

### Attachment 3: Summary of Feedback and Revisions to Draft Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan (January 2018)

The following table presents a summary of feedback received from the community and Council, and describes any corresponding changes made to the revised version of the plan (Proposed Plan, January 2018). Comments and proposed revisions are grouped in the following order:

General Comments

Introduction

Transportation – General

Transportation – Specific Locations

Trails and Pathways

Parking

Parks

Urban Forest

Gorge and Harbour

Environmental Quality

Future Land Use Map

Future population growth/density – general

Amenities in new development – general

Noise – general

Traditional Residential Areas

Urban Residential Areas

Special Planning and Master Planned Areas

Urban Villages

Employment Lands

Heritage

Infrastructure and Green Buildings

Neighbourhood Food Systems

Neighbourhood Well-Being

Arts, Culture and Placemaking

Action Plan

General/Other Comments

Comments	Proposed Revisions & Rationale
<b>General comments</b>	
Refer to Roundhouse, Bayview consistently throughout	Changes made
Review for consistency: 2.5 storeys vs 2 ½, metres vs m , Catherine at Edward Street Village	Changes made
Lime Point refers to the area east of Lime Bay, not west of Lime Bay	Change all references to “South of Esquimalt Road”, from “Lime Point Area”
Change cover to “proposed Plan”	Changes made
Refer to “Lekwungen People” when referencing earlier Aboriginal use and occupation The historic Songhees Village is a major part of our history - anything to honour that would be good	Revisit references, history in plan and revise to give more prominence, recognition.
Refer plan to Township of Esquimalt	Revised draft plan to be formally referred to Esquimalt, with invitation to meet, once community feedback is incorporated. No text changes recommended.
Add titles and preamble to maps to make them more clear	Revised titles of maps to make them more prominent Added preambles to Land Use Map and other urban place designation maps to better explain the intent.

Numbering is challenging to follow. Consider consistent numbering between goals and sections and action plan in order to see which sections are related.	Goals refer to more than one policy; no change to numbering recommended. Add policy cross-reference to Action Plan
Ensure goals in introduction match goals in individual chapters	Revised
Clearly indicate desired amenities and relative priority for Vic West	(NEW) Add new Neighbourhood Amenities and Improvements (Chapter 15)
Order of land use chapters could be re-organized to help with user-friendliness	Re-order chapters and add overview to Future Land Use section to help with navigation.
Concern that there is a mismatch between what we heard in early engagement and what the plan addresses	General comment.
<b>Introduction</b>	
More description of the history of the neighbourhood and its role in the development of the city and the placemaking in Vic West. Exceptional natural (and cultural) heritage, overall, needs to be better identified	Revise pages 13, 19, 20, history timeline, Chapter 10 (Heritage)
Acknowledge and include the role of Core Songhees and master planned areas in neighbourhood plan, and the theme of knitting the areas together. Add more detail about the vision for each area, and major elements Important for reader to understand full picture of future development Integrate master planned area features into individual chapter topics (transportation, parks, etc) Update Big Moves map to better integrate master planned areas	(NEW) Update Big Moves map to better integrate master planned/ Songhees area. Revise Big Moves to add a new move- Knit together the old and new (p. 9) Add additional content to Master Planned Areas (p.87) and images throughout plan.
Provide overall neighbourhood targets to be achieved, such as number of added residential units; overall population; number of added commercial and industrial units; etc.  Add targets for other goals in neighbourhood plan.	No change recommended. Population projections, and actual number of additional residential, commercial and industrial units depend on many variables and are difficult to predict accurately.  Other targets monitored at City-wide level rather than neighbourhood level. No further changes recommended.
Add more First Nations history and context Review language used in heritage timeline to communicate history of First Nations people in Vic West (especially with respect to Songhees Reserve) Add more neighbourhood historical features to timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise heritage timeline (p. 222-23) to add more points in time and emphasise pre-European settlement history</li> <li>• Reviewed language used</li> <li>• Heritage timeline remains brief for overall readability</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation - General</b>	
Add map summarizing all active transportation improvements	(NEW) Add new Map 4 to summarize transportation improvements
Add Transit Map	(NEW) Add transit network map in Section 3.11
Goals missing from Transportation section.	Revise to match with goals in introduction.
Make it more clear that plan encourages development that supports a range of transit options	(NEW) Add sub-section 3.11 to encourage development (housing, commercial uses) that support a range of transit options. (NEW) Add goal to transportation section: Connect Vic West to the rest of the city and region by transit, rail and water. Create additional opportunities for housing to be located near frequent transit routes

Photo of bus on p. 27 poor quality	To be replaced in final document
For busy roads, desire for stronger language for transportation improvements, rather than “encourage”, “consider”, since many improvements have been suggested in past Make taming major roads a more central goal Reduce speeds to 30 km h on all major roads	Many of these improvements will be achieved through redevelopment, so difficult to assign a timeline. Added cross-referencing to Map 4 to refer to specific actions/ initiatives on major roads. 30 km/h speed limits have been considered in past; would increase risk of congestion and have impacts on adjacent streets. No further changes recommended.
Need more covered and secure bike lock up areas	No change recommended Locations to be explored through individual developments, street improvements and park improvement planning.
Concern regarding E&N Rail going to the new bridge	No change recommended The Plan reflects current City policy regarding assessing the re-establishment of E&N train service, and maintenance of corridor for transportation purposes (see 3.11.3)
Coordinate bike routes with Esquimalt (e.g. off-Esquimalt Rd route, to Tillicum)	Revised Map 3: Neighbourhood Active Transportation Network to show continuation of routes into Esquimalt on map Revised plan will be referred to Township of Esquimalt for review.
Include more north-south and east-west AAA facilities.	No change recommended All Ages and Abilities network determined at City-wide level. Local streets to be improved over time.
Facilitate walking and cycling between Vic West Elementary and residents in Esquimalt around Esquimalt High.	No change recommended Plan identifies several initiatives to improve walking/cycling, including connections between Esquimalt and Vic West: Pine Street, E&N improvements, intersection of Hereward St and Wilson Street.
Traffic slow down/calming is needed for Craigflower, Wilson, Hereward, and Catherine. Many drivers drive twice the speed limit on these streets.	No change recommended Plan identifies locations to be assessed for safety/comfort on each of these corridors (see summary Map Several initiatives to slow down traffic identified for Craigflower Village through urban design, on-street parking (7.1, 7.2)
Add Roundhouse as key destination	Revise Map 3 to add Roundhouse, Dockside Commercial Areas, Westside Plaza.
Consider pairing traffic calming measures with cycling routes	No change recommended Locations will be assessed for needed pedestrian/cycling improvements; this could include traffic calming depending on the conditions of the particular location.
Improve sidewalks in the area between Russell and Catherine, Esquimalt and Wilson.	No change recommended Relative priority of sidewalk improvements identified in Pedestrian Master Plan. No change recommended.
Consider a light at the crosswalk at Turner St. and Bay St.	In Burnside Neighbourhood (out of Vic West neighbourhood plan). Comments forwarded to Engineering and Public Works
Concern that roads / infrastructure not able to address additional traffic impacts from new development/ commuters	No change recommended 2004 Transportation Study confirmed sufficient road/bridge capacity for vehicle traffic from future Victoria West and background regional development, with accompanying traffic demand management in new developments.
<b>Transportation – Specific Locations</b>	
<b>Alston Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several comments on need for safe crossings at Alston/Skinner, Alston/Henry/Bay. Alston is a Greenway and should be safe to walk.</li> <li>More signage and lighting to support Alston as future pedestrian/bike connection. Add garbage receptacles along route</li> </ul>	Include a new Map 4: Neighbourhood-Identified Priority Transportation Improvements for clarify/ ease of reading (NEW) Map 4 initiative #1 identifies Alston Street as pedestrian-oriented corridor. Added cross-referencing to 3.3.10. and 3.4.3. 3.3.10 identifies Alston Street as a location for sidewalk network improvements through redevelopment. Catherine Street would remain as designated cycling route; Alston Street is more direct for pedestrians.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alston road is not a good choice for active transportation corridor - too steep and off the main. Make Catherine and Bay transportation corridors.</li> </ul>	
<b>Bay Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess pedestrian crossing safety and wheelchair accessibility at Bay and Tyee (particularly pedestrians coming from stairs and crossing on east side of Tyee)</li> </ul>	Crossing recently upgraded. No further changes at this time.
<b>Bay St Bridge:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bay St. Bridge needs upgrading, and improved pedestrian and bicycle accessibility.</li> <li>Concern about Bridge's ability to deal with future population, commuter traffic</li> <li>Do upgrades to bridge before any more development</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>2004 Transportation Study confirmed sufficient road/bridge capacity for vehicle traffic from future Victoria West development, with accompanying traffic demand measures in new developments. Bridge to be resurfaced and painted (2018); long-term plan to widen road deck for cycling facilities, add new sidewalk, extend turning lane. Region's long-term focus of on walking, cycling and transit improvements aims to reduce commuter traffic over time.</p>
<b>Craigflower Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enforce 30km/h speed limit on Craigflower in front of "Village"</li> <li>Concerns about speeding through Craigflower – would love to see more traffic calming</li> <li>Add light to pedestrian crossing at Raynor/ Craigflower</li> <li>Add Pedestrian crossing at Styles St.</li> <li>Bus stop at Craigflower and Raynor</li> <li>Questioning need to traffic calm Craigflower side streets</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>Speeding concerns to be referred to Victoria Police – operational issue.</p> <p>Additional crossing improvements were previously evaluated – no additional changes recommended at this time.</p> <p>Poor visibility, topography and traffic would make it difficult to have another bus stop at Craigflower and Raynor.</p>
<b>Edward Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close west side of Edward at Catherine to cars</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <p>Would shift traffic impacts to adjacent streets.</p>
<b>Esquimalt Road</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce speed on Esquimalt Rd. to 30km/h all along to Esquimalt</li> <li>Need more effective traffic calming and beautification along Esquimalt Road in Victoria, like in Esquimalt.</li> <li>Add parking for businesses along Esquimalt.</li> <li>Add pull-out in front of Skate Park so parents can pick up children (currently stopping in traffic).</li> <li>Add new crosswalk at Southwest corner of Vic West park to get to bus stop</li> <li>Change light at Robert St./Esquimalt Rd. to "on demand" so light turns green when car on Robert exits or enters Robert St.</li> <li>Turning lights may no longer be needed at Maitland Street and Esquimalt Road</li> <li>Lighting along Esquimalt to Wilson cycle/pedestrian path needed for safety (location unclear)</li> <li>Re-design the E&amp;N/ bike lane crossing at Esquimalt and William St for safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road design can accommodate 50 km/h traffic. Future development along Esquimalt Road will provide a narrowed feeling along the corridor, and help reduce speeds.</li> <li>(NEW) 3.3.20. Monitor and review speed limit along Esquimalt Road following completion of new Johnson Street Bridge. Also added to Action Plan.</li> <li>Parking on Esquimalt Road: where new development occurs, City's street cross-sections apply and may include on-street parking (e.g. on Esquimalt Road).</li> <li>(NEW) Add "Assess vehicle drop-off/parking for skate park" to 4.15.1. and Action Plan short-term Parks, Open Space and Waterfront items (2018-2019)</li> <li>Traffic lane changing from Maitland Street to Robert Street previously evaluated, but would have removed the signalized crossing to the transit stops.</li> <li>E&amp;N Trail currently identified as long-term (2027+ initiative). Action Plan will be adjusted if timelines change.</li> </ul>
<b>Harbour Road:</b>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns should be addressed when new cycling facilities associated with Johnson Street Bridge are ready</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about bike/pedestrian/vehicle congestion from Harbour Road onto Esquimalt Road. Suggestions include bike-priority signals; discourage car traffic on Harbour Road; eliminate vehicle turns on/off Harbour Road</li> <li>protected two way bikeway on Harbour between Esquimalt and Goose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion already supported by City-wide AAA network plans. See 3.2.1. regarding two-way protected facility planned for Harbour Road.</li> </ul>
<b>Hereward Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sidewalk extension and a crosswalk on Hereward at Hereward Orchard would greatly improve access to the E &amp; N Walkway and slow/calm traffic</li> <li>Narrow, dangerous road. Concern about bikes here in future.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan identifies Hereward Street to be assessed for cycling and pedestrian improvements (3.3.7) in short-term.</li> </ul>
<b>Hereward St/ Wilson St/ Rothwell St and Hereward St/ Pine St/ Dominion St:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many comments on need to assess and improve safety at Hereward/Wilson/Rothwell and Hereward/Pine/Dominion.</li> <li>Include a 'blue line' from Barnard Park north along Rothwell, Hereward to Dominion and Arm to Arm Park. This is a 'water to water' pedestrian/cycle route.</li> <li>Concern that Rothwell is not identified as connected to the adjacent priority pedestrian and/or cycling routes highlighted for Hereward and Esquimalt roads</li> <li>Connect Selkirk and Barnard/West Song by enhancing pedestrian and cyclist connectivity along Hereward/Rothwell.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise Map 3, Map 4 to include active transportation improvements on Rothwell St to link Hereward St to Barnard Park.</li> <li>Plan already identifies Wilson Street at Hereward St crossing 3.3.14; Hereward Street to be assessed for cycling and pedestrian improvements 3.3.14; Action Plan: Hereward/Wilson/Rothwell and Hereward/Pine/Dominion to be assessed for future improvements. No additional changes recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Kimta Road:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need stop sign at the corner of Kimta and Tyee, have had problems with cars not stopping</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be reviewed in conjunction with development of Kimta Street AAA project (2019)</li> </ul>
<b>Langford Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve pedestrian conditions on Langford St between Alston and Tyee – prevent cars from parking on "sidewalk;"</li> <li>Others support retaining parking in Alston/Langford/Tyee commercial area, even as pedestrian improvements are made.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) Referred for evaluation for short-term improvements as part of update to Pavement Management Plan (3.3.10).</li> <li>(NEW) Add evaluation for short-term improvements as part of update to Pavement Management Plan (2018) to Action Plan.</li> <li>Long-term: Sidewalks identified as part of Pedestrian Master Plan ; to occur through redevelopment (3.3.10)</li> </ul>
<b>Lime Point Area:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate more residential parking south of Esquimalt Rd. (e.g. Robert St., Maitland, etc.)</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents can request Residential-Only Parking areas through existing City program.</li> <li>Any rezoning on Robert Street would require the dedication of right of way or easements to meet current standards for on-street parking and sidewalks on both sides of the street.</li> </ul>
<b>Mary Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wilson and Mary intersection is dangerous</li> <li>Mary St. cut through traffic</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.6.3. already identifies need for evaluation of road conditions at Mary Street and Wilson Street.</li> </ul>
<b>Pine Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve traffic control at Pine Street and Craigflower Road in light of being main connection point for cyclists to the Galloping Goose</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood plan identifies problem areas; detailed assessment and any improvements, including detailed design, would be determined after neighbourhood plan is adopted.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about cycling/pedestrian route on Pine St impacting parking</li> <li>Pine Street traffic safety concerns - particularly Pine &amp; Craigflower - there isn't enough detail or commitment in the plan for me to trust that "taming" traffic or community-led initiatives would be successful.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pine Street is identified as part of the City's long-term All Ages and Abilities network. To be designed as shared use facility, which shares road with cycling, on-street parking and vehicles.</li> </ul>
<b>Reno Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Installing permanent barriers at Belton/Reno with good access for cyclists to pass through</li> </ul>	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barrier to be replaced in 2018 (reflected in Action Plan). Pedestrian and cycling needs to be considered as part of detailed design.</li> </ul>
<b>Rothwell Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian crossing time is too short at Rothwell Street and Esquimalt Road. Red light is not respected if cars don't see pedestrians.</li> <li>Reconsider need for cycling connection to Barnard Park, given that you can't cycle in/through there (but pedestrian connection can be improved)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise 3.6.6 to include assessment of crossing at Esquimalt Road.</li> <li>Cycling connections to parks encouraged through City's Parks and Open Space Master Plan. No further changes recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Selkirk Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern regarding traffic speed on Selkirk – can Selkirk on Victoria side be traffic calmed?</li> </ul>	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 3.6.4. already identifies Selkirk Street for assessment of cut through traffic and speed.</li> </ul>
<b>Sitkum Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic lights needed at Sitkum &amp; Esquimalt</li> </ul>	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified as future improvement in plan when required by redevelopment (3.3.15).</li> </ul>
<b>Skinner Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about sightlines at intersections in Skinner St/Langford St. etc.</li> <li>Evaluate pedestrian crossing safety at Skinner at Catherine (esp. for cars turning left off Catherine onto Skinner)</li> </ul>	Staff will monitor. No further action recommended at this time.
<b>Suffolk Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about short cutting on Suffolk Street for drivers trying to avoid the E &amp; N stoplights and there are several young families here.</li> </ul>	(NEW 3.6.7) Assess Dalton Street south of Wilson Street for short-cutting and speed. (NEW ) Action Plan 2019: Assess Dalton Street south of Wilson Street for short-cutting and speed.
<b>William Street:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>500 block William Street not good for bike lane, very narrow, lots of delivery trucks, etc. Suggestion – lane go down Springfield or stay on dedicated bike lane to Wilson Street</li> </ul>	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>William Street greenway would be developed as shared use route due to low traffic volumes and speed; no bicycle lane planned.</li> </ul>
<b>Wilson Street (between Bay Street And Hereward St)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cars don't stop at mid-block pedestrian crossing on Wilson</li> <li>Signage and formal crossing needed at intersection of E&amp;N with Wilson – poor visibility, grade, fast traffic, trucks</li> <li>Concern with Wilson St. blind corner and speed change - too much speeding on this street</li> <li>Desire to improve foot traffic safety on Wilson Street, particularly where there is a need to cross from Rothwell.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW 3.3.12) Assess E&amp;N Trail on Wilson Street crossing for safety and visibility.</li> <li>(NEW) Action Plan 2019 Assess E&amp;N Trail on Wilson Street crossing for safety and visibility.</li> </ul>

Trails and Pathways	
Connect to trails in other communities (e.g. to waterfront trail in Esquimalt to Gorge park)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise 3.1.1. to add “and adjacent neighbourhoods and municipalities”</li> <li>• Proposed active transportation routes and waterfront pedestrian routes designed to connect across municipal boundaries.</li> <li>• Extend trails across municipal boundaries (Map 3 and 4)</li> <li>• Show possible future opportunity to be explored linking to Gorge waterfront in Esquimalt (Map 4)</li> </ul>
Mixed opinions on whether or not lighting should be added to trails in parks	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding Galloping Goose Regional Trail to be referred to CRD for future trail improvement planning (Action Plan for 2018).</li> <li>• Lighting through Banfield Park to be addressed through future park improvement planning (see Action Plan)</li> <li>• Safety goals need to be balanced with potential ecological impacts.</li> </ul>
<b>Banfield Park:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety concerns with shared cycling/pedestrian path.</li> <li>• Separate so that cycling paths and pedestrian paths are clearly separate (e.g. reflective line).</li> <li>• Mixed opinions on paving trails. Some fear paving will increase speeds or have ecological impacts. Others feel that existing flooding and gravel is dangerous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycling safety identified as key concern in community engagement.</li> <li>• 3.3.3., 3.3.5. already identify future assessment of trail in Banfield Park for safety and visibility.</li> <li>• Trail conditions and possible improvements to be addressed through future Park Improvement Plan for Banfield Park. Action Plan changed from “Long Term” to “Medium Term” to reflect adjusted timeframes.</li> <li>• No further change recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Delta Hotel connection:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sign E &amp; N Trail better from the path behind the Delta Hotel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise 3.3.16 to include wayfinding as part of Kimta Road Pilot Project.</li> </ul>
<b>E&amp;N Trail</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sherk Street E&amp;N connection should be north-south, not east west.</li> <li>• Provide details of when Sherk Street connection to E&amp;N Trail will be improved</li> <li>• The rail bed between the Round House and the bridge could host special events similar to street markets - add power outlets and places for stalls and good lighting</li> <li>• Lighting for walking/cycle path from Esquimalt Rd. to Wilson St. needed soon</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise Map 3 to show correct alignment of E&amp;N Trail connection at Sherk Street.</li> <li>• (NEW) Add connection to Sherk Street to Action Plan as medium term item</li> <li>• Community-led placemaking projects encouraged in plan (14.1) and existing City programs, with support of land owners.</li> <li>• Refer to CRD.</li> </ul>
<b>Galloping Goose:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add signage to the trails, especially where people enter the trail to warn about bicycles passing (e.g. bottom of stairs near Bay St Bridge)</li> <li>• Speed control for cyclists</li> <li>• Put ramp on/replace stairs down to Goose/Trestle from Arthur Currie Lane</li> <li>• Upgrade Trestle Bridge.</li> <li>• Widen trail.</li> <li>• Add a speed bump or other indication for cyclists to slow down at bottom of Bay Street stairs for pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Add garbage cans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational concerns regarding Galloping Goose Regional Trail to Parks, Recreation and Culture CRD for future trail improvement planning</li> <li>• Maps 3 and 4 revised to show likely connection from Raynor Avenue to the Galloping Goose via Tyee Road rather than the existing stairs.</li> <li>• Staff reviewed garbage can placement in response to suggestion. Supply and placement is adequate.</li> </ul>

<b>Hereward Park:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connecting Hereward to E&amp;N Rail Trail on the bike is very awkward. A better path up that park would be a great help.</li> <li>Access from Hereward onto E&amp;N needs improvement shortly, not in 10-15 years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.3.6. Hereward Street to be assessed in future for cycling and pedestrian improvements, to include crossings.</li> <li>Informal path in Hereward Park is on BC Hydro and Township of Esquimalt property. Neither have indicated plans to upgrade path.</li> </ul>
<b>Pioneer Co-op:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider formalizing mid-block connectivity through Pioneer Co-op</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change recommended.</li> </ul> <p>Formal connection identified as desirable in plan (6.4.4.); to be secured through redevelopment. Decision to make access public in meantime would be up to Co-op.</p>
<b>Selkirk Trail (future)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for future trail on waterfront instead of Selkirk Ave.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change recommended.</li> </ul> <p>Potential for waterfront trail to be explored through future planning for Arm Street and Burleith Parks (4.2.2). Additional work needed for habitat assessment, consultation and comprehensive planning for this area.</p>
<b>Tyee Co-op:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that Tyee Cooperative pathway is not public, although plan shows it as a connection. Some recent near-miss incidents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-word 3.3.15 to clarify that Tyee pathway is not currently public path but that a future public path is desired there through any redevelopment of the site.</li> <li>Change transportation map improvement for Tyee Co-op 3.3.15 to show as “potential improvement”.</li> </ul>
<b>Vic West Park:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Path between apartment at 55 Bay Street and Vic West Lawn Bowling need lights and better drainage</li> <li>Ensure lighting for safety along Wilson St. at Westside Village</li> <li>Show trail in Vic West park as greenway</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff to assess for lighting needs (operational issue)</li> <li>Plan shows greenways, cycling routes and AAA routes collectively as “active transportation routes”</li> </ul>
<b>Vic West School Trails:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern with Vic West Elementary trails across playing field.</li> <li>Concern with public access during school hour</li> <li></li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many existing examples of public using trails in other school yards, with management options (e.g. after hours only; fencing).</li> </ul>
<b>Westsong Way:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about people biking on Westsong walkway from the bridge to head St. Refresh the signage.</li> <li>Allow cycling over long term on Westsong Walkway</li> <li>Do not allow cycling on Westsong Walkway</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signage concern referred to Engineering, Parks and Public Works – operational issue.</li> <li>Expanding walkway to accommodate cyclists would be challenging due to ecological concerns and narrow space. Parallel routes proposed along Kimta/Esquimalt Road.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Lots along Westsong Way:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about future development of existing privately held water lots</li> <li>Concern about maintaining secured waterfront public access at the Victoria International Marina</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added Section 4.3 providing principles for consideration by the Harbourmaster in the case of an application for works on a water lot and/or by the City in case of a request for access to a water lot across City lands.</li> <li>Recommend revision of the Victoria Harbour Plan concurrent with the Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan in order to reflect these additional principles. The Harbour Plan did not recognize the existence of water lots west of the Songhees area.</li> <li>Added existing waterfront access to Map 3: Existing and future waterfront pedestrian routes.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate residential only parking on Catherine near Skinner</li> <li>Change parking to residential in the area between Russell and Catherine, Esquimalt, Lime Point</li> <li>Suffolk St. parking is a concern</li> <li>Bowlsley St. has no parking; those residents park on Suffolk</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents can request Residential-Only Parking areas through existing City program.</li> </ul>

<p>Different perspectives on parking (e.g.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Numerous concerns regarding traffic impacts that may come from new development</li> <li>• Ensure adequate parking is offered for homes and businesses. Even if people are biking more and more, most households still keep a car for grocery shopping, ferrying the kids, or going out of town.</li> <li>• Some feel parking requirements for new developments should be reduced. Car ownership is falling and will continue to decline.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan tries to strike balance between current demand and shifting to less car ownership/ more transportation alternatives in the future.</li> <li>• Parking requirements regulated by zoning bylaw which has been updated in 2017 based on recent parking occupancy study; owners can apply for variances, which are considered on case-by-case basis.</li> </ul>
<b>Parks</b>	
<b>General</b>	
Photos – add photos with people, add photo of Gorge Waterway (Arm Street Park photo is in Esquimalt)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add or replace photos in Chapter 4: Parks to show people</li> <li>• New photo to show Gorge Waterway.</li> </ul>
Add introduction to parks section and urban forest sections Recognize urban forest master plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) preamble added to Parks, Open Space and Waterways section (Chapter 4) and Urban Forest Sub-Section</li> </ul>
Incorporate accessibility in parks for persons with disabilities. Ask for input from people with disabilities	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility is a guiding principle in the Parks and Open Space Master Plan and will be an important consideration for future park improvements. Specific details to be developed through individual park improvement plans.</li> </ul>
Suggestions for any park space in neighbourhood include water park, interactive art installations	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.5.6 and 14.1.2. propose public and interactive art in parks.</li> <li>• Parks and Open Space Master Plan suggests water features are a higher priority in non-waterfront neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>
Continue to remove invasive species and plant native species in Banfield, Burleigh, and other parks	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational issue – referred to Parks, Recreation and Facilities</li> </ul>
Need more/improved play places for families with kids including playground improvements in Barnard Park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need and timing for playground upgrades identified outside neighbourhood plan, through capital planning.</li> </ul>
Desire for park improvement plans for Arm Street, Burleigh and Banfield Park to be done in short-term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Banfield Park improvement plan moved to medium term to reflect adjusted timeframes</li> <li>• Park planning timelines are established with consideration for park planning needs and priorities across the city. No further change recommended.</li> </ul>
Need summary of Bayview parks Add images to show planned parks for Railyards and Dockside.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) added Map 12 to show parks planned for new areas, with details p 87- 89.</li> <li>• Reorganized Bayview Lands and Dockside parks policies to be consecutive (4.9 and 4.10).</li> </ul>
Public washrooms requested for Songhees walkway and Banfield park	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visitor facilities to be identified through individual park planning and/or Parks and Open Spaces Master Plan implementation.</li> </ul>
Order is confusing for park improvements	Re-order 4.6 – 4.16. to be more coherent
<b>Alston Green</b>	
Establish new community garden space at Alston Green.	(NEW) Identified as possible location for community gardens in in 12.2.1.b. Community can approach City with proposal, under Community Gardens policy.

<b>Banfield Park</b>	
Fence in the green space around the playground in Banfield park. Stop kids from running onto the bike path or towards the bluff edge.	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestions referred to Parks, Recreation and Facilities for future consideration. Specific park features to be determined through future park improvement planning for Banfield Park.</li> </ul>
Mixed opinions on paving trails in Banfield Park. Mode separation desired given common concern re: safety problems with cyclists and pedestrians sharing the path and potential for pavement to increase speeds.	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trail improvements to be evaluated as part of future park planning for Banfield Park. Improvements need to balance safety with ecological goals.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for a beach that provides a more accessible (kids and seniors) and swimmable shoreline. Some suggested this for Banfield park.</li> <li>• Better beach access identified as number one priority at swim event, followed by expanded dock</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised Banfield Park Policy 4.8.b. (new numbering) to explore opportunity for improved beach access.</li> </ul>
<b>Barnard Park</b>	
Consider putting a bathroom in Barnard park, since it is already being used for that even without a facility	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No plans for additional washroom at this time – staff to monitor</li> </ul>
Need a doggy bag dispenser in Barnard park.	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispenser recently installed</li> </ul>
<b>Bayview Place and Roundhouse</b>	
Include reference to Turntable Plaza or more generally to new open space and Lime Bay Park improvements at Roundhouse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised under newly numbered policy 4.9 Bayview Place and Roundhouse</li> </ul>
<b>Docks</b>	
Strong support in survey and events for more swimming docks Concern that plan puts onus on community to establish docks – reword as a partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise policy 4.2.4 to “support community-led efforts in partnership with the City”</li> <li>• Dock may also be considered in more detail through park improvement planning for individual parks.</li> </ul>
Suggestions that the City fund swim docks like playground infrastructure, or funded by developers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other funding sources are encouraged.</li> <li>• (NEW) Chapter on Neighbourhood Improvements and Amenities identifies waterfront access as key neighbourhood priority (15.1).</li> </ul>
Many suggested small (non-motorized) boat launches, docks, and storage facilities for many of the waterfront parks  Support for establishing swim docks for many of the waterfront parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.2.4. already identifies potential locations for future docks, launches.</li> <li>• (NEW) section 4.3 identifies possible water lot uses which could support non-motorized recreation.</li> </ul>
<b>Island at End of Robert Street</b>	
Please mark Island at south end of Robert Street as a “no go” space out of respect for First Nation use and history Protect islands as both a burial island and a sensitive ecological area. On-going erosion from human use.	No change recommended at this time. Staff will monitor.
<b>Commercial uses</b>	

Allow some trail-side stands to sell produce Some suggest allowing commercial vendors along trails. Others cautioned not to.	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be addressed through implementation of mobile vending bylaw, which identifies exploring limited commercial uses in some locations.</li> </ul>
<b>Dogs in Parks</b>	
Opinions mixed on whether or not there should be an off-leash dog area in Banfield Park	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upcoming City-wide Dogs in Parks Strategy will review off-leash areas and needed changes. No change recommended.</li> </ul>
Fence in the grassy off leash dog park at Vic West park fenced in. Grass is more accessible than gravel for physically impaired pet owners.	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Split rail fence recently installed. Staff are monitoring.</li> </ul>
<b>E&amp;N Rail Trail</b>	
Get rid of East and North rails and create a linear park Support the revitalization of the train for commuting and tourism	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E&amp;N Rail corridor identified as future transportation corridor (3.11.3). Stakeholder groups/ businesses currently exploring options.</li> </ul>
<b>Hereward Park</b>	
Access from Hereward onto E & N needs improvement shortly, not in 10-15 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access would be a partnership with BC Hydro and CRD. To be explored as opportunities arise.</li> </ul>
Improve Hereward Orchard by planting young trees, added benches, etc. and adding another waste receptacle.	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already identified in draft plan as potential community orchard site (12.2.2)</li> <li>Community can approach City with proposal for community gardens or orchard improvement under Community Gardens Policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Railyards Park</b>	
Animate parks by Railyards – beautiful space with very little going on, not many people using it.	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood plan encourages use of parks for events, placemaking and other community-led initiatives ( 4.5.6)</li> <li>Completion of the Railyards development will include additional housing, an additional park/playlot and pedestrian and bicycle connections from the Skinner/Bay Tyee intersection to the Galloping Goose, encouraging use of open spaces here.</li> </ul>
<b>Rainbow Park</b>	
Designate Rainbow Park permanently (prior plans were for road to connect Robert Street to Russell Street) Questions regarding plan to buy or renew lease of the Park? Please clarify in plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Various maps have been updated to show the entire park, while also showing the existing right of way.</li> <li>Any changes to Rainbow Park Right of Way may have implications for future planning of E&amp;N trail. Future planning process for design of the E&amp;N Rail Trail from William Street to the Johnson Street Bridge to be undertaken in partnership with CRD.</li> </ul>
Picnic tables and community garden in Rainbow Park – better maintenance of park	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community can approach City with proposal for community gardens under Community Gardens Policy.</li> <li>Request for picnic tables referred to Parks, Recreation and Facilities (operational)</li> </ul>
<b>Milne Street green space</b>	

Develop pathway on Milne Street right of way to connect Catherine Street with Mary Street. Overgrown. Boulder is part of public land.	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boulder is on public right of way. Grades are not suitable for formal public walkway.</li> <li>Lawn and vegetation control referred to Parks, Recreation and Facilities (operational issue).</li> </ul>
<b>Russell Street green space</b>	
Suggestion to protect green space on the block of Russell St. running north-south, between Henry St. and Wilson St.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referred to Parks, Recreation and Facilities staff for further assessment and consideration.</li> </ul>
<b>Triangle Park</b>	
Don't want orchard/garden in Triangle Park. Park is too small - a nice oasis for relaxing.	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community support on walk about for additional features to animate the park. More trees/gardens still compatible with opportunity to relax. No change recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Vic West Park</b>	
Pave walkways through park from Esquimalt to Save On so we can skate to the park Repair cracked sidewalks Lights at the skate park	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting and pathway improvements coming (2017 – 2019) through implementation of Vic West Park management plan.</li> </ul>
Add water fountain	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New water fountain at Skate Park.</li> </ul>
Concern regarding cars stopping on Esquimalt Road to pick up people using Skate Park Improve signage to Vic West Park access/drop-off points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised 4.15.1 to add assessment of vehicle drop-off/parking conditions for Skate Park.</li> <li>(NEW) Add short-term action: Staff to assess need for pull-out to service Vic West Skate Park.</li> </ul>
Take down some trees to make the space more open and inviting for park and parking lot	No change recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goal is to preserve trees in parks unless there is a safety or infrastructure concern.</li> </ul>
<b>Urban Forest</b>	
Require large street trees in new developments. Desire for more trees and shrubs Concern about boulevards that impede the view of drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised 4.18.4 to supports street tree in other multi-unit development.</li> <li>(NEW) Proposed Design Guidelines for Townhouses and Attached Housing include consideration of planting spaces and a variety of trees on-site, and support for canopy street trees.</li> </ul>
Develop a Urban Forest/Street Tree sub Plan for Vic West to propose strategy for overall tree canopy in the neighbourhood while identifying which sub-neighbourhoods can be improved with more consistently laid-out trees. The city still needs a comprehensive Boulevard plan for all.	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional urban forest initiatives to be undertaken at city-wide level, through implementation of Urban Forest Master Plan, including canopy targets for different parts of city, street tree programs, etc.</li> </ul>
<b>Gorge and Harbour</b>	
Identify clearly the historic Victoria Harbour Migratory Bird Sanctuary and provide background Identify significant species and invasive threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) Add Migratory Bird Sanctuary to Map 7 (Parks and Open Space Network)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong but mixed opinions about removing, engaging with, or supporting those living on boats moored in Gorge</li> <li>Remove derelict boats</li> </ul>	No change recommended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside scope of neighbourhood plan. Being addressed through other City initiatives.</li> <li>Future moorage not contemplated in Gorge due to environmental concerns.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider putting boat buoys in the Gorge and renting them out to generate revenue and clean up the current situation.</li> </ul>	
<p>Consider Green Shores guidelines and certification for waterfront development</p> <p>Concern about sea level rise in Vic West</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) Policy 4.1.5. Investigate incorporating Green Shores principles for ecologically-sensitive shoreline development in waterfront parks.</li> </ul>
<p>Remove smelly seaweed to eliminate the foul odours, particularly between Maitland Road and Esquimalt boundary.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seaweed is important part of shoreline ecosystem. No further action recommended.</li> </ul>
<p>The bank area at Burleith park should be reinforced to stop the bank erosion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) Added direction to look at shoreline ecosystem health through park planning for Burleith Park (4.6.1.)</li> <li>Management strategies to be addressed through future park improvement planning for Burleith Park (long term action).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting and signage to feature wildlife and history- foot of Mary Street it's possible to build tide pools - there are a few natural ones there and our daughter loved watching the sea life in them</li> <li>Need more thorough acknowledgement of "naturehood," bird sanctuary and migration routes in Vic West</li> <li>Recognize eel grass and other sensitive Gorge ecosystems</li> <li>Identify significant species and invasive threats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) Add Migratory Bird Sanctuary to Map 7 (Parks and Open Space Network)</li> <li>(NEW) Added direction to look at shoreline ecosystem health through park planning for Burleith Park (4.6.1)</li> <li>Refer to Parks, Recreation and Facilities – interpretive signage can be addressed through individual project proposals or operations. No further change recommended.</li> </ul>
<p>Add DPA 8 Gorge Waterway to map</p>	<p>(NEW) Update Map 7 (Existing Parks) to indicate existing Environmental Development Permit Area 8.</p>
<p>Suggestion to add floating trash cans in the Gorge, as there are on Cowichan River.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed with Parks, Recreation and Facilities staff. Would create challenges for trash collection, as City does not have boat.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental quality</b>	
<p>Ensure that improvements do not compromise ecological integrity</p>	<p>General comment. No changes.</p>
<p>Alston boulevard needs restoration</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified for future improvement through redevelopment, and Pedestrian Master Plan.</li> <li>(NEW) Figure 36 for Alston-Bay-Tyee development indicates desired cross-section with boulevards, street trees and sidewalks</li> </ul>
<p>Invasive vegetation has taken over from Rainbow park to Esquimalt</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operational issue – referred to Parks, Recreation and Facilities.</li> </ul>
<b>Future Land Use map</b>	
<p>Future land Use Map – needs introduction/ more context</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add new introduction to Future Land Use Map, describing vision.</li> </ul>
<p>Throughout chapters 5-11: Avoid the use of the words “is/are supported” because the implementation of some policies on any site would be considered through rezoning process which considers a number of factors and site context.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replaced “supported” in some places with “may be considered” or similar language</li> </ul>
<b>Future population growth/ density - general</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support in survey/ open houses for plan's direction for where and how to accommodate future growth.</li> <li>• Others had concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concern that too much new housing being added to neighbourhood overall and/or traditional residential areas, given OCP intent to protect character of traditional residential areas and to direct 90% of pop increase in core areas and large urban villages and 10% in traditional residential areas.</li> <li>○ Concerns expressed about too much change, too much height and density. Concern about impacts on future traffic (particularly at urban villages)</li> <li>○ Concern that there is a mismatch between what we heard in early engagement and what the plan addresses</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisions made to plan to reduce envisioned density in certain areas in response to public input. These changes are detailed in the Traditional Residential Areas section, below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ reducing the area proposed for Urban Residential development south of Esquimalt Road;</li> <li>○ removing Skinner Street and Suffolk Street as areas where 3-storey apartment buildings may be considered;</li> <li>○ further reducing the areas where townhouses in two rows are supported, and increasing the minimum lot area suitable for this housing type;</li> <li>○ increasing the minimum lot size for a duplex with suites from 500m<sup>2</sup> to 555m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>○ increasing the minimum lot size considered for small lot house zoning</li> <li>○ clarifying policies encouraging the retention and adaptive re-use of heritage buildings rather than new development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The proposed policies are meant to provide opportunities for incremental development over 25 years considering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Community engagement showed strong support for more housing diversity and for most proposed housing policies.</li> <li>○ New development within Traditional Residential Areas is focused in part within close walking distance of large urban villages - areas where the OCP anticipated 40% of residential growth - and along frequent transit routes, with less development envisioned in certain areas (e.g. "Northwest sub-area")</li> <li>○ New housing types proposed in plan unlikely to result in rapid population growth in traditional residential or urban residential areas, due to land values and limits on height/lot sizes. New development will be monitored, and policies can be adjusted if growth rate is faster than anticipated.</li> <li>○ Draft Plan reduces potential for certain types of housing (e.g. townhouses) by limiting areas and density (the Official Community Plan currently supports them throughout Vic West)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Other areas/neighbourhoods could accommodate more growth. Recent development in Vic West has accommodated enough growth for this area. Slow development to let the neighbourhood integrate new development and settle.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All neighbourhoods are projected to increase in population over next 20-25 years. Increase in housing in traditional residential/urban residential areas expected to be incremental due to land values and restrictions on lot sizes/ heights/ location of types of development.</li> </ul>
<p>Some people expressed desire for more quantitative information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want to see more clear visualization of what full buildout could look like (both of villages and neighbourhood as whole)</li> <li>• Add population projections for Vic West to plan</li> <li>• Desire for capacity analysis</li> <li>• Add specific growth projections for different land uses</li> <li>• Add numbers anticipated for different Master Planned areas</li> <li>• Add targets for population and housing types into overview</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A visualization model is more suitable to master planned sites or greenfield development. It is difficult to accurately produce a model for traditional/ urban residential areas, as redevelopment of individual properties depends on many different variables.</li> <li>• Information on population projections/master planned areas/ land uses provided as background information for plan. Difficult to make accurate predictions.</li> <li>• Chapter 5: New introductory sentences to overview describing where future population will be concentrated (along corridors, villages).</li> </ul>
<p>Address overcapacity school in light of potentially more people here.</p>	<p>Revised plan to be referred to School District 61 for review. Population growth under age 18 expected to be incremental</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about ability of infrastructure, particularly bridges and roads, to handle future population increase.</li> <li>• Suggestion that infrastructure improvements should be completed (e.g. Bay Street Bridge) before new development</li> </ul>	<p>2004 transportation studies/modelling indicate sufficient road capacity based on full build out. Bay Street upgrades for pedestrian/cycling improvements planned for medium term (5 – 10 years).</p>

### Amenities in new development – General

Require accessibility (e.g. wheelchair accessibility) in portion of new units.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual property owners/ developers encouraged to add features to developments that meet the needs of future residents. Accessibility considerations now highlighted in all reports to City Council, including for new developments.</li> <li>Provincial building code addresses accessibility.</li> <li>Proposed guidelines for Townhouses and Attached Units include guideline 5.a. for accessibility.</li> </ul>
Ensure more tax revenues from new development in Vic West (e.g. Roundhouse) stays in Vic West	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current City approach is that all tax revenue goes to general revenues, to be allocated across City as needed.</li> <li>Public amenity contributions from development would directed to Vic West.</li> <li>(NEW) The addition of Chapter 15, Neighbourhood Amenities and Improvements, provides an overview of the preferred improvements.</li> </ul>
<b>Noise- General</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion of a noise curfew if waterfront infrastructure is added</li> <li>Assess and mitigate noise from airport and other waterfront industries</li> <li>Should not build at Lime Point until airport situation fully declared with noise exposure forecast</li> <li>Concern about potential noise if train service is very frequent</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hours of operation from industrial/commercial properties regulated by business licences.</li> <li>New development in close proximity to the working harbour are encouraged to consider noise attenuation measures, and ensure that new residents are aware of potential noise impacts.</li> </ul>
<b>Traditional Residential Areas</b>	
<b>Overall density, growth and development</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern with developer driven assembly and redevelopment incited by townhouses in traditional residential areas</li> <li>Mixed opinions on need for increasing density of housing in traditional residential area</li> <li>Some concerned these housing types would lead to densely packed housing in the area</li> <li>Others feel the small lot houses and more suites is a good way to add invisible density</li> <li>Community engagement showed strong support for more housing diversity. Strong support for most housing policies.</li> </ul>	<p>Some changes to this section of the plan, which are detailed in subsequent comments below. and summarized here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised Maps 10, 11 Maintain existing Traditional Residential designation on Robert Street (draft plan had proposed Urban Residential development here) and limits to 3 storeys.</li> <li>(NEW) New policy 6.5 removes 3-storey apartment buildings as an option on Skinner Street and Suffolk Street</li> <li>(NEW) New policy 6.5 reduces the area where townhouses in 2 rows are supported (by excluding from the North Catherine Street area) and revised policy 6.13 (new numbering) makes it harder to build this housing type by requiring a larger lot size</li> <li>Revised policy 6.14 (new numbering) increases the size of lot considered for duplexes with suites slightly from 500m<sup>2</sup> (5,500 sq. ft.) to 6,000 sq. ft. (555m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>Revised Policy 6.15 (renumbered) to remove consideration</li> <li>Revised Policy 6.16 (new numbering) proposes a minimum lot size of 220m<sup>2</sup> (approx. 2,400 sq. ft.) for consideration of small lot rezoning. (Draft Plan proposed 180m<sup>2</sup> (2,000 sq. ft.)</li> <li>Revised Policy 6.16. softens the language discouraging small lot rezoning as an option east of Russell Street, while still maintaining a preference for other housing types.</li> <li>Revised Section 6.8. clarifying policies encouraging the retention and adaptive re-use of heritage buildings rather than new development</li> </ul> <p>Plan maintains a range of options for infill housing based on the following rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community engagement showed strong support for more housing diversity. Strong support for most housing policies.</li> <li>Development pressure likely to continue in all City neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan's housing policies aim for incremental change in the residential areas. New housing types proposed in plan unlikely to result in rapid population growth in traditional residential or urban residential areas, due to land values and limits on height/lot sizes.</li> <li>New development will be monitored, and policies can be adjusted if growth rate is faster than anticipated.</li> </ul>
Why does more population need to be accommodated in Vic West / especially in Traditional Residential Areas? Noting, OCP intent to protect character of traditional residential areas and to direct 90% of pop increase in core areas and large urban villages and 10% in traditional residential areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development pressure likely to continue in all City neighbourhoods. Role of neighbourhood plan is to identify what kind of development is desirable, if a property owner chooses to redevelop their site.</li> <li>Neighbourhood plan policies direct majority of growth core area, corridors and within walking distance of large urban villages. Due to new limits on lot sizes, density and geographic distribution, new neighbourhood plan policies direct proportionally less growth traditional residential areas than in current OCP.</li> <li>Plan's housing policies aim for incremental change in the residential areas. New housing types proposed in plan unlikely to result in rapid population growth in traditional residential or urban residential areas, due to land values and limits on height/lot sizes. New development will be monitored, and policies can be adjusted if growth rate is faster than anticipated.</li> </ul>
Allow incremental infill (multiplex, duplexes), but don't want to see big changes all at once.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pace of change in traditional residential areas expected to be gradual due to land values and restrictions on heights/ lot sizes/ boundaries of different housing types.</li> <li>Development will be monitored, and policies can be adjusted in case of rapid changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Clarity</b>	
Difficult to understand which housing types are appropriate for which area	<p>The Traditional Residential Areas section has been revised for added clarity, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of a revised Map 11 (formerly Map 8) and the addition of a table of housing types, density and building height which may be considered.</li> <li>A greater number of named and numbered sub-areas to reflect the different contexts and policies in the Traditional Residential Areas</li> <li>Key provisions of each sub-area (housing types considered, density, and height) remain the same, excepting changes identified in this document.</li> </ul>
Avoid rounding metric measurements where it makes policies out of line with existing zoning or lot sizes found in Victoria (lots were platted in Imperial measures.) Provide lot dimensions in both metric and feet (many people more easily identify lot width/size by feet/square feet)	<p>Minor changes to lot requirements as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Houseplexes on corner lots: change from 550m<sup>2</sup> to 555m<sup>2</sup> (6,000 sq. ft.)</li> <li>Lot depth for townhouses in two rows: change from 40m to 39.5m (130 ft.)</li> </ul>
Update images to better reflect policies, remove "placeholders"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added new Fig. 15 showing an example of a house converted to commercial use</li> <li>Removed Figure 16 (as numbered in Draft Plan) which shows townhouses in two rows on a single lot</li> <li>Added new Fig. 19 showing a townhouse option with no front-accessed parking</li> <li>Added Fig. 24 (new numbering) showing conceptual site organization and parking options for duplexes; removed Fig. 18, 19 (Draft plan numbering) which were photographs of duplexes. (Fig. 18 was redundant with Fig. 17).</li> <li>Added Fig. 30 (new numbering) showing actual small-lot houses in Vic West on lots aligning with the revised policy 6.16.</li> </ul>
<b>Boundaries of Traditional Residential Areas</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please consider Area 2 to continue west along Craigflower to Alderman – one lot deep. All are large lots with duplexes near the end of their lifecycles</li> <li>Extend Trad Res Area 1 to Craigflower between Russell and Alderman.</li> </ul>	<p>Limited changes recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three largest lots between Belton Avenue and Alderman Road have been included on revised Map 11 (formerly Map 8) in the "General Areas" where townhouses in two rows may be considered, as these lots exceed the dimensions for this housing type, and topography and lot pattern provide transition to adjacent lots.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other parts of Craigflower Road remain in the Northwest Sub-area, but new Policy 6.5 and revised Policy 6.15 supports houseplexes of up to 4 units along Craigflower Road and nearby and Styles Street, rather 3 where lots are of sufficient size (currently few lots meet this requirement).</li> </ul> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community engagement indicated support for maintaining traditional residential character of this area.</li> </ul>
Do not agree with breaking up Langford St. – one side Area [3], the other side Area 2. Leave the remainder of Langford Area [3].	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map 11 (formerly Map 8) and new policy 6.5. rename these areas as “Northwest Sub-area” (north of Langford Street) and “General Areas” (South of Langford Street).</li> <li>The north and south sides of the street have different characteristics, with more character houses located on the north side of the street.</li> <li>For lots in their current configuration, there are minimal policy differences between these two sub-areas.</li> </ul>
Difficult to understand which housing types are appropriate for which area	<p>The Traditional Residential Areas section has been revised for added clarity, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusion of a revised Map 11 (formerly Map 8) and the addition of a table of housing types, density and building height which may be considered.</li> <li>A greater number of named and numbered sub-areas to reflect the different contexts and policies in the Traditional Residential Areas</li> <li>Key provisions of each sub-area (housing types considered, density, and height) remain the same, excepting changes identified in this document.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion to restrict heights of new buildings to what is there now.</li> <li>Concern that accommodating infill development and conserving green space is better supported with 3 storeys of living space.</li> <li>Differing opinions on preference for peaked roofs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where 3 storey buildings remain supported (Esquimalt Road, south of Esquimalt Road, adjacent to Catherine Street at Edward Small Urban Village), strengthen language that buildings should transition sensitively to adjacent lower-scale development (Policy 6.6.1.b., was 6.15.1.)</li> <li>Revised policy 6.6.1. (renumbered) reduces the height supported along Skinner Street to 9 metres and 2.5 storeys (with or without basement) rather than the 3 storeys supported in the Draft Plan, and encourages more sensitive transitions to adjacent properties and peaked roof forms. (Newly numbered Policy 6.6.1, was 6.1.5.1)</li> <li>Revised policy 6.6.1. (renumbered3d) clarifies that buildings of 2 – 2.5 storeys are supported elsewhere in Traditional Residential Areas, with 2.5 storeys and additional measured height supported only where a half-storey is contained in a peaked roof.</li> </ul>
<b>Townhouses, Houseplexes, Duplexes, Triplexes, Small Lots Houses</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns expressed about townhouses, houseplexes, and small lot homes having potential to incentivize lot assembly and large scale demolition and redevelopment.</li> <li>Desire to avoid lot assembly, larger scale demolition and redevelopment. Smaller/lot scale redevelopment preferred.]</li> <li>Concern that affordability will decline as single family lots are marketed for development potential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove townhouses in two rows as an option in the newly identified North Catherine Street area (Policy 6.5, Policy 6.12)</li> <li>Increase the minimum size of lot considered for small lot rezoning (Policy 6.16)</li> <li>In some cases (townhouses in 2 rows, in those areas where location and lot depth permit), requiring a minimum lot size supports a sensitive design, on-site open space and transitions to neighbouring properties, while making this development type more difficult, and therefore encouraging a slower pace of changeThe OCP and previous Vic West Plan (1998) supported townhouses throughout Vic West, but little land assembly.</li> <li>Economic analysis for other neighbourhoods has shown that development of townhouses is about as economically viable as other uses, including continued use as single detached houses.</li> <li>The proposed plan reduces the density for townhouses in most areas, as compared to the Official Community Plan.</li> <li>Plain aims to support incremental, not rapid, redevelopment. If trends show unexpected rate of change, policies can be revisited.</li> <li>Enhanced policies to encourage the retention and reuse of houses of heritage merit (policies sections 6.8 [renumbered], 10.3).</li> </ul>

Desire expressed to avoid tracts of newly built houses - prefer new housing construction to appear more piecemeal and incremental.	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design guidelines would apply to all duplexes, triplexes, houseplexes and other new multi-unit housing required to following design guidelines with focus on new housing that fits with surroundings, and minimizing impacts on adjacent properties. Variability in design encouraged.</li> <li>Land values in Vic West unlikely to support rapid or large-scale redevelopment</li> <li>New development will be monitored, and if trends show unexpected rate of change, policies can be revisited</li> </ul>
The lot requirements for more than one row of townhouses are less than for a single row of townhouses. That does not make sense, multiple row house will even create more parking demands.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise newly numbered Policy 6.12. to increase the lot size required for double row of townhouses to 30 metres (100 feet) to encourage site layouts with more green space and more sensitive transitions to surrounding development. This makes this development type more difficult.</li> </ul>
Concerns about unmaintained multi-unit houses - reference to existing fourplexes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside scope of neighbourhood plan – existing complaints can be referred to Bylaw for follow up</li> </ul>
<b>Design &amp; Character</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important that new housing (esp. townhouses) in all traditional residential areas are well designed and respect the context in which adjacent heritage homes exist.</li> <li>Concern that new development will destroy the character and feeling of established character houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) New policy 6.5 reduces the area where townhouses in 2 rows are supported (by excluding from the North Catherine Street area) and revised policy 6.13 (new numbering) makes it harder to build this housing type by requiring a larger lot size, for the purpose of supporting more sensitive site layout, building and open space design.</li> </ul> <p>No further change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design guidelines would apply for all new duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, houseplexes, multi-unit buildings (4+ units), commercial and industrial development. These guidelines focus on good design that fits with surroundings, and minimizing impacts on adjacent properties. Heritage or historic context of surrounding properties would be taken into account.</li> <li>New development permit guidelines are proposed for townhouse development in Vic West. These guidelines include requirements for compatibility of form and materials.</li> <li>The plan identifies an update to duplex development permit guidelines as a short-term action.</li> <li>Revised Sections 6.8, 10.3 contain enhanced policies to encourage the retention and reuse of houses of heritage merit.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure open space is retained on lots, and not paved, to adequately serve functions of food growing, rain water permeation, habitat.</li> </ul>	<p>Some revisions made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For duplexes, townhouses in one row, and houseplexes, guidance for zoning has been revised to support 35% of the lot depth as a rear setback. (Renumbered policy 6.7.4.)</li> <li>Proposed Development Permit Area guidelines for Townhouses and Attached Housing include guidelines for addressing tree planting spaces on-site and in boulevards (Guidelines 5.c., d., e.), on-site landscaped areas (Sections 2.c., 5), and stormwater management on-site (Guideline 5.h.).</li> </ul> <p>Further changes not recommended. Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zoning sets minimum set-backs and open space requirements.</li> <li>Total number of units in some housing types (e.g. houseplexes) has been limited to reduce impacts of surface parking on open space.</li> <li>Homeowners are encouraged to install rainwater harvesting technologies (pervious pavement, etc.).</li> <li>Through city-wide processes, the City will be updating the tree preservation bylaw and related policies, and proposing stormwater requirements, in 2018.</li> <li>Through a City-wide process, the City will be considering further regulations for the treatment of stormwater on-site.</li> </ul>
Ensure neighbours' access to light and privacy is respected by new buildings.	<p>Some changes proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres contain enhanced guidance on sensitive transitions to lower density development.</li> <li>Draft townhouse guidelines for building separation have been enhanced (Guideline 2.b.)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building height anticipated by the plan has been reduced in some places (e.g. south of Esquimalt Road, per Map 11 and New Policy 6.6.) or additional policies for transition in scale has been added (revised policy 6.1.2). Further changes not recommended. Rationale:</li> <li>Design guidelines would apply for all new duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, houseplexes, multi-unit buildings (4+ units), commercial and industrial development. Focus is on good design that fits with surroundings, and minimizing impacts on adjacent properties.</li> <li>For single family homes, light, privacy and overlook regulated through zoning setbacks and maximum height.</li> </ul>
Preserve public views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) New policies 6.1.5, 6.1.8., 8.5.6, and revised Maps 10, 15 indicate new development should respect the view of the Olympic Mountains from Catherine Street at Edward Street, and the view of the Sooke Hills from Catherine Street at Skinner Street. These view corridors have been included in the proposed content specific to Vic West in the Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres.</li> <li>The existing development permit guidelines for various areas (Songhees, Dockside, Roundhouse and Bayview lands) protect public view corridors in these areas.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discourage flat roofs, preference for heritage style roofs</li> <li>Others interested in more progressive or modern designs which may or may not have a peaked or pitched roof.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City cannot regulate style of single detached housing outside of a Heritage Conservation Area. Public engagement did not indicate interest in additional Heritage Conservation Areas in Vic West.</li> <li>In Traditional Residential Areas, 6.6.1.c. (renumbered) already requires that a half-storey above the second storey be contained within a peaked roof in order to provide for massing sensitive to adjacent buildings.</li> <li>(NEW) Policy 6.6.1. (renumbered) has been revised to clarify the heights in storeys and metres which may be considered, to provide additional opportunity/incentive for infill housing types with a peaked roof.</li> <li>Development Permit Guidelines address compatibility of built form in buildings of 2 or more units. There are different ways of achieving compatibility within different architectural styles – style &amp; roof type is only one</li> <li>No further change recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking demand &amp; traffic</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many expressed concern about potential increases (or on-site costs) of parking demand. Some feel changes in technology and car ownership will negate or reverse parking demand in pace with intensification.</li> <li>Some feel parking requirements should be relaxed to encourage alternatives and in light of likely changes in car ownership and technological changes (e.g. car-share, self-driving vehicles).</li> </ul>	<p>No further changes recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2018, the City will be proposing an updated Zoning Bylaw Schedule C regarding on-site parking requirements, based on a study of parking occupancy at existing developments.</li> <li>Overall parking and traffic demand expected to decrease over life of plan due to decreasing car ownership, improved transit and other alternatives.</li> <li>Community's long-term desire for added housing choice (ownership + rental) was expressed as a priority over immediate concern for on-street parking. Pace of change is expected to be incremental.</li> <li>Parking requirements add significantly to cost of new commercial and multi-unit residential developments. Reduced parking requirements can help address overall housing cost.</li> <li>No further changes recommended.</li> </ul>
<b>Suites, renting, and cohousing</b>	
<p>Desire for introducing additional types of housing with rental suites beyond those proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow more than one legal suite in single family homes (not just duplexes)</li> <li>Support allowing suites even if house does not have heritage designation</li> <li>Garden suites behind duplexes should also be allowed</li> <li>More parking flexibility</li> <li>More total floor space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised policy 10.1. to add the option of a heritage house with two suites.</li> </ul> <p>No further changes recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff does not support a policy for garden suites behind duplexes at this time. Remove the option for garden suites behind houseplexes. (Flexibility may be considered in heritage properties)</li> <li>Garden suites are already supported for single detached homes in all Traditional Residential areas where they meet city-wide policies.</li> <li>Draft plan already supports 2 suites in single detached houses which are subject to heritage designation (Policy 10.3.1).</li> <li>Heritage policy (Policy Section 10.3) supports adaptive and creative re-use of buildings (10.4) which may support a variety of site designs.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider some case-by-case flexibility on site requirements for allowing additional rental units in traditional residential areas.</li> <li>Consider allowing Garden suites in Trad Res Area 1</li> </ul>	
Some suggest that suites should only be rentable in houses when owner-occupied.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The city-wide secondary suites policy has not included an intent to limit rental suites to owner-occupied houses.</li> <li>Would be difficult to regulate and enforce. No change recommended.</li> </ul>
Accommodate tiny houses (e.g. in driveways)	<p>No changes recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City-wide garden suite policy recently updated.</li> <li>Tiny houses in driveways would be regulated by City bylaws for recreational vehicles, not by zoning/land use controls.</li> </ul>
Encourage cohousing	<p>No changes recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-housing, where residents own individual homes and share amenities, could be suitable in a variety of multi-unit housing types proposed in the plan (e.g. apartment building, townhouses, rowhouses). Would be achievable under land use policies in proposed plan; no additional policies needed.</li> </ul>
Allow airbnb usage in suites	<p>No further changes recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Short-term vacation rentals being addressed at City-wide level.</li> </ul>
<b>Pioneer Cooperative Block</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing role in any redevelopment should be prioritized.</li> <li>Pioneer Co-op – Replacement for retained units should be non-market (not “affordable”) and similar bedroom configuration – family friendly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Former policy 7.1.9. has been moved to become the first policy in the Pioneer Cooperative Special Planning Area sub-section (newly numbered policy 6.4.1.)</li> <li>This policy supports a similar number and floor space (rather than bedroom configuration) of affordable units. In a rezoning conferring density, the City would seek a housing agreement to secure the affordability level of units.</li> </ul>
Policy regarding community garden for the Pioneer Cooperative site is too prescriptive; the primary public benefit of this site is the provision of affordable housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newly numbered policy 7.1.6. (formerly 6.4.8.) has been softened to encourage opportunities for urban food production.</li> </ul>
Policy 7.1.5. regarding limited commercial or community-serving uses at Pioneer Housing Cooperative may be interpreted too broadly in the future. This policy is not evident on Map 9: Traditional Residential Areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newly numbered policy 6.4.6. (former policy 7.1.5.) clarified to support commercial services rather than commercial uses, specify a limited area, and that the primary use of the site be maintained for housing.</li> <li>New Policy 6.10.2. added in new sub-section 6.10: Limited Commercial Uses, limited commercial uses, to cross-reference to Pioneer Housing Cooperative. Limited commercial also included as a use in Policy 6.5 and new Figure 11: Traditional Residential Housing Types.</li> </ul>
The boundaries of this Special Planning Area include adjacent parcels which are not part of the cooperative property.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map 11: Traditional Residential Sub-Areas (formerly Map 9) has been revised to only include the coop property.</li> </ul>
<b>Skinner Street (Proposed apartments and 3-storey building height)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about development of apartment buildings on Skinner (Traditional Residential Area negatively impacting character of area - particularly character and heritage houses</li> <li>Some opposed to tall buildings (i.e. 4 storeys) going up at Raynor and Skinner as you go up the hill – concern that they will overshadow duplex-zoned houses</li> </ul>	<p>Revisions to Skinner Street Traditional Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) New policy 6.5 removes 3-storey apartment buildings as an option in Traditional Residential areas of Skinner Street (formerly identified as “Sub-area 1” in the Draft Plan”).</li> <li>Revised policy 6.6.1. (renumbered) reduces the height supported along Skinner Street to 9 metres and 2.5 storeys (with or without basement) rather than the 3 storeys supported in the Draft Plan, and encourages more sensitive transitions to adjacent properties and peaked roof forms. (Newly numbered Policy 6.6.1, was 6.1.5.1)</li> <li>Revised policy 6.15.3. (renumbered) supports houseplexes with more than 4 units on Skinner Street where all design guidance can be met.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some preference for houseplex and townhouses instead of apartments,</li> <li>Others supportive of higher buildings along Skinner Street.</li> <li>Conserving heritage is significant part of opposition to townhouses and apartments around Skinner and Catherine St.</li> <li>Consider additional policies for Skinner Street for properties adjacent to Heritage Conservation Area on Catherine Street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres for Vic West include guidelines for compatibility of scale and character with surrounding development and heritage buildings, and design which considers views of the Sooke Hills from Skinner Street and Catherine Street.</li> </ul> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skinner Street/ is frequent transit corridor; opportunity to add more housing units and diversity and promote housing that is less reliant on vehicles. Townhouses, houseplexes, triplexes and duplexes would still add new housing in a form that is more traditional residential in character.</li> </ul> <p>Revisions to Skinner Street Urban Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised Policy 6.1.2. (renumbered) specifies height which may be considered at Raynor</li> </ul>
<p><b>Suffolk Street (Proposed apartments and 3-storey building height)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about development of apartment buildings on Suffolk (Traditional Residential Area 1) changing character of area</li> <li>Concern from surrounding residents about change in character. Topography and lot size are constraints on apartments.</li> <li>Some preference for houseplex and townhouses instead of apartments, some feel townhouses should not be supported in traditional residential areas either densification on Suffolk would mean more noise</li> <li>Concern about traffic impacts – some houses on Bowlsby do not have on-site parking; short-cutting is an issue</li> <li>Esquimalt/Suffolk Area – we want to preserve the little green, semi-private space that exists now between houses/houseplex</li> </ul> <p>Others support proposed changes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) New Map 11 (formerly Map 9) and policy 6.5 removes 3-storey apartment buildings as an option in Traditional Residential area south of Suffolk Street (formerly identified as “Sub-area 1” in the Draft Plan”). This area is identified as part of the “General Area” in the proposed plan, supporting various infill housing types depending on lot size, with height of up to of 2 -2.5 storeys.</li> <li>Along Esquimalt Road, plan would support buildings up to 3 storeys (existing OCP policy for arterial roads)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Affordability</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbourhood plan needs to help with affordable housing</li> <li>Need to better define affordability</li> <li>Interest in more affordable housing for middle income</li> <li>need family friendly affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise all policies referring to bonus density in Chapter 6 (Urban Residential section), Chapter 7 (Urban Villages), Chapter 8 (Employment Areas), to include reference to non-market housing, secured by a housing agreement for the life of the building, and affordable to households identified by the City’s Housing Strategy or other City-wide policy. This language replaces more general references to “Affordable Housing” in the Draft Plan.</li> <li>(NEW) Chapter 16 includes Affordable Housing as a desired Neighbourhood Improvements and Amenity.</li> <li>(NEW) Clarify glossary definitions to distinguish between affordable housing and non-market housing.</li> <li>No further changes recommended.</li> </ul> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The neighbourhood plan contains policies to help support more affordable housing as well as ownership opportunities: new opportunities for mortgage-helping suites (to make home ownership more attainable and create rental housing), affordable housing through developer contributions in certain locations, policies to support revitalization of housing co-ops.</li> <li>Tools are limited to address affordable housing through neighbourhood plan; most initiatives to be achieved through City-wide projects and by other levels of government.</li> </ul>

Concern that affordability will decline as single family lots are marketed for development potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land values make rapid redevelopment unlikely. Potential development on any one lot is limited by various policies on lot size, density, number of units, desired setbacks, and housing types supported in various sub-areas.</li> <li>Plan is not proposing city-initiated rezoning of traditional residential areas following adoption of this plan. Rezoning process and restrictions on lot sizes/areas would be disincentive to land speculation.</li> <li>Staff believe that increase in land value in response to greater diversity of housing types is unlikely based on recent economic analysis; however can be monitored over time.</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Development Permit Area</b>	
Add new section to housing chapter regarding guidance for new housing along Gorge Arm (Selkirk Ave), in an environmental DPA.	<p>(NEW) Revised Map 11 and Policy 6.5 identify a Gorge Waterfront Sub-Area. This sub-area carries forward policies developed in 2003 for the Victoria Harbour Plan, which does not support rezoning for further density in this area. The plan notes that a future process would evaluate the merits of seeking waterfront easements, with consideration of rezoning, at the same time that park planning is done for Arm Street and Burleith Parks. (Renumbered policies 4.2.2., 4.6.2.)</p> <p>The Action Plan identifies this as a long-term action (2028+).</p> <p>Existing environmental Development Permit Area 8 provides guidance for the protection of shoreline areas.</p>
<b>Urban Residential Areas</b>	
<b>Overall</b>	
Map clarity	Revise Map 10 (formerly Map 8): Urban Residential Areas to label all nearby streets, for clarity
<b>Affordability</b>	
Don't locate all affordable housing on busy streets	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing supported in a variety of locations in Vic West, including some blocks adjacent to (but not on) Esquimalt Road, in Westside Large Urban Village, if new housing is added/redeveloped at housing cooperatives.</li> <li>Non-market housing which is included as part of a private development generally requires Urban Residential or Large Urban Village densities, at a minimum, to be viable.</li> <li>Non-market housing may be built by affordable housing providers anywhere residential development is supported.</li> <li>The plan supports the creation of rental housing suites which could provide market rental opportunities in various location.</li> </ul>
Make affordable housing mandatory rather than bonusing for new development	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City looking at ways to encourage/ require affordable housing in new developments through upcoming city-wide inclusionary housing study (Fall/Winter 2017-2018).</li> </ul>
Need middle income housing also	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New types of housing which include rental suites, which provide for added ground-oriented housing units (e.g. townhouses), or which provide multi-unit rental or strata ownership units would provide market housing options.</li> <li>Additional support for housing types with suites may help middle-income households qualify for a mortgage.</li> <li>Housing prices largely set by the market.</li> </ul>
Can anything be done to support people to own their own units rather than development which seems to make money for developers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A variety of ownership housing forms are anticipated by the plan</li> <li>Homeownership programs are outside scope of neighbourhood plan. City is looking at a variety of other housing initiatives through the implementation of the Victoria Housing Strategy.</li> </ul>
On Esquimalt Rd. (south side) between Catherine St. and Mary St. – large parking lot – could be converted to low-income housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Choice to redevelop will be up to property owner. Portion of this property is right-of-way for E&amp;N Trail.</li> </ul>

<b>Amenities &amp; service</b>	
How can we continue development without overloading existing capacity (social, transport, services and parks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) Chapter 16, Neighbourhood Improvements and Amenities, has been added to identify the priority improvements identified by the community.</li> <li>• (NEW) Policy 7.1.4. identifies community amenities (community facility or public space improvement) desired where rezoning for additional density is considered in Westside Large Urban Village.</li> <li>• (NEW) Chapter 9, Core Songhees and Master Planned Areas, describes amenities which are required as part of Master Development Agreements.</li> <li>• New developments will provide Development Cost Charges (DCCs) to offset impact to infrastructure.</li> <li>• Amenities and infrastructure improvements to be sought from individual developments to offset impact of new development in the immediate area.</li> <li>• Other City systems/ networks expected to be able to meet future capacity Vic West Transportation Study (2004) and Parks and Open Space Master Plan (2017) confirmed sufficient capacity for transportation and parks, respectively.</li> <li>• Capacity/need for community facilities and services to be assessed through upcoming city-wide recreational planning.</li> </ul>
Require accessibility (e.g. wheelchair accessibility) in portion of new units.	<p>No further action recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual property owners/ developers encouraged to add features to developments that meet the needs of future residents.</li> <li>• Accessibility considerations now highlighted in all reports to City Council, including for new developments.</li> <li>• Accessibility requirements included in the BC Building Code.</li> </ul>
<b>Character &amp; design</b>	
Concern that design guidelines have not been effectively implemented in past, or will get negotiated away by developers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General comment</li> <li>• New City-wide Development Permit Guidelines adopted in 2012 as part of the Official Community Plan Update. Additional guidelines proposed through the neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>• Development Permit Guidelines are bylaws.</li> </ul>
Need deeper setbacks from all sides than what is done downtown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setbacks will be determined by zoning. Existing zoning for outside of the Downtown Core Area contains different setbacks than downtown zoning.</li> <li>• City-wide Development Permit Area guidelines and proposed guidelines for Vic West are different than those for the downtown, and typical zoning also differs with respect to setbacks. These guidelines address sensitive transitions to adjacent development. The design of individual developments will be reviewed against surrounding character of the area.</li> </ul>
Important to retain open spaces for families with children, growing food, habitat.	<p>No additional changes recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing City-wide <i>Guidelines For: Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial, Industrial</i> require open space for residents (private and/or shared, depending on type of housing). Further guidelines are included in the Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres proposed to be applied in Vic West.</li> <li>• Need for on-site open space balanced with proximity to waterfront areas and parks.</li> </ul>
<b>Esquimalt Road and South of Esquimalt Road</b>	
Preserve views of water from within the neighbourhood, even if approving taller buildings on Esquimalt Rd. and Lime Point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) New policies 6.1.5, 6.1.8., 8.5.6, and revised Maps 10, 15 indicate new development should respect the view of the Olympic Mountains from Catherine Street at Edward Street, and the view of the Sooke Hills from Catherine</li> </ul>

	<p>Street at Skinner Street. These view corridors have been included in the proposed content specific to Vic West in the Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing development permit guidelines for various areas (Songhees, Dockside, Roundhouse and Bayview lands, Harbour Road Industrial Area) protect public view corridors in these respective areas.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many comments that 5 storeys is too high for Esquimalt Road that 3, maybe 4 storeys should be the max.</li> <li>Others suggested allowing taller buildings in these areas for sustainability, to support affordable housing contributions, or to relate to Roundhouse area.</li> <li>Esquimalt Road and Lime Point area: 5 storey should only be allowed where there would be no impact on the light, privacy, green space or liveability of the existing residences.</li> <li>Buildings should be higher (6 storeys or more) to provide opportunity for affordable housing</li> </ul>	<p>(NEW) Revised Map 10 indicates maximum height to be considered in metres and approximate storeys (given that storey height may vary). Heights proposed along the north side of Esquimalt Road remain at 5-6 storeys in most areas, with the corner of Esquimalt and Dalton limited to 3 storeys; 6 storeys on the south side of Esquimalt Road; and lower heights along Mary Street.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 6.2.6. (renumbered, formerly 6.3.5.), existing City-wide Development Permit Guidelines, and the proposed Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres include guidance for sensitive transitions to adjacent lower-density development.</li> <li>Policies 6.1.8., 8.5.6. identify public view corridor to be respected.</li> </ul> <p>Staff have reviewed building heights and feel that higher building appropriate along Esquimalt Road due to mix of building types, wide street and frequent transit route. Recommend areas be added to Development Permit Area with new design guidelines to address potential impacts on neighbouring properties. Existing buildings on the south side exceed 6 storeys. Buildings above 4 storeys are more likely to support inclusion of non-market housing.</p>
Desire for a more welcoming/engaging streetscape than seen in Songhees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building of Roundhouse development will improve streetscape and vibrancy in area.</li> <li>Pedestrian and cycling improvements planned along Kimta Road.</li> <li>City-wide Development Permit Guidelines, and the proposed Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres include guidance for creating pedestrian-friendly environments for different contexts (residential or commercial frontages).</li> </ul>
Along Esquimalt Road - encourage shop fronts and good pedestrian access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 6.2.3. already supports commercial uses on the ground floor.</li> <li>Ancillary retail is also supported in light industrial areas.</li> <li>Development Permit guidelines related to shopfront design.</li> <li>Pedestrian improvements recently completed along Esquimalt Road. Additional improvements for sidewalks and individual frontages to be achieved through redevelopment.</li> </ul>
<b>South of Esquimalt Road Area (formerly Lime Point Area)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about changing traditional residential designation in Lime Point area (south of Esquimalt Road) to urban residential designation</li> <li>Many comments that 5 storeys is too high for Lime Point, and that 3, maybe 4 storeys should be the max.</li> <li>Others suggested allowing taller buildings in these areas, to support sustainability, affordable housing contributions or relate to Roundhouse area.</li> <li>Desire to maintain ground oriented character in the portion of these areas that have homes now.</li> <li>Concerns about impacts to privacy, scale and change in character of Lime Point Area</li> </ul>	<p>Based on community feedback and additional urban design analysis, revise policy 6.5 (newly numbered) and Maps 10, 11 (formerly Map 8, Urban Residential Areas and Map 9, Traditional Residential Sub-areas) to support development more compatible with existing character around Robert Street. Specific changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain Traditional residential designation on the east side of Robert Street and the the south end of the block between Mary Street and Russell Street, considering development up to 3 storeys and 1.2 floor space ratio. This built form is compatible with townhouses and courtyard forms of housing found in the area.</li> <li>Reduce the anticipated height on the east side of Mary Street to approx. 4 storeys (proposed as 5 storeys in draft plan)</li> <li>Policies 6.1.8., 8.5.6. identify public view corridor to be respected. City does not have the authority to protect private views.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve views of water from within the neighbourhood, even if approving taller buildings in Lime Point</li> <li>• Move lots at south end of Russell-Mary block be moved to Area 3 of Trad Res (3 storey development) for compatibility to existing development and consistency with waterfront policies/development</li> <li>• Consider different designation for Trad Res 4-storey apartment on waterfront west of Robert Street</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to step down heights toward the water and reduce allowable heights for sites on higher ground to maintain views and effective height limit</li> <li>• Design should be sensitive to the West Song walkway</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 6.2.1. directs lower buildings/ stepping down on lots facing the waterfront.</li> <li>• Traditional Residential designation is retained adjacent to the waterfront.</li> <li>• Existing and proposed Development Permit Guidelines require sensitive design towards all public spaces, including streets, parks, pathways and the waterfront.</li> </ul>
<b>Commercial &amp; industrial uses</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are many vacant office/retail spaces available already. If you build more office, how do we know they will be used?</li> <li>• Many comments regarding maintaining employment areas, including light industrial.</li> <li>• Other comments regarding supporting office employment, transitioning some light industrial uses to office employment</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisions about whether to build office/ retail spaces would be determined by property owner. Evaluation of existing demand and what exists in the area is typically part of the decision about whether to redevelop a property or not.</li> <li>• Analysis by CRD, recent trends and consultation show high current and expected demand for new light industrial and office space in Victoria.</li> <li>• Proposed plan policies support a mix of retaining light industrial areas with some smaller parcels transitioned to employment and residential use.</li> </ul>
Consider allowing retail (e.g. coffee shop) at foot of Mary St. rather than just residential.	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mary Street at Esquimalt Road is identified as Industrial Employment or Employment with residential, to support light industrial uses, ancillary retail of products produced on-site, or commercial uses.</li> <li>• A retail/food services use at the waterfront would generate traffic through the residential neighbourhood.</li> </ul>
<b>Pre-zoning</b>	
Suggestion to be proactive, pre-zone to match stated land use goals (e.g. the industrial zone at Lime Bay & along Esquimalt Rd. should be changed to a new artisanal activity land use zone)	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-zoning is generally not proposed at this time.</li> <li>• Pre-zoning of light industrial areas may occur to update uses. This would be determined through a subsequent rezoning process. Existing light industrial zoning already supports artisan activity and ancillary sales.</li> <li>• Pre-zoning land would remove opportunity for bonus density (e.g. for community amenities/ affordable housing) to be negotiated and for community input.</li> </ul>
<b>Special Planning and Master Planned Areas</b>	
Confusing section – add more context, introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) This section is revised as a new chapter Chapter 9: Core Songhees and Master Planned Areas), and includes descriptions of each Master Planned Area based on existing Master Development Agreements, Development Permit Guidelines, and zoning.</li> <li>• One Special Planning Area which is located in Traditional Residential (Pioneer Housing Cooperative) has been moved to the Residential Areas chapter.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) Create separate chapter for Master Planned Areas</li> <li>• (NEW) Move Pioneer Co-op policies to Traditional Residential Areas; move Tyee Co-op and site near Johnson Street Bridge to new Master Planned Areas chapter</li> </ul>
Encourage urban food production at Tyee Cooperative with redevelopment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised policy to encourage opportunities for urban food production at Tyee Co-op, and moved to Tyee Co-op section.</li> <li>• Original wording was too prescriptive as primary public benefit for co-op is affordable housing</li> </ul>
Require affordable housing at Pioneer Co-op	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy (7.1.) is worded to allow Pioneer Co-op membership to determine housing needs in the future (eg tenure, cost and size) as these needs may change over time.</li> </ul>
Clarify that Bayview Place is being planned as integrated neighbourhood, while Bayview and Roundhouse have separate zoning and MDAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master Planned Areas: the new introduction refers to Roundhouse, and to Bayview Place as a residential Sub-area of Roundhouse development.</li> </ul>
Reference to Bayview MDA should be changed to Roundhouse MDA – include both “Sitkum Park” and “Lime Bay Park”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to both parks have been identified in the description of the Roundhouse</li> </ul>
More detail as to how master planned sites contribute to overall neighbourhood: greater diversity, vibrancy and density for the city and lessen the development pressure on the lower-density, traditional neighbourhoods, while also supporting neighbourhood retail, greater transportation choice, and overall urban sustainability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction the Master Planned Areas section of Chapter 9 elaborates on the role medium- and higher-density development and associated commercial areas, parks and open spaces, and trail connections support broader goals for Vic West and the City’s core. Some photos have been added.</li> <li>• (NEW) Added Map 12 showing existing/approved building footprints/ block plans and snapshot images.</li> </ul>
Give incentive / compel the Roundhouse development to build the promised commercial spaces	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master Development Agreement provides details of planned development and phasing for Roundhouse. Changes to MDA would be proposed by property owner.</li> </ul>
<b>Urban Villages</b>	
<b>All Villages</b>	
Support for focus on walking and cycling as higher priority than cars and parking	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan supports more focus on active transportation, in accordance with OCP transportation hierarchy.</li> </ul>
Encourage more variety of shops and businesses in Westside Village, Craigflower Village.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan policies (and existing zoning) support diversity of commercial, office, service uses.</li> <li>• Plan policies support a focus on pedestrian-friendly spaces including patio dining along Wilson Street.</li> <li>• Individual tenants will be determined by property owner. No change recommended</li> </ul>
More community services (including a church) and retail needed for existing residents in Songhees/ Roundhouse Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) New Policy 7.1.4 identifies community space as a desired public amenity in Westside Large Urban Village; also identified in New Chapter 16: Neighbourhood Improvements and Amenities.</li> <li>• These policies reflect existing policy 13.1.2. for future community facility in area of Westside Village</li> <li>• Retail space and community space (or cash-in-lieu) identified in Roundhouse Master Development Agreement (see 13.1.4.).</li> </ul>
Need to see more community benefit from new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise plan to add new Chapter 16: Neighbourhood Improvements and Amenities to clearly indicate desired amenities for Vic West.</li> <li>• Additional clarity has been added regarding desired site-specific amenities indicated in urban residential, urban villages and employment sections (e.g. public realm improvements in villages, community space in Westside Village area, on-site non-market housing).</li> <li>• New development contributes to Development Cost Charges</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial contributions and taxes from new development go into City-wide revenues, to be redistributed according to City's Financial Plan.</li> </ul>
Concerns regarding whether additional parking and traffic demand can be managed as more people are added	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking and traffic demand expected to decrease over life of plan. Majority of new housing concentrated near transit, within walking distance of downtown and cycling facilities. No changes recommended.</li> </ul>
Introduction needs more recognition of adding housing along transit and heritage character of this urban village Add goal to support housing along transit route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised text to add more emphasis for transit and heritage character</li> <li>Revised goal 2 to: Improve the walkability, bikeability, transit use and public realm in and around urban villages</li> </ul>
<b>Westside Village</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong survey support for proposed vision/ policies/amenities for Westside Village.</li> <li>Some concern about 6 storeys being too tall in Westside Village, Da Vinci site - desire for more human scale</li> <li>Others supportive of 6 storey heights.</li> <li>Others suggested that if Westside shopping centre redevelops, require community amenities as a result of any new density allowed on site.</li> <li>Concern that future development density on Westside Village site should be limited due to past agreements.</li> <li>Consider more density on Westside shopping centre site at the corner of Bay/Skinner Street.</li> <li>Desire for additional services/ businesses in area:</li> <li>New library, community space for classes, new school.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) New Policy 7.1.4 identifies community space as well as previously identified public realm improvements and non-market housing (former policies 8.5.3.e, 8.5.7.) as desired improvements in Westside Large Urban Village; also identified in New Chapter 16: Neighbourhood Improvements and Amenities.</li> </ul> <p>No change to density and height recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area around Westside Village features higher buildings, wide roads, large-sized lots and distance from low-scale residential houses. Six storey buildings would be compatible with surrounding area.</li> <li>Limited taller buildings are supported in two areas because of context: the Bay Street/Skinner Street corridor to support development at an area identified as a key opportunity for an architectural statement during engagement; and in the Westside Shopping Centre site to support more flexibility in design which can include a mix of lower and taller buildings, with human scaled buildings at the edges.</li> <li>Additional density not recommended as increasing beyond the 2.75 floor space ratio would create densities identical to Old Town; and the intent of allowing taller buildings at the Westside Shopping Centre site is to allow for a more flexible mix of lower-scale and taller buildings.</li> <li>Future redevelopment of Westside Village to higher may require a rezoning; densities will be revisited at the time based on the specifics of the application.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure sunlight still shines into Westside Village and other residential areas as development happens / after</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed application of the <i>Guidelines for: Residential, Commercial and Industrial</i>, and <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> with Vic West-specific content added, provide additional guidance for compatibility, form and massing and livability.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify that large format retailers in this area should be designed for an urban environment, not a suburban one</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise policy 8.5.2.b. to "...encourage large ground-oriented retail in an urban format"</li> <li><i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> with Vic West-specific content added, provide this guidance as a bylaw</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize and modify surface parking design to improve pedestrian movement and safety in Westside Village</li> <li>Calm traffic in Westside Village – particularly quieting truck traffic servicing the village.</li> <li>Green the roof at Westside Village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes to the configuration of Westside Village would be subject to zoning and design guidelines if redevelopment occurs.</li> <li>Comments to be referred to property owner.</li> </ul>
Desire for Dockside and Roundhouse to create villages that are well linked to Westside Village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan proposes better pedestrian and cycling connections between the two, improved crossings, and more continuous urban design and public realm treatments. Chapter 3: Transportation and Mobility includes an integrated system of pedestrian and bicycle links in and outside of Master Planner developments (see Map 3: Neighbourhood Active Transportation Network).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Chapter 9: Core Sonhgees and Master Planned Areas describe the amenities including commercial areas, park and public space improvements, and pedestrian connections to be included in these developments.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close Wilson St. along Westside Village to cars from Bay to park edge; remove parking</li> <li>Don't remove parking on Wilson between Tyee and Bay.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing Urban Design Polices for Westside Urban Village (newly numbered policy section 7.1.7. and 7.2, formerly 8.5.3 and 8.6) envision Wilson Street as a pedestrian-friendly high street for the area, with streetscape improvements, trees, furnishings rather than a pedestrian-only space. Improvements would occur primarily through redevelopment. New development would include pedestrian-friendly storefront and pedestrian spaces accommodating patio dining.</li> <li>Pedestrianized streets generally do not support retail uses except in high-density or tourist areas. Closing street would worsen congestion and traffic on adjacent streets.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need new library, school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) New Policy 7.1.4 identifies community space as desired improvements in Westside Large Urban Village; also identified in New Chapter 16: Neighbourhood Improvements and Amenities. This reflect existing policy 13.2. from public engagement.</li> <li>Need for new schools determined by School District 61; final plan will be referred for review. Population under age 18 not expected to increase dramatically due to small housing size.</li> </ul>
<b>Craigflower Village</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong support from survey and open houses for proposed vision/policies for area.</li> <li>Concern with increasing scale of Craigflower Village and surrounding density - particularly regarding feel, impact on neighbours, sunlight, noise, traffic.</li> <li>Suggest re-visiting this section with a more moderate, gradual approach to change (i.e 2-3 stories maximum, fewer garden suites, etc)</li> <li>Concern that higher buildings would change the quiet and small scale character of Craigflower village.</li> <li>Opposition to adding more people near village; others support for adding more people in and near the village</li> <li>Desire to emphasize heritage, historic feel of area</li> <li>Analysis on need for new commercial space considering closing businesses downtown</li> </ul>	<p>Revisions for clarity and design guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add Craigflower Village to new Development Permit Area. Apply Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres with specific content for Craigflower Village, including small storefronts, to ensure compatibility of new development, and respect of historic character.</li> <li>In newly numbered policy 7.3.3. (revised from 8.1.2., 8.1.6.), the location of specific development has been clarified by the addition of addresses.</li> <li>Properties north of the village have been moved to Traditional Residential (see newly numbered Map 11, Policy 6.5., Policy 6.10) to replace former policy 8.1.6. Clarity is added that commercial use is only supported in converted houses, similar to existing examples on these blocks.</li> <li>Revise Craigflower concept sketch to remove brown residential frontages on side streets outside the village; this is already supported and is confusing.</li> </ul> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community feedback indicated strong support for adding more housing and attracting more customers with a few new retail spaces. New development will achieve housing and business objectives and support frequent transit route. Future development is expected to be incremental due to height limits.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed 3-4 mixed use building at Raynor/ Russell Streets:</li> <li>Concern about impact of 3-4 mixed use building proposed at Skinner St and Russell Street: change in character, impacts on adjacent neighbours, traffic impacts from vehicles accessing Raynor Street, too much density and change</li> <li>Others support the idea of changes in this location</li> <li>Some feel townhouses would be more appropriate on this site than apartments</li> <li>Concern about 3-storey buildings up Raynor Street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised Policy 6.1.2 to specify a maximum building height as viewed from Russell Street (the lowest elevation of the property).</li> <li>(NEW) Added policy 6.1.5. to maximize views of the Sooke Hills from Skinner Street at Catherine Street when designing new development.</li> <li>(NEW): Add Skinner Street to new Development Permit Area and apply Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres with specific guidelines for Skinner Street Corridor, including considering the scale of development adjacent to Raynor Street and adjacent houses, and respecting the public view corridor.</li> <li>No other changes recommended.</li> </ul> <p>Rationale: Existing commercial zoning on "Chicken on the Run site" would allow 3-4 storeys (up to 12 m). Strong community support for mixed use/residential building on corner, provides gateway at entrance to village, provides affordable housing opportunity due to City-owned right of way, on frequent transit corridor, grade between Russell and Catherine lessens visual impact of 3-4 storey building.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about existing businesses forced out because of future development.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key goal is to support existing Craigflower Village businesses with more people living nearby, and a few more businesses to attract more customers to the area. Village will face future competition for customers due to new commercial areas at Dockside and Roundhouse.</li> <li>Existing zoning would allow 12-metre tall redevelopment on some sites. The plan scales this back and provides nuance and encouragement to keep and reuse existing buildings.</li> </ul>
<p>Various comments regarding streetscape in Craigflower Village area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about losing trees by adding parking to both sides of Craigflower - suggestions to have no change or separated bike lane only</li> <li>Confusion about whether parking and/or trees would be removed along Banfield Park</li> <li>Improve pedestrian friendliness and connectivity across Craigflower Road</li> <li>Extend orchard to Craigflower Road to engage the other side of street</li> <li>Allow mobile (bike based) food entrepreneurs on the Banfield Park fringe to enhance the commercial, festive feel of the village.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newly numbered policy 7.4.2. already specifies retaining trees and shifting sidewalk to be separate from street, Sufficient width exists for this opportunity.</li> <li>Plan policies support several initiatives to improve pedestrian conditions, including crossing improvements, added housing/mixed use (more on-street activity), on-street parking (to slow traffic), and added features on park edge.</li> <li>Specific improvements may be determined as opportunity arises through development in the area.</li> <li>Action Plan identifies streetscape design to be undertaken at the same time as an improvement plan for Banfield Park (Medium-term).</li> <li>Suggestion for mobile food vendors, extending orchard to be referred to for exploration of Commercial Uses in Parks (in progress) and for future park planning</li> </ul>
Rename to Banfield Village instead of Craigflower Village	No change recommended.
Support for a renewal/refresh of the community centre. Could make better use of same building footprint and need more gym space.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13.1.1. supports collaboration between City and Community Association to enhance facilities and other aspects of centre.</li> </ul>
Comments regarding additional businesses/ services for Craigflower Village: breakfast place, pub, grocery store as anchor, performance space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan policies support diversity of commercial/ retail uses at this location. Individual tenants up to property owner and zoning. Grocery store would require much larger retail floor area/ parking for Craigflower Village. No changes recommended.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider amount of additional parking and traffic demand created by more commercial space</li> <li>Concern that policy not requiring parking for village businesses is too broad – suggest that certain businesses at grade (e.g. smaller footprint retail, food services and personal services) businesses not be required to provide on-site parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newly numbered policy 7.3.8.(formerly 8.1.5.) revised to not require additional parking for a change in use in existing buildings or for ground-floor commercial use at 405 Craigflower Road (“Chicken on the Run” site)</li> <li>Overall parking and traffic demand expected to decrease over life of plan due to decreasing car ownership, improved transit and other alternatives. Craigflower Village located on frequent transit line, close to regional trail/bike network, within walking distance of neighbourhood housing.</li> <li>Parking requirements add significantly to cost of new commercial development. Relying on shared public parking (e.g. on-street) is beneficial to small urban villages by reducing the overall amount of parking needed and supporting better urban design.</li> </ul>
<b>Catherine St at Edward St</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong community support from early engagement, survey</li> <li>Concern about new small urban village competing with existing/future commercial areas at Craigflower, Westside Village, Roundhouse and Dockside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boundaries of proposed small urban village revised to include only existing commercially zoned properties.</li> <li>New Traditional Residential Sub-area (Policy 6.5) proposed to allow residential buildings similar in character, height (3 storeys) and density to small urban village, to create a unified character along Catherine Street between Edward Street and Langford Street.</li> <li>(NEW) Policy 7.5.2. added to support canopy street trees with any new development.</li> </ul>
<p>Some concern with height of small apartment buildings and shadowing (esp. given elevation)</p> <p>New development should respect the heritage style in the area</p>	<p>Development Permit Area proposed, with specific guidelines added to support a unified character for this block, including street trees, pedestrian-friendly design, and sensitive transitions to lower density properties.</p>

Bella Street improvements	Renumbered policy 7.4.10., 7.5.2. (formerly 8.4.1.) revised to clarify name of street, support an alternative road design comfortable to pedestrians
<b>Employment Lands</b>	
<b>Amenities</b>	
Need housing that is attainable for those employed in the light industrial jobs. Suggest requiring affordable housing for residential above industrial.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-market housing is included as a desired amenity in all areas which include residential uses. Individual amenities are typically negotiated on a case-by-case basis, guided by City-wide policy and neighbourhood plans.</li> <li>• Affordable housing may be difficult to require in industrial/employment-based buildings due to lower economic viability of industrial spaces.</li> <li>• While employees may need affordable housing, jobs located in light industrial areas tend to pay more than retail services jobs.</li> </ul>
Add a dramatic theatre (not movie) or a dance / art school. But those things might be developed in the pre-existing light industry areas.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depending on zoning, these types of uses may already be supported in these areas. If not, property owners can apply for a change of use/ rezoning if new business type is proposed.</li> </ul>
<b>Compatibility and feel</b>	
Many emphasized need to ensure uses are good neighbours with residential. Some feel that light industrial cannot be compatible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) Proposed Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres contain guidelines regarding supporting compatibility of uses through design.</li> </ul> <p>No change recommended to plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan policies recognize that many light industrial uses are not compatible with residential or commercial uses, and emphasize limiting uses to those which are compatible.</li> <li>• Suitability will be evaluated when zoning is updated – whether for a proposed development or in a City-initiated rezoning to modernize light industrial uses.</li> </ul>
Some feel noise from car crushing (in Burnside) and shipyard is excessive.	Operational/enforcement issue. Referred to Bylaw Enforcement.
<b>Environmental Quality</b>	
Need more assurance of environmental stewardship by waterfront industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waterfront industry required to comply with all environmental regulations and discharge bylaws.</li> </ul>
Plan doesn't sufficiently recognize Marine Industrial use as designated in the Harbour Road Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) Added policy 8.1.1. supporting Marine Industrial uses consistent with the Harbour Road Industrial Waterfront Guidelines and related zoning.</li> </ul>
<b>Height</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many expressed concern regarding height of proposed light industrial mixed use buildings, suggesting 2 -3 storeys as a maximum. Others felt 4 storeys was acceptable.</li> <li>• Some concern about height of buildings in Employment Residential Areas south of Esquimalt Road (5 storeys)</li> <li>• Ensure that any increases in height allowed do not impact views, light, privacy, or green space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (NEW) Revised Map 15 specifies anticipated height in metres, and approximate number of storeys, given that industrial and commercial floor heights may vary and are typically taller than other development types.</li> <li>• Proposed heights are generally consistent with intent of draft plan heights, while number of storeys has generally been reduced.</li> <li>• (NEW) Height supported between Tyee Road and Skinner Street has proposed at 14m (approx. 4 storeys rather than 5 storeys) due to grade of site and the way height is measured on a sloping site, to consider transition to uses across Tyee Road.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the way height is measured on a sloped site would result in excessive height facing Tyee Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) Proposed Development Permit Area and associated guidelines, including the Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres contain guidelines regarding supporting sensitive transitions to adjacent lower-scale development.</li> <li>Rationale: Proposed heights support the inclusion of residential or upper floor commercial uses.</li> </ul>
<b>Parking &amp; Traffic</b>	
Parking needed for businesses in employment areas.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking requirements are determined by Schedule C of the Zoning Bylaw, which is proposed for revision in 2018 based on study of actual parking demand in the city.</li> </ul>
Minimize impervious pavement of parking spaces.	<p>No change recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development in all areas (including employment areas) encouraged to add rainwater management features, including impervious surface, through Rainwater Rewards program.</li> <li>Additional City-wide initiatives forthcoming, including exploring requirement for storwater run-off to be managed on-site.</li> </ul>
Concern about the 700 block of Tyee for General Employment with limited residential. Too many people and not enough space or road access for commercial vehicles. Albion has been a challenging for Railyards residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NEW) Revised Map 15 supports height between Tyee Road and Skinner Street has proposed at 14m (approx. 4 storeys rather than 5 storeys proposed in the draft plan) due to grade of site and the way height is measured on a sloping site, to consider transition to uses across Tyee Road.</li> <li>Minimizing impacts on residential properties is a key concern for any future housing here. 9.5.2. – 9.5.6. provide direction to minimize commercial transportation (and other) impacts on residential properties.</li> </ul>
<b>Viability</b>	
Concerns raised about economic trends, need for industrial space / sufficiency of existing stock.	<p>No change recommended</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis by CRD, recent trends and consultation show high current and expected demand for new light industrial and office space in Victoria.</li> </ul>
<b>Heritage</b>	
Heritage map shows the previously unconsolidated lot lines for the Roundhouse site – update needed. Also – the Heritage Property colour should only cover DA-1 lands north of the rail corridor.	Revised Map 16 to show correct lot lines.
Some properties missing from Heritage map	<p>Revise Map 16</p> <p>Show existing Heritage Conservation Area</p>
<p>Heritage section could include more description of Vic West's unique history, the history of the place, and the important heritage buildings/sites.</p> <p>Include more First Nations history, recognition of past occupation in Heritage section</p> <p>Include reference to heritage interpretation and celebration</p>	Revise introduction to plan, add preamble and text to Heritage Chapter 8 to incorporate comments/ address feedback.
<b>Infrastructure and Green Building</b>	

Eliminate heating oil in Vic West	Reworded 11.4.5 to emphasize aim to move away from heating oil in Vic West, as well as explore other heating options. (NEW) 11.4.6. to work with utility companies and province to explore solar and other energy sources (Utility companies, rather than the City, would provide leadership on incentive programs) City of Victoria to prepare education and outreach materials to encourage and support shift to solar power in residential properties.
Why include sea level rise map? Neighbourhood plan does not have policies that address sea level.	Removed. Sea level rise policies to be addressed through future city-wide level initiatives.
Infrastructure part of the plan has no new ideas. We should be thinking beyond natural gas and thinking about incentives to include solar energy production. Natural gas is not green energy.	Added various (NEW) policies 11.4.1. – 11.4.7 to acknowledge other infrastructure/ green energy initiatives underway. Green energy initiatives will be tackled through city-wide Climate Leadership Plan, outside neighbourhood planning. No further changes recommended.
<b>Neighbourhood Food Systems</b>	
Suggestions that the City should step in to provide more leadership, resources and support for community gardens Opinions on City role in allotment gardens mixed; some feel the City should create more allotment gardens (e.g. in Vic West Park), others feel this is not appropriate on public land. Consider planting fruit trees along some city streets mixed with native trees Concerned about fruit trees in the "public gardens". unless maintained for things like cherry moth and other pests these can affect trees in the entire neighbourhood	Food production on City land currently guided by city-wide policies on Community Gardens, Community Orchards and Boulevards (updated in 2016). Neighbourhood plan identified potential locations, but the establishment of food features would rely on community interest, leadership and support No change recommended.
Concern that gardens need to rely on density bonuses Some opposition to the transaction of density in return for amenity that could be better directly funded by the city from taxes on public land.	Density bonus is just one tool to achieve community gardens. Community gardens supported through other means under City's community gardens policy. Many different community amenities are desired through new development. Developers encouraged to add features that will meet needs/ interests of residents, as these vary widely based on occupants, maintenance needs, etc. City has limited tax base and many competing demands. Taxes not collected from public lands. No changes recommended.
More farmer market-type initiatives would add to the character of the area of the newer area of Vic West	Farmers markets supported in plan (12.1.1). Operator/ community group can approach City with proposal. No change recommended.
Food systems section needs to be stronger	Many food systems initiatives are addressed at city-wide level through existing programs, policies and regulations. Staff have reviewed the chapter and community feedback, and propose no further changes.
<b>Neighbourhood Well-Being</b>	

Support for improvements/ rebuilding of Vic West Community Centre to improve facilities. Need more gym space. Expand for daycare for infants (1-3 years old).	Plan supports continued work with Victoria West Community Centre to sustain/enhance facilities (13.1.1.) over time. No change recommended. Feedback to be shared with Vic West Community Association.
Vic West needs more services for homeless/drug/alcohol addictions/PTSD – all prevalent here  Plan for water holding system for community emergency preparedness	Important suggestions but outside the scope of neighbourhood plan.
Allow development/renovations for more daycare spaces in the area.	13.2.2. already supports daycare and eldercare as a use in accordance with zoning. (NEW) 13.2.2. Revised policy to add that facilities should be suitable to scale of immediate surroundings (consistent policy as in other neighbourhood plans)
Recognize the importance of Esquimalt's recreational facilities for Vic West residents	Recreation facilities in Saanich and other Victoria neighbourhoods also used by Vic West residents. Added acknowledgement to introduction.
<b>Arts, Culture and Placemaking</b>	
Formatting incorrect for locations and themes for public art	Re-format 14.2 and 14.3.
Avoid proposing thematic frames for potential projects public art projects as this may change over time. Keep the potential sites, though.	Revise 14.1.6. to reword as "suggestions from the community include" in more narrative (rather than policy-based) format
For the goals and intent statement, is it possible to say 'Encourage art and Placemaking initiatives' and leave out '..that celebrate Vic West's identity'?	Goal was identified through early engagement to reflect what was heard; not intended to limit placemaking and public art initiatives
Add new gateway/ welcome to Vic West signs at key entry points Improve wayfinding signage at all entry points to Vic West	(NEW) 14.1.7. Add new policy to encourage gateway signs, in partnership with community
<b>Action Plan</b>	
Have individual actions reference policy numbers in the plan Add cross-referencing from plan policies to action plan	Added numerical references to Action Plan
Want more clear and detailed plans of actions for each initiative and area, coordination with other levels of government and agencies, and community ownership.	Specific details worked out annually through work plans and based on annual Council budget approvals; would be difficult to provide more detail at this time.
Add introduction to Action Plan to encourage other sources of funding, including community-led efforts such as fundraising, community tax areas	(NEW) 15.2 Added to Action Plan
Under the Action Plan, I disagree strongly with the sentence beginning with: "Create Zoning to support ground-oriented..."	Comment unclear
<b>General / Other Comments</b>	

Methods for continued input and involvement as the plan changes over time	
Questions regarding Lime Bay and other north harbour ferry services and stops? Ferry service from the western communities into Victoria's core? Consider a water taxi service that has more hours for commuter traffic.	Water taxis are operated by private companies. Would be up to individual business to propose service changes.
Plan for water holding system for community emergency preparedness	Water supply currently provided through bottled water.
Confine lighting to site and minimize light pollution (lighting of sky).	Zoning bylaw and Development Permit Area Guidelines address lighting for some types of uses