, each time it is grouped with other worthy attributes of the City's character.</p> <p>* Neither noted or indirectly acknowledged are the facts that</p> <p>a) the Harbour is the very reason that the City is situated where it is; and</p> <p>b) of the many varied attributes that make the city what it is, the Harbour (and the remaining upland meadows) are the only ones that are not man-made.</p>
	8.12	In fact Victoria is characterized by among other things, a vital and diverse multi-area harbour. Why is the noted assertion confined to the Inner Harbour?
	8.12	<p>The harbour is important and hopefully, the height restrictions around it will not change to higher.</p> <p>p. 98 the neighbourhoods matter as ambience, so everything that applies to the core area also does to the Traditional Neighbourhoods. There are important landmarks there like Ross Bay Villa, Trutch House etc.</p> <p>There should be some evaluations on the heritage values given and lost in rehabilitation of buildings.</p>
	8.13	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.
	8.13	Policy 8.13 – “Maintain the special characteristics of Old Town and Chinatown along the waterfront in the Historic Core designation through lower-scale building forms.” Which special characteristics? What sort of building form? What about materials used, etc? Where and how are these items being addressed and defined?
	8.14	<p>8.14: "Support new infill development and property additions....."</p> <p>Does this mean that developments like those on Despard and Irving will not be allowed in future? Blasting the rock to sidewalk level (Irving) and bulldozing all the trees and altering the grade (Despard) is definitely NOT SENSITIVE.</p> <p>THERE ARE NO DESIGN LIMITATIONS IN PLACE FOR "REGULAR HOUSING" DEVELOPMENT (non-infill and additions) IN THE PRESENT PLAN!</p>
	8.14 – 18.15	Comments and discussion also included asking the City to consider the character of this neighbourhood – once it's destroyed with densification, you can't get it back. Try to keep options

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		open for potential homeowners by saving the greenspace and light. 20.22.3 can be stated better.
	8.14	The Cook Street Village was devastated by Castana. We lost heritage on Sutlej 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.
	8.15	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.
Human Scale	8.16	Try to encourage underground power lines in order to give trees priority on streets (as opposed to pruning and felling tall trees - think of Lansdowne St. in Oak Bay as opposed to Carlisle Ave. in Esquimalt).
	8.16	Put overhead wiring underground, where feasible.
	8.18-8.19	Kudos for spelling out how important it is for streets to be well defined by enclosure and by building heights proportionate to street width.
	8.18	Wording of policy 8.18 needs work regarding "formally planted trees". Not sure what is meant by "formal" – regular spacing, unity through landscaping?
	8.19	Policy 8.19 may need exclusions or another policy for special situations (historic James Bay streets cited as an example with different building height ratios proportionate to street width).
	8.21	Policy 8.21 seems specific (re: extending Government Street mall northwards) while the preceding policies under the human scale principle are general (policies 8.18 through 8.20)
	8.21	Support for Policy 8.21 "Extend the Government St mall northwards to Pembroke St..." particularly with respects to plans to develop Douglas St as a primary transit corridor. As Douglas St becomes less amiable to pedestrians, Government St should become more so.
	8.21	The Government Street mall and including the word evolve along with the word extend as it relates to this mall; evolving the space in the context of increased privatization of public space.
	8.24	8.24 – We note here that, though we agree that parking should not "dominate development or streetscapes," , underground parking is exceptionally expensive to provide, driveways leading to the back of a building take up space without adding to the streetscape, etc..

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	8.24	Kudos again for taking parking out of the public realm.
	p. 63	The 'Human Scale' section moves from global statements to specific directives (8.21) Any thought of improving pedestrian amenity by encouraging weather shelter e.g. verandahs / canopies – other than passing mention in 8.27? Perhaps specific mention of clean, safe, well-lit and well maintained sidewalks, crosswalks and public open spaces?
	p. 63	Under 'Response to Context' - no mention of landscape context, respecting heritage? No mention of signs? I think this doesn't explain what context is or how to respond to it – this is a key urban design issue and needs more work. Are you familiar with 'Responsive Environments' (new edition might be out) and discussion on 'grain' articulation' permeability' (not that I want to encourage more jargon)...
	p.63	P. 63, Corridors, should add "Encourage pedestrian and cycling access to and through villages and nodes, separated from motor vehicles whenever feasible."
	p. 63	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.
Connectivity	8.25 – 8.33	The design of corridors as it relates to a complete streets notion; a 'complete street' approach to transit.
	8.27	Connectivity related to inadequate sidewalk space in the Belleville / Laurel Point Inn neighbourhood.
	8.27	I would like to see a safer set of corridors for kids to pass from Vic West Elementary School to Banfield Park and the Community Centre.
	8.27	I would be very happy with lighting regulations. In my neighbourhood one apartment has seven incisive outdoor lights to protect car parking and entrance pathways.
	8.27	As an aging person, I would like to see more public toilets in Vic West along West Songhees Walkway.
	8.28	Consider inclusion of a box to explain "bicycle tracks"
	8.29	I think we all agree that the Harbour Pathway is a worthy goal. What I don't understand is how it will ever be implemented, given all the multiple owners of harbour front land. Does the City have a strategy for this? On a related issue, the City needs to develop a harbour plan as detailed and comprehensive as the new Downtown Plan. Perhaps the City shies away from this because of all the overlapping federal, provincial and municipal jurisdictions that govern the harbour. But if

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		the City is going to claim the harbour as a major public space, then the City has the primary responsibility for planning its future in a way that serves the interests of all its citizens, not just the tourism industry and other business interests.
	8.29	Not entirely clear what "way finding measures" are. You should clarify with an example. Also, I have never heard of the "Victoria Harbour Pathway": need to promote this (or give it a more appealing name...)
	8.30	Policy 8.30 re: greenway identity is a good idea. It should not just be for cyclists.
	8.32	Replace "neighbourhood" to "local area" boundaries.
	8.32	Sensitive areas like the Southeast woods and the wetlands of Beacon Hill Park are perceived as negative spaces. Do not develop because people can be educated that these are wonderful and rare places to enjoy. Also, make village designs take questions from the neighbourhood they are in. Unlike Castana!
	8.33	Why not state: 'the City of Victoria will develop a way-finding and directional signage system' if there isn't one already?
	p. 64	Complete streets concept: remove barriers in the pedestrian realm; improve the visibility of wayfinding etc.
	p. 64	I STRONGLY support James' recommendation that the City take a lead role in developing a harbor / waterfront plan as detailed and comprehensive as the new Downtown Plan. This is a huge gap in the document.
	p.64	P. 64, Natural features and green spaces, should add "Ensure green spaces and greenways are actually green, by planting and maintaining trees and other vegetation."
	p. 64	Emphasizing connectivity by bike travel through villages.
Beautification of the Public Realm	8.34	P. 65, item 8.34.2 "Sustainable site design that is attractive." I have no idea what this means.
Beautification of the Public Realm	8.34 – 8.42	Yes, with better landscape planning, the local Parks, Recreation and Culture won't look like pretty little sudden islands with mysterious entry points! Make the urban walk seem continuous and contiguous!
Beautification of the Public Realm	8.35	Regarding lighting: avoid any more "Victorian" lamp standards. Restrict them to the tourist zone. Develop a new style for outlying areas.
Beautification of the Public Realm	8.39	Public places should appeal to all, not just a small eager group of artists. If any art is displayed in a public place, it should be temporary so that we are not stuck with art that appeals to some. Lease/rent the space and circulate the artwork so tax payers are not stuck. I do not appreciate being told that I'm uneducated in art if I do not want it. It's like a designer telling you to like the way they decorated your home because they are a professional but you do not like it or feel comfortable with it.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
	p. 8.39	need public input into public art – eg. Save on Foods Memorial Arena sculpture
	8.42	How does policy 8.42 (re: maintain horticultural plantings) create place? The policy is too prescriptive.
	8.42	Policy 8.42 re: horticultural plantings should not be an overarching goal and the natural environment should be thought of as beautiful. Disagree with the above statement as Victoria is a city of gardens and exotics are characteristic of Victoria.
	8.42	For horticultural features, encourage aesthetic native and edible plants, and especially community gardens.
	8.42	Consider using softer more naturalistic and native plantings in roundabouts, medians, etc to provide a continuity and extension to the surrounding native landscape. They do this very well in the town of Bend, Oregon AND they incorporate (in roundabouts for example) large sculpture within it. So...integrate landscaping with public art/sculpture. In Berlin, Germany the medians are planted with tall grass, softening the hard cityscape and making it feel very relaxing!
	8.43	Policy 8.43 re: horticultural plantings is located in the element “Natural Features and Green Spaces”. Consider adding natural plantings in addition to horticulture. Consider the addition of “landscaping” as element of urban design.
	8.43	Natural Features should mean Native Ecosystems that do not require seasonal plantings. In Beacon Hill Park we have wetlands, old growth forest, Garry oak parkland and herbaceous meadows. These should be maintained as a legacy of our native landscape and support towards Climate Change policy.
	p. 65	“Beautification” may not be the appropriate name re: Beautification of the Public Realm principle
	p. 65	Does beauty = plants (on p. 65)? Needs work in how it guides treatment of landscape.
	p. 65	Consider an indigenous and adaptive plantings policy for public land. The City is a leader, so it should lead in sustainability. The planted boulevards and medians throughout neighbourhoods, while very artistic, have high maintenance costs.
	p. 65	Sorry, I think the word ‘beautification’ tends to trivialize urban design...Perhaps this is the best place to talk about much higher standards for public and private signage and lighting? I think the word ‘horticultural’ might be redundant?
	p. 65-66	In the Beautification section public art comes after street lighting. I think something as important as public art, which encourages outdoor activities and healthy lifestyles deserves more emphasis. In addition in the Animation section it should be pointed out how public art can help communities celebrate diversity and promote cultural understanding.
	8.44	Expand consideration of through-block pedestrian passageways to other areas – not only

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Animation of the Public Realm		Downtown.
	8.44	P. 66, Corridors, item 8.44 should add "...and seek such pedestrian- and cycle-only links to and through villages and other nodes."
	8.44	The public realm as it relates to through-block passageways and protecting public space.
	8.45	I would like to see varied and vibrant street markets on Broad Street and other places without good visibility.
	8.47	Memorial benches a good way to fund outdoor seating.
	8.48	The OCP should focus more on day-to-day living rather than celebrations. Spirit Square is dead - only manufactured life when City wants to spend some money. It is dead because there is no reason for anyone to head to a square surrounded by government buildings with no retail or commerce.
	8.48	We need a public market, pref. Downtown, permanent.
	8.48	Need to increase more harbour front usage which might include a performing stage area, play area, outdoor public gym, public gardens, increase the length of walking paths & bike paths and creating specific allocations for buskers and street vendors that will increase tourism.
	8.48	The Inner Harbour should be more public. Prime real estate should not be a parking lot. Compare with other cities - Wellington, Chicago, Copenhagen.
	8.48	OCP places too much emphasis on celebrations. Need more on day-to-day living needs for outdoor and public space access/use.
	8.48	Create a festival site with all the amenities to support these types of activities - but not in Parks, Recreation and Culture. The Parks, Recreation and Culture should be areas that quiet, nature loving people can count on. This is the one public area that should be the recreation center for those who don't like to party, make noise, complete, etc.
	8.50-8.51	Develop more community gardens. More public markets (i.e. Farmer's markets) that are less regulated, and have more affordable table rentals.
	p. 66	Consider switching the arts and culture in Placemaking and Parks, Recreation and Culture, i.e. arts and culture in public realm and cultural spaces to trade sections.
p. 66	Re. placemaking, we need to not only encourage and support efforts at placemaking, but also remove relevant bureaucratic impediments to the same (the example of the challenges faced by Fernwood NRG in their Mandela project is a good one). A clear process for temporary street closures for this kind of community building project should be put in place.	
Heritage Values	8.52 – 8.56	The first four of these questions are very abstract.
	p. 67-71	Heritage sections seem complete – no gaps identified
	p. 67-71	I suggest that this section and urban design sections need to be better integrated and work together. This Section is very precise, technical and specific, in contrast to the wording of the rest

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
Heritage Conservation		of Section 8. I think the two could be improved with some word-smithing by an outside 'editor'.
	P. 68, Thematic Framework	I think that we're missing the opportunity to promote our green initiatives. I'd love to see a bubble added titled "Sustainability Capital of BC", identifying our good work on sustainability, including food security by City Hall and community orgs and members, and restaurants focus on local produce.
	8.58.6	We need more HCA as neighbourhoods are being disassembled and rebuilt in an unrecognizable nature. There are several streetscapes that have been ruined by odd building out of place.
	8.58.2; 8.59	Also, Rockland has the largest number of heritage buildings on Vancouver Island, yet there is very little recognition of this. Apart from past awards for two large restorations, annual awards seldom include any Rockland projects. A specific heritage policy must be created for Rockland. This would motivate residents to protect Victoria's mansions by adding them to the heritage register. With owner consent, many could be designated and thus be eligible for funding from the Victoria Heritage Foundation. Areas of significant heritage buildings should be classified as Heritage Conservation Areas.
	8.62	Policy 8.62 – "Continue to support site-specific development that conserves the heritage values of a heritage resource, or resources as consistent with the National Standards..." How is this different than what is already in place? Where is a distinction being made between restoration and rehabilitation? At what point in the development process will this decision be made and by whom?
	8.66	The word "facadism" in policy 8.66 (p. 70) should be clarified.
	8.66	Policy 8.66 is confusing in terms of its intent. The way it is written it discourages adaptive reuse and rehabilitation.
	8.67	Our native landscape gives a "sense of place" as we live in this special Garry oak ecosystem, old growth coastal fir forest and wetland. We need to protect it and encourage to expand it with native plantings and removal of invasive species.
	8.67	Native landscapes must be a heritage asset...not just buildings and structures. Our city has some significant and small parcels of land that have heritage value and the public can be educated on its importance in relation to Climate Change as well. Designate these landscapes as heritage and protect them from development.
8.67	The Academy grounds with ancient trees and unique heritage-type orchard close to downtown is the responsibility of the Provincial Capital Commission. The goal to make them a public park was well supported during the campaign to prevent the academy from becoming a mini-shopping mall with paid admission gardens.	

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		<p>Suggestion: Secure the grounds for future generations by making them a special, historic public park.</p>
	8.67	<p>Honour the two B.C. Supreme Court rulings (Justice Matthew Begbie and Justice Dean Wilson). The latter was made in response to the mayor and council seeking a legal decision whether a folk roots music festival in Beacon Hill Park would be legal. The answer was negative. "Beacon Hill Park is not for profit or utility "; it was conveyed to the City of Victoria in trust. Consider applying the same edict to all Victoria parks -no banners or amplification disturbing the peaceful park environment. Remove the fence surrounding the, "zoo" and return the space used by the children's farm to bonafide park. Demolish or relocate the police bam elsewhere -no more buildings or hard top! Relocate the parks' maintenance yard to a location outside the Park.</p> <p>The checkers' pavilion blocks the panoramic sweep of the Juan de Fuca Strait with its scenic mountain range on the horizon that extends from the far east to the far west so far as the eyes can see. During the park's early days that superb vista could be seen in its entirety from the summit of Beacon Hill. The view is special and ought to be visible in its entirety still, not obstructed mid-centre. Now boarded up to keep people out, proposals for different uses of the checker's pavilion are made from time to time notwithstanding past infamies such as slurs painted on woodwork, graffiti, urinal use, etc.</p> <p>Suggestions: Demolish or move the pavilion to another location outside Beacon Hill Park. Remove the over-size, self-naming letters advertised on the roof of the lawn bowling club and the surrounding fence. Transfer the members of that private club to the Canadian Pacific Lawn Bowling Club (720 Belleville Street) and return those vacated greens to bonafide park for use of the public at large without membership fees. Although supposed to be available to the public at large, the cricket clubhouse is always locked except when in use by members (who pay fees). That building was enlarged as a result of an arsonist who burned down the original, a situation that could occur again because there are no details posted (name of contacts, phone number, etc.), necessary to enable speedy response to emergencies).</p> <p>Make BHP vehicle-free and close the roads. The vehicles and heavy equipment driven from Park Boulevard to the parks' maintenance yard pose a danger to children who cross the driveway from the playground to reach the toilets. They are also inappropriate and unattractive in a park setting and should be driven in (if allowed at all, since they are clearly utilitarian) via the Cook Street entrance. Better still, relocate the park's maintenance yard to a location outside BHP and return</p>

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		the then vacant space to bonafide park, its intended use.
	p.69	In relation to Urban Form on p. 69 and maintaining areas of value, such as Lower Cook Street and Dallas Road and secure these areas under placemaking; Heritage and conservation areas and tools that can be used with justification.
	p. 69 - 70	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
Arts, Culture and Heritage	8.69	Art is in the beholder and raises negative responses from tax payers if driven by a committee. Return to "the city of gardens" as it is non-confrontational and adds beauty to the city and cools the air and softens the environment. There are rare murals and art installations that unit the city residents.
	8.69	Avoid plaques. Murals are OK, large scale installations better: something that instantly engages the viewer. Also, please do not use cairns! Arrggghh....
Community Cultural Development	8.71	Specifically the arts community. We need to make sure that the community plan nurtures the need for those old chinatown funky spaces and lower cost venues and such to remain intact. Artists need room to create, room to rehearse, facilities to get their work off the ground. As the city becomes more gentrified, we need to maintain places that do not cost a small fortune. Also provide support for performance and art related venues so the creative community has places to thrive. There is an incredible wealth of artistic talent here on many fronts, and Victoria needs to recognize what an impact the creative community has on the vibrancy of the city!
	8.72	Natives are people, as we are all people. There are many types of cultural contributions which make up Victoria. We do not need separate or special programs for some residents/citizens.
	p. 71	Create and foster opportunities for people to lead in placemaking activities so the sense of place comes from the grassroots, not just from the "official" plan.
	p. 71	Placemaking from a regulatory role but also providing opportunities for neighbourhood events; focused community events and an appropriate application process.
General – Other		Two members felt the Placemaking chapter should be moved towards the front of the document.
		Support urban design and heritage conservation as overarching principles of the document.
		In Figure 7: Urban Place Guidelines (Section 6: Land Management and Development), the difference between "place character features" and "built form" is not apparent.

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		There is no budget or financial source identified for Placemaking.
		Section 8 – P. 71 – No “Measuring Progress” performance indicators. I highly recommend “Measuring Progress” performance indicators be included in each section.
		The city of Victoria is unique. It has many UNIQUE NEIGHBOURHOODS and we need to embrace and cultivate their difference instead of trying to make them homogenous.
		The arts are one of the primary means of public dialogue in a community. They contribute to learning and health and affect positive change. This change can help a community become more cohesive.
		In the Urban Design Elements section I’d like to see that public amenities like museums, libraries, archives, universities and public galleries receive strong encouragement. They are sites of public discourse and dialogue and are particularly important centres for learning. Public spaces are sites that promote community participation and mobilization.
		This section provides an important context and reinforces the sense of pride and interest citizens have in the ‘place’. It is vital to reinforce design for all ages and stages of citizens, and the diversity of needs this implies.
		‘Placemaking’ seems to me to be an unusual title for this Section – perhaps ‘Urban Design’ (in its broad sense) is more appropriate.
		No green/sustainable measure noted in Section 8.
		The Placemaking matrix (Figure 11 on p. 61) and chapter organization are complicated and repetitive. Collapse the matrix by reducing to 3 or 4 urban design elements to make it more readable. Consider reversing the matrix and chapter organization to lead with urban design elements as subjects, rather than placemaking principles, to reduce redundancy.
		Rethink the definition of “vibrancy”
		Connect landscaping (gardening in particular) to community identify (“City of Gardens”) and cross reference landscaping policies to Food Systems.
		Not enough emphasis on Victoria as a green city.
		Section 8, Placemaking – We agreed whole-heartedly that Victoria is a “special place.”
		Placemaking section not accessible – may be wording or sentence structure.
		Specific policies easier to understand over general policies

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		Cultural and natural heritage not evident in the policies, i.e. creeks, watersheds, trees on hilltops. Natural heritage does not shine through
		Had to read the chapter a number of times – complicated language
		The ideas discussed at the previous workshop in November are evident, but also see jargon
		Depth of history important to placemaking. Need knowledge of history in looking ahead to placemaking.
		Coordination of urban design/placemaking across City departments is needed
		Each matrix should be subtitled: “Principle 1: Vision for City Image”, “Principle 2: Response to Context”, etc
		Inner Harbour should be included as an urban design element given its prominence and importance.
		Urban forest connectivity is not mentioned in Placemaking section (it was noted that other chapters cover this topic).
		Support heritage values being embedded throughout document.
		Hope that the Placemaking policies are used and don't get lost in place of DPAs and regulation.
		First Nations' heritage and values is a gap: should be recognized through OCP, and central to Placemaking, e.g. conservation of values associated with landscapes.
		Sometimes it's important for the City to get out of the way and let communities lead Placemaking.
		The notion of Victoria as a Capital City and the many significant facilities in Victoria in the thread of the tapestry of community.
		<p>There is continued encouragement for new buildings on historic sites (p. 61- 8c; p 63- 6.15 and elsewhere). I understand that sometimes there may be need for something new or there may be economic need. (This last is not supposed to be taken into account by Council but rather the effect of the building.) The effect of this encouragement is to make the developers think that they have a right to build what they want to on a heritage site.</p> <p>Yes, there may be some changes but the OCP also gives allowance for the landmark buildings and open spaces, later named as Legislature and the Empress, to be fully respected (p. 36 Public Facilities, Institutions, Parks and Open Space).</p> <p>There are other landmark buildings, e.g. Mount St. Angela, St. Ann's Academy, as very significant which deserve equal respect. There are some sites which should not have new buildings, especially large ones competing with the original. and possibly the building process affecting that physically. (The tower behind St. Andrew's Cathedral caused damaged to the older structure, still to be seen.)</p>

Sub-Topic	Plan Reference	Feedback
		We note with interest the development of Development Permit Areas and Heritage Conservation Areas to regulate form and character in ways that acknowledge community values.
		What makes a great place? Safe People are happy Solitude Lots of people Natural areas Great views Different activities to do Exercise Untouched place
		I have a sore shoulder and can't continue survey (computer/mouse hurts arm) but great job on this section, keep arts and culture and neighbourhood connectivity alive, vibrant and supported!!! A big priority for a creative, safe, vibrant city that is fun to live in and thrives both economically and socially!!!
		Role and identity of Victoria as capital city is a gap: really need emphasize in city image and policy direction.
		Integrate sust goals / framework into thematic framework – things such as food security / ghg emissions
		know it's a provincial matter, but protection of archaeology needs much more emphasis. Environmental retrofitting of heritage buildings, where feasible, is also a great thing.