

---

**From:** Antonio Tsui  
**Sent:** September 3, 2025 12:09 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Amendments to an OCP Bylaw in James Bay

To Mayor, Councillors, and Members of Community:

We are the residents of **42 South Turner St. in James Bay, Thomas Hunt, Antonio Tsui and Sau Tsui.**

We are **100%** against the proposed rezoning that would allow six-storey buildings in our neighbourhood, and we believe the City must first address **infrastructure accountability**.

We had a sewage backup recently at our home. We called a plumber, and the cause was confirmed to be tree roots in the **City's portion** of the sewer line—not ours. We paid **the full amount** for this emergency on a public holiday on August 4th. Public Works came out, cleared the blockage that same day and the following day on August 05, the Public Works confirmed with a camera inspection that the problem was indeed on City property. They even placed that section on their maintenance schedule.

Despite this, the City only reimbursed me **half** of the cost. We contacted Public Works twice by phone and followed up with an email, but after more than a week, I still have no response.

This is frustrating because as residents, we pay **100% of our property taxes and sewer utility fees**—not partial. Yet when the City's infrastructure fails, the City only takes partial responsibility.

That raises a larger concern: if the City is unwilling to fully maintain and take responsibility for existing infrastructure today, how can residents have confidence it will handle **greater demand tomorrow with rezoning and six-storey buildings in James Bay?** More density means more pressure on already aging sewer and stormwater systems. Without proper maintenance and accountability, problems like this will only grow—and they risk becoming **public health issues**.

Rezoning without first upgrading and maintaining infrastructure is putting the cart before the horse. Before moving forward, the City needs to show residents that infrastructure will be properly managed, maintained, and funded.

I urge Council to ensure accountability and infrastructure improvements come first—before adding density that our systems may not be ready to handle.

Thank you for your time!

Antonio Tsui  
Thomas Hunt  
Sau Tsui

---

**From:** Jay Jennings  
**Sent:** September 5, 2025 2:04 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** OCP

Mayor and Council

I am not in favour of the changes to the OCP as proposed. They do not take into consideration 1. the city of Victoria is already the 7th most densely populated in Canada  
2. The proposed blanket zoning will destroy the ambience of many neighborhoods such as Fernwood, Fairfield, Rockland etc. Which over time will result in less sense of community and fewer tourists as parts of the city will become quite unattractive.

More flexibility and public consultation is required.

3. Until governments at all levels realize that they are the biggest single factor in housing unaffordability,( approx. A third of the cost of a new home) housing will remain unaffordable for most.

4. The City have not been transparent about the the actual significant increases in tax to pay for upgrades to infrastructure.

5. The ack of adequate parking requirements will, over time, create hugely congested streets and people will have to park a long way away from their residence.

Jay Jennings

---

**From:** Diane Carpenter  
**Sent:** September 7, 2025 10:20 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** OCP James Bay feedback from a long-term renter

Hello Council,

My name is Diane Carpenter and I have been a resident and renter in James Bay for nearly 30 years in three locations, and 17 years at my current address at 160 Government Street. Like many residents in my building, I am a single, self-supporting 55+ individual who works full time to provide essential services for other Victorians. The rent I pay here is below market and fortunately 'in line' with my relatively low income. I will have no pension beyond the government one, which I understand is the case with many others in our building. All told, most of us get by on modest incomes and have been unable to accumulate much in savings. We are able to be independent and look after ourselves in large part due to the affordability of our residence.

I understand the need to build more housing in Victoria and area; I don't think anyone disputes this. However it is illogical to tear down truly affordable housing to replace it with mainly 'market rate' housing that is unaffordable to current residents. Surely there must be other locations suitable to the needs without removing the very type of housing urgently needed but in very low supply. James Bay has more than it's fair share of density and in order to be equitable, other areas must share the load.

As we know, James Bay is the gateway to virtually all tourism in Victoria. If through upzoning we remove most of the character homes and green spaces, this will erode the experience of visitors. There are constant cabs, pedicabs, horse and carriage, and foot tours moving along the streets surrounding our neighbourhood. If our area resembles a cement subdivision in 'anywhere' USA/Canada', what incentive will people have to return and spread positive word of month?

Please, please slow down this process just a little to enable a reconsideration of the upzoning in our immediate area and the reduction of charm and greenspace; if not for the locals then for our tourists.

Thank you,

Diane Carpenter

---

**From:** Peg Orcherton  
**Sent:** September 9, 2025 2:14 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Official Community Plan

To Mayor and Council,

We are in full opposition to your plan. Our city is changing in so many ways and very little, very little of it is positive change. And done mostly with little input from the citizens- it seems we are living in very autocratic times.

The Plan:

Too much, too fast, too big, too tall.

We are a small city that does not need to be a “BIG” city. We are NOT Manhattan, or some little European country; but your plan is ensuring we will lose our “uniqueness” and become a place for “others” to come here and live. We who live here now, pay the taxes, try to support local business and you are making it so we are being shoved out. The housing being built is all the wrong kind (NOT affordable and not for families). We are losing heritage buildings and even more so under your plan, iconic landmarks, and greenery around the city. Sunlight and privacy are being lost on peoples’ dwellings. Young people starting out are being socially engineered to accept tiny boxes to live in with no outside space ( maybe a balcony) to be in. Where and what we live in affects our mental health and wellbeing. Public parks are not sufficient to fill this gap and there is pressure on greenspaces. Traffic is AWFUL thanks to your current and past initiatives, and I don’t see the likelihood of improvement under this plan. Another mental health issue ( road rage eh?).

We are one City with many unique neighbourhoods. And- that uniqueness is what has made Victoria for decades a unique, wonderful, and diverse city – a city a place where families can live and grow.- a place which until now has been the envy of many. Your plan makes for blah and boring with lots of (ugh) concrete and densification . Climate change anyone?

Too much demolition; not enough preservation.

Development overrides tree protection and threatens canopy growth – again climate change. Taking out mature trees and even planting young saplings 2 for 1 will create a gap in canopy/cooling effects until years after they grow to maturity.

Where is costing, investment and planning? We have old infrastructure that have aged out yet we are adding more onto it. Crazy! I have seen ( and at least a couple of incidences reported on news) sinkholes happening. We have one that has already needed more attention as it gets bigger after repairs, in our neighbourhood.

The Public has a right to be heard. Too often lately autocratic behaviour from the Province and YOU the municipal council is occurring, and our voices are being shut out. Small groups SHOULD NOT be in charge of creating solutions that are then presented as UP FOR DISCUSSION but shhh! We know they really aren’t. this is NOT democratic, transparent, or collaborative in any sense. Public participation in this process was minimal, condensed, groups ( such as Community Associations) were excluded and staff sharing *their* vision of the OCP rather than just presenting information and listening to the residents the offer their thoughts and opinions for staff to take back, consolidate and give to the Council. Residents elected you and expected opportunities to let Council know what they want and how they see the city growing. You virtually put everyone on mute!

In closing we are doing our part to participate in a very unfriendly, not transparent, and collaborative way but rather top-down imposing upon us down here. Get off your high horses and listen to the people who live here and are tired of being ignored, dismissed, and frankly overlooked until the last moment and then, only as a “must do” step on your check list.

Angry, frustrated and 100% opposed to this OCP.

Peg and Steve Orcherton  
2653 Cedar Hill Rd  
Victoria BC V8T 3H1

---

**From:** James Farrow  
**Sent:** September 9, 2025 8:36 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Fw: Public Hearing re:OCP, September 11, 2025

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my opinions and concerns regarding the OCP. I oppose the current iteration of the OCP specifically as it concerns blanket approval of 6-storey construction in most of James Bay, as well as its lack of consideration of heritage architecture. I don't think that heritage is being given the priority it deserves.

I believe that the City of Victoria should delay introduction of this OCP until improvements are made.

I moved from Montreal to Victoria in 1976. Before I moved, I watched as Montreal's heritage architecture was destroyed with little thought to the impact it would have on Montreal's central core. I was impressed, when I moved here, to find the strongest conservation program in the country. I bought my house in James Bay in 1978, and spent many years restoring it to its original character.

I realize that this option is no longer available to the younger generations, given the value of the land on which heritage structures in James Bay sit. But there are options to increasing density while retaining the character that so many people love. Too often, wonderful heritage structures have been replaced by bland buildings of, no architectural merit, that will never be affordable.

I am not opposed to increasing the density of housing in Victoria, but I believe it can be done without destroying the fabric of our city. For example:

1. A comprehensive plan to group higher density buildings in specific areas of James Bay, and of the city in general, would avoid the spot-zoning that occurred in the 1970s.
2. The design of larger structures should not overwhelm the character of surrounding heritage buildings. I would like to point out Capital Park as an example of a development that combines heritage architecture and new construction in a sensitive manner. Michigan Street between Government and Menzies, with good quality modern buildings and both owner-occupied and rental heritage buildings, is now a delightful area of James Bay.
3. During construction of Capital Park, trees were protected and now add greatly to the character of the street.

4. Specific areas of Victoria should be designated as heritage precincts and priority in these areas should be given to maintaining and increasing density within the current housing stock, building in-fill housing sensitively, and perhaps moving at-risk houses into those precincts.

If heritage is given priority in planning, increased density does not need to reduce the livability of heritage neighbourhoods. There is room for development in James Bay, but it needs to be done sensitively.

Yours truly,

Jim Farrow  
James Bay resident

---

**From:** Sustainable Victoria Network <info@sustainablevictorianetwork.ca>  
**Sent:** September 9, 2025 9:27 PM  
**To:** Councillors; Public Hearings  
**Subject:** OCP Submission for Public Hearing  
**Attachments:** OCP submission1.pdf

Dear Mayor and Council,

A group of concerned Victoria residents have formed the Sustainable Victoria Network believing that only by working together can we hope to affect positive change in our community (<https://www.sustainablevictorianetwork.ca/>). Many folks are convinced, contrary to what council says, that the development lobby and special interest groups like Homes for Living and Urban Development Institute have had too much sway over what happens in the city. Towards that goal, we have been canvassing people to find out what issues are of most concern to them regarding the proposed Official Community Plan (OCP). The following 5 issues were presented with a possible solution to each one. Residents were asked to check off each one they were concerned about. This form is on the front page of the website.

The attached table has the names of people who completed the survey and what issues they would like to see addressed. We trust you will block out their e-mail addresses when you add this document to be considered as part of the Public Hearing on September 11. Here are the 5 issues:

1. The population estimates in the document appear inflated. The city claims there will be **142,000** people by the year 2050 but the BC Government estimates the number in the year 2046 to be **118,253**. This is a discrepancy of close to **24,000** people!

**I request the city population estimate match the provincial figure. This reduces density targets set throughout the document.**

2. Less than 2,500 people commented on the city survey out of a population of 93,000. The city's questionnaire also forced people to choose between 4 and 6 story buildings on every lot with no option to refuse either.

**I request Council consult further using a questionnaire that offers true choice. This consultation should be conducted by an independent body, not City staff, and reach a broad cross section of residents.**

3. The existing Missing Middle Housing regulations already allow for a minimum of **6 units on lots throughout Victoria** which provides for a range of housing options. This is sufficient density increase in residential areas to meet our housing requirements.

**I request the draft OCP be modified to only have Missing Middle zoning in residential areas outside of major transportation routes**

4. The draft OCP is not compatible with the city's *Trees Masterplan; Parks Masterplan, BC's 2022 Coroner's Report on Extreme Heat; BC's commitment to the Coastal Douglas-fir zone;* and the Union of BC Municipalities' resolutions on tree canopy and stormwater management.

**I request the following policy change be added to the draft OCP: Victoria signs onto the C40 climate cities recommendation of 40% green infrastructure on each lot which includes grass, shrubs etc. with 15% of each lot dedicated solely to contiguous plantable space.**

5. The draft OCP only provides tenants compensation of (i) 2-6 months' rent (and the 6 months comes only after 20+ years of tenancy!) and (ii) a right to return to the new building at 20% below market rents.

**Council needs to approve the same tenant protections that the City of Burnaby requires: (i) developers cover the difference between current rent and the new rents when they relocate and (ii) a right to a unit in the new building at your old rent.**

More submissions are coming into our e-mail box all the time. There will likely be an additional e-mail on Thursday afternoon for your consideration.

Sustainable Victoria Network  
Info@sustainablevictorianetwork.ca

I request the city population estimate match the provincial figure.	I request Council consult further using a questionnaire that offers true choice.	I request the draft OCP be modified to only have Missing Middle zoning in residential areas outside of major transportation routes	I request Victoria signs onto the C40 climate cities recommendation of 40% green infrastructure on each lot which includes grass, shrubs etc. with 15% of each lot dedicated solely to contiguous plantable space.	Council needs to approve the same tenant protection that the City of Burnaby requires	First name	Last name	Email
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked		Diane	Carson	
Checked	Checked	Checked		Checked	Tom	Carson	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Kathleen	Hadley	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Timothy	Elkin	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Linda	Roberts	
Checked	Checked			Checked	Erik	Peterson	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Christopher	Petter	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Gary	Beyer	
2025-09-08					Linda	Bateman	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Coleen	Hadley	
Checked	Checked		Checked	Checked	Emily	Perkins	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Esther	Callo	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Helen	Boyd	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked		Maureen	McComb	
Checked	Checked		Checked		Michael	Muret	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Gerald	Anderson	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Alison	Trembath	
Checked	Checked		Checked	Checked	Robert	Anderson	
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Rebecca	WoodburnRist	
Checked	Checked	Checked			Aleeta	Galichon	





Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Shannon	McDonald
2025-06-27	Checked		Checked		Raymond	Fischer
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked		Murray	Gudmundson
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Julia	Ford
Checked	Checked		Checked	Checked	nadene	morton
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Unchecked	m	oll
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Deborah	Lepetit
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	C	Acheson
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked		Robert	June
Checked	Checked		Checked		Peg	Orcherton
Checked	Checked	Checked		Checked	Jocelyn	Barr
2025-06-17					Chris	Petter
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Sheena	Bellingham
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked		Patti	Christianson
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Mary	Davies
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Steve	Weatherbe
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Chris	Krywy
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Gordon	Clements
2025-04-17					Joan	Athey
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked		Arthur	McInnis
Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Checked	Kirk	Buhne

---

**From:** Tim Elkin  
**Sent:** September 9, 2025 1:54 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** Victoria OCP

I am writing to express my deep concerns with the proposed changes to the OCP. My name is Timothy Elkin. I am 75 years old. I have lived in Fairfield for 30 years and before that, in Fernwood.

I live at 1907 Shotbolt Rd, V8S 2L1.

I have a PhD in Urban and Regional Planning from the University of Waterloo. I am a retired member of the Royal Town Planning Institute in the UK.

There has been poor and very limited public engagement, yet there is a dramatic, radical change of direction associated with the proposals in the new OCP. The community has been essentially shut out. Meanwhile the proposed changes fit very well with a development-oriented approach, providing opportunities for the development industry. For residents, government reliance on the market means worsening affordability, more tenant displacement, and strained infrastructure. This is essentially a supply-based approach to the problem of housing affordability. There are urban experts who say that simply increasing the supply of housing like this will not improve affordability. Certainly that is my view.

I'm against the proposed Urban Form & Land Use provisions of the OCP. The proposed OCP is a backward step for Fairfield, my neighbourhood. I support increased density in neighbourhoods, but I don't support four- and six-storey buildings everywhere. This universal, simplistic zoning approach to planning is deeply flawed.

Our existing neighbourhood plan will be eliminated. There will not be public hearings for new developments that fit the proposed OCP and the related zoning by-law amendments.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my view.

---

**From:** Ines Piccinino  
**Sent:** September 10, 2025 11:18 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings  
**Subject:** OCP Public Hearing Submission

Good morning,

I'd like to put for consideration the re-evaluation of the Bowker Creek "daylighting". As climate change continues to make our overall temperatures warmer, the problem with mosquitoes carrying diseases will increase. Having open creeks could make it much more difficult to manage insect population. Many cities are already re-considering those types of plans because of global warming.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ines - Oaklands' neighbour