

We can fully support all that is being presented, please allow us an equal opportunity to do so.

Introduction

The Cook Street Village (CSV) planning process started in April 2016 as part of a proposed Fairfield-Gonzales neighbourhood plan. The result came to Council as part of a Fairfield plan that was reviewed in COW workshops on April 24 and March 1 2018. Council referred the CSV section back to staff with instructions to work with interested neighbourhood groups on revisions defined in the following motions:

- That Council direct staff to amend the plan as follows: 6. Design of Cook Street Village Built Form a. Detailed review of plan policies and guidelines by staff to consider additional adjustments/ revisions based on feedback (e.g. character, setbacks, massing, street wall, shading, impacts to street trees, transitions) through additional urban design analysis. To be incorporated in next version of plan. b. that consideration be given to a two storey street wall with step backs of any additional storeys.
- Direct staff to assign an urban designer to work collaboratively with those interested to produce an integrated and completed set of conceptual drawings of urban design and public realm enhancements for the Cook Street Village that can be used as a basis for more detailed public realm design during phase four of the bike network implementation, while not tying the conceptual design to a preferred bike lane treatment.
- Council direct staff to amend the plan as follows: 7. Design of Cook Street Village Streetscape and Cycling Infrastructure a. Expand design principles in plan based on community feedback (e.g. recognize Lekwungen history, shading, character, lighting, community gathering, slowing traffic, artistic elements) b. Broaden scope of AAA cycling route design to an Integrated Streetscape Plan for Cook Street Village, pending budget approval, to include sidewalks, boulevards, street trees, on-street parking, loading, public spaces and connections to neighbourhood destinations (2021 design; 2022 implementation). c. Parking management strategy for Cook Street Village area identified as short-term action.

NB: At the COW meeting, Councillor Isitt asked the Director of Planning whether; if there were a consensus on a particular topic could it be approved by council prior to the approval of the whole LAP. The response was that if it is council's wish there is nothing that would prevent them from doing so.

City staff then met individually with a number of people involved with potentially interested community groups and then convened a meeting on May 28 attended by 18 community members. This led to the establishing of a steering committee of both staff and community members, and a community-only subgroup as a working committee. That committee developed a vision statement and a set of goals and strategies for discussion with staff, and subsequent revision. (Appendix A)

A design charrette was held on July 26, led by two consulting architects and attended by the working committee, other community members, and city staff. The work of the charrette was presented to the public in five store-front pin-up sessions in the village between August 8 and 14. The sessions were attended by over 400 people, and their response was detailed and strongly positive. (Appendix B)

Written comments and conversations with those who attended the storefront revealed a strong vein of skepticism about the outcome of this process, based on the assumption that whatever is recommended will either be rejected outright or ignored in practice. With that in mind we urge council to approve these recommendations and direct staff to incorporate them into a revised plan.

There is not a person who has visited the village that has not spoken about the significances of the Boulevard Trees and the need to ensure their future health and wellbeing. A practical first measure would be to direct staff to commence the process of identifying them as “significant”.

REPORT TO COUNCIL RELATING TO BUILT FORM COOK STREET VILLAGE
WE SEEK COUNCIL APPROVAL AND REQUEST THAT SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR
HEIGHT, STOREYS, DENSITY, SETBACKS AND STEPBACKS BE ADOPTED INTO THE OCP

The transition from public to private realm has been derived from respectfully consideration of all interested parties including an independent consultant, development community, business community, community at large and recommendation from council and staff. **Using the Draft LAP and the Cook Street Village Guiding Principles** as the template, we believe we have achieved a balance that will:

- **Protect** and renew the street tree canopy
- **Maintain** the sunny and open feeling of the streets
- **Encourage** front patios, display areas, seating and other semi-private space in front of businesses
- **Keep** the eclectic, unique feel of the village
- **Support** and strengthen village businesses as the village changes
- **Widen** sidewalks and create better spaces for pedestrians and those with physical impairments

| | |
|---|--|
| Building Height | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13.5m maximum (to accommodate up to 4 storeys) |
| Density | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 1.5:1 maximum (FSR) OCP allowances for Cook Street as a secondary arterial road • Up to 2.1:1 provided that .4 of the increased density provides permanent secured rental housing |
| Street level uses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial modulated, transparent storefronts in the village boundaries, residential outside. |
| Street front setbacks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For redevelopment using the existing zoning, the use of existing street front footprint (is supported |
| Street front setbacks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2m minimum setbacks will be required for the street frontage that remains unchanged in a rezoning. |
| Street front setbacks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2m minimum plus a 1m average equalling 3m setback will be required for the street frontage that has increased in a rezoning. |
| Upper story stepbacks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stepping back 3m minimum after the second story and all additional storeys • Upper story balconies will not project into the stepbacks |
| Village Designation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properties within the Cook Street Village boundaries not to be considered as strategic locations • Development to be more in keeping with OCP allowances along secondary arterials roads |
| Sidewalks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3m minimum, unobstructed, slab concrete sidewalk will be maintained • Other paving materials or colouring will be used to clearly distinguish the difference between public and private realm |
| Boulevard trees on Cook Street development and building deign | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All boulevard trees are designated “significant” with pre-established clearances above and below ground that meet the requirements for; • hydro 3m clearance around power lines • safe distance from building face and balconies allowing for normal tree maintenance cycles |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintaining healthy, physically balanced and stable trees • Clearances will take into account the existing mature trees and the future growth of younger trees as well |
| Existing Village and residential boundaries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where a development or building extends beyond existing village boundaries there should be both a distinct physical and visual difference in the building • Such differences should be more in keeping with a traditional residential environment |
| Environmental standards and environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that new rezoning developments will achieve sustainability objectives by meeting LEED Gold equivalent and step 2 in the BC Energy Code building efficiency rating. • It is expected that new development will address stormwater management on-site, and demonstrate how it will mitigate stormwater impacts on adjacent properties. • The Village is situated on the Fairfield Lagoon with a Seismic Hazard rating of High to Very High |

REPORT TO COUNCIL RELATING TO PUBLIC REALM COOK STREET VILLAGE FROM THE BUSINESS AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS OF THE (CSV) STEERING COMMITTEE

The public realm in Cook Street Village is marred by a patchwork of relatively untended grass boulevard spaces that are dry and trampled in the summer and muddy in the winter, and offer no protection against compacting of the soils around the roots of the trees. We foresee a public realm that complements local businesses, with wide sidewalks, ample space for patios and displays, well maintained and used boulevards, and a road slow and safe for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians crossing the street.

Specifically, we propose the following Guiding Principles and Design Criteria for strengthening Cook Street as the heart of the neighbourhood. These principles were all presented in the design workshop/charrette held in 26 July 2018, and received substantial support from people who attended the pin-up display of the results of the charrette that was held in the Village in August 2018.

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Boulevard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse uses and soft and hard landscape treatments of the boulevard are encouraged. Possible treatments to beautify boulevards include grass areas, and permeable pavers where soil compaction is likely to occur. Possible uses include bike racks, flower-beds, planters, seating and pedestrian scale lighting for which City funds will be needed. Amenities contributions should be explored as avenues to assist costs. |
| Trees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and replace the chestnut trees that define the character of the Village. Identification of chestnut trees on Cook St as “significant trees” under the Tree Preservation Bylaw is encouraged. |
| Gathering Spaces | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot sequential, temporary street closures at Oliphant, Sutlej, Pendergast and McKenzie to allow for car-free events and to assess relative effectiveness and impact of each closure and whether the preferred one should be made permanent. • Use methods demonstrated in the Tactical Urbanism Kit of Placemaking Victoria. |
| Street Furniture and Outdoor Rooms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate a variety of public art set within local contexts that shall include or reflect indigenous histories. • The installation of low level, pedestrian-scale lighting is encouraged. • In keeping with the eclectic character of the Village, street furniture should be diverse and changeable, associated with adjacent business and possibly making use of the boulevard to create “outdoor rooms.” |
| Roadway Slow and Safe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify the roadway through the Village in ways consistent with established passive speed-reducing practices in order to slow traffic and make the roadway a shared space equally safe for motor vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians transiting to or through the village • Evaluate existing pedestrian crosswalks to incorporate improvements to make drivers more aware of them and pedestrian to feel safe as well as be safe using them. Consider moving the existing |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| | <p>crosswalk at McKenzie further south, which may provide the opportunity for a pedestrian crossing island.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate replacing the traffic light at Oxford with a pedestrian-operated flashing light. <p>> Determine if it would be beneficial to install such lights at other crosswalks including May Street.</p> <p>> Consideration for painting the street to visually narrow the driving lanes and provide improved parking efficiency.</p> |
| Gateways | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish village gateways on Cook with appropriate signs (including speed lights) and artwork, at the north between Pakington and Southgate, and at the south between Park Blvd and Chapman, |
| Connections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify connections from the AAA bikeway on Vancouver to Cook St on Pendergast and/or Oliphant, with a link to Oscar and Sir James Douglas School for children coming from James Bay • Improve connection on the west side of Cook from the Village to Beacon Hill playground with hard surface materials. |
| Traffic Calming | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish pre-gateway pinch points (traffic islands) to slow down traffic approaching the Village between Pakington and Southgate, and at the south end between Park Blvd and Chapman. • Employ additional passive hard and soft landscape and street elements to encourage reduced speeds within the Village core. |
| Parking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of parking in the Village will be undertaken in a dedicated study, but there should be no reduction in current parking capacity. Further study of alternative parking options should be examined as part of a comprehensive passive traffic-calming/speed reducing initiative. |

Appendix (A)

7. Emerging Plan Directions: Urban Villages

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Urban Village Goals | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Retain and strengthen neighbourhood-serving businesses2. Improve the walkability, bikeability and public realm in urban villages3. Encourage design that fits in with the neighbourhood character4. Establish high quality, vibrant public spaces for gathering as part of urban villages |
|----------------------------|---|

1. Cook Street Village Area



Guiding Principles

1. Protect and renew the beautiful street tree canopy
2. Create gateways that signal the entrance to Cook Street Village
3. Widen sidewalks and create better spaces for pedestrians in Cook Street Village
4. Support and strengthen village businesses as the village changes
5. Maintain the sunny and open feeling of the streets
6. Encourage new nearby housing and residents to add customers for village businesses
7. Keep the diverse, unique feel of the village
8. Create a new public gathering place in Cook Street Village
9. Encourage patios, display areas, seating and other semi-private space in front of businesses
10. Slow down traffic through the village
11. Improve bike facilities and bike parking in Cook St Village. Find design solutions that work for businesses.
12. Find on-street parking solutions that work better for residents and businesses
13. Design streets and sidewalks through the village to be used for special events
14. Improve the condition of the boulevards through the village
15. Improve village transit service

June 28, 2018 - POLICIES AND IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE COOK STREET VILLAGE

The numbers in brackets show which of the Cook Street Village Guiding Principles the statement is linked to.

1. (5)(1)(4) Goals: Protect street canopy; maintain sunny and open feeling.
Strategy: Delete any references to “street walls”; our trees provide the walls and enclosure we need. All measures should be taken to protect the boulevard tree canopy and root structure, including providing a minimum clearance of 2 metres between the tree canopy and building facades.
2. (11)(10)(4) Goal: A complete street focus for the Village to provide a slower, safer environment for all.
Strategy: With Vancouver Street, one block west of the village, determined as the primary AAA north-south cycling corridor, delete references to bike lanes in the Village and focus on creating a complete street that provides a safe and slow welcoming environment for AAA cyclists, pedestrians, and those with wheelchairs, scooters and or other mobility issues and concerns coming to and passing through the village. Provide additional external parking for bikes.
3. (5)(4) Goal: Maintain the sunny and open feeling of the streets.
Strategy: Where all or part of a building is in the village. The maximum number of storeys shall be four, the maximum height shall be 13.5 metres and the maximum density shall be up to 1.5:1 FSR. Up to 2.1:1 provided that .4 goes towards permanent rental housing
4. (9) Goal: Encourage patios, display areas, seating and other semi-private display areas in front of businesses,
Strategy: For redeveloping under the existing zoning, the use of existing street front footprint (is supported) -> 2m minimum setbacks will be required for the street frontage that remains unchanged in a rezoning. -> 2m minimum plus a 1m average equalling 3m setback will be required for the street frontage that has increased in a rezoning.
5. (5) Maintain the sunny and open feeling of the streets.
Strategy: Stepping back building face on Cook 3m minimum after the second story and all additional storeys and not allow upper story balconies to project into the setbacks.
6. (7) Goal: Keep the unique, diverse feeling of the Village.
Strategy: All development shall reflect the existing form, fit and eclectic character of the village, using only traditional materials and subtle colouring. There should be both a physical and visual difference in building appearance where a development involves more than one property and expands its street frontage within the existing village boundaries. Consideration should be given to pedestrian passageways between buildings.
7. (4)(7)(11)(14)(13) Goals: Support and strengthen locally-owned Village businesses; design street and sidewalks to be used for special events.
Strategy: New retail spaces should be built and designed to accommodate small locally owned businesses. Similarly, the public space shall be designed to facilitate the accommodation of booths and other temporary retailers from time to time.

8. Goal: To ensure there are minimal levels of practical environmental standards for buildings that may be a part of our village and community for the next 75 to 100 years:
Strategy: It is expected that new rezoned developments will achieve sustainability objectives by meeting LEED Gold equivalent and step 2 in the BC Energy Code building efficiency rating. It is expected that new developments will address stormwater management on-site, and demonstrate how stormwater impacts on adjacent properties will be mitigated.
9. (3) Goal: Widen sidewalks and create better spaces for pedestrians in the Village.
Strategy: All new sidewalks to be a minimum of 3 metres (5 meters where possible) and made with standard poured concrete to clearly distinguish and separate private property and public realm.
10. (4)(11)(12) Goal: Find parking solutions that work better for residents, motorists and cyclists.
Strategy: There should be no loss of on-street parking. A joint City-merchants-residents study should explore innovative ways to increase parking availability, including both public and commercial spaces; e.g. allowing short-term non-resident parking on the first block of selected side streets leading into Cook Street.
11. (10)(4)(11) Goal: Slow down traffic through the Village.
Strategy: Cook Street should be “safe and slow” through the Village, with extra width crosswalks, no raised crosswalks and the minimal use of crossing islands both of which concern public agencies (fire, ambulance, transit) and the businesses community. Speed boards at both entrances to the Village would help to enforce the fact that the Village is a special traffic area. Incorporate a number of visual treatments to encourage the slowing of traffic
12. (4)(11)Goal: Support and strengthen Village businesses as the Village changes.
Strategy: The centre lane through the Village will be retained for now. Any future changes to the centre lane should not take place till there is a consensus between the Business Association, other community representatives and the city.
13. (14)(4)(8)(2)(10) Goal: Improve the streetscape to offer all users more opportunities to enjoy the Village experience.
Strategy: Resources should be allocated to beautify the public realm with pavers, street lighting, seating and other features,, as well as entry features to clearly distinguish the entrances to the Village. Street furniture could be designed to allow multiple uses.
14. (8)(14)(4) Goal: Create new opportunities for public gatherings in the Village.
Strategy: Work with the city not only to identify public gathering space or spaces that could be available full-time or during community events, but also to identify and implement the resources needed to make such locations a reality; e.g. permanent bollards that could be raised or lowered to temporarily close off an adjoining section of a side street.

The list of policies was developed and is supported by:

- aligning with the Community Design Principles in the LAP and CSV Guidelines
- reviewing several years of previous community engagement materials
- reviewing materials derived from facilitated session and walks with CSV Resident Network
- reviewing the draft LAP feedback, edits and facilitated session materials

- reviewing materials from many city policies and related documents
- reviewing materials from the LAP Working Group
- reviewing materials from Mayor and Council and City Staff
- reviewing materials from the previous CSV design workshop
- consulting with the City Staff and the LAP Working Group
- consulting with the Cook Street Village LAP Steering Committee
- consulting with Cook Street Village Business Association (CSVBA)
- consulting with a representative from the FGCA
- consulting with the CSV Resident Network members and Steering Committee
- consulting with the Manager of Operations of BC transit, the Deputy Fire Chief, and the Supervisor of Transportation and Operations with the City of Victoria
- it has been reviewed, revised, and edited several times as a direct result of feedback

APPENDIX B

PinUp PostIt Notes Sorted into Topic Categories

List of Topics: The notes were sorted by key word(s) for each topic and the full PostIt note was copied. A number of PostIt comments appear more than once because they referred to several topics.

- A. Four storey buildings
- B. Setbacks
- C. Stepbacks
- D. Sidewalks
- E. Energy Efficiency, Environment
- F. Trees
- G. Traffic Speeds – slow and safe
- H. Bikes and bike lanes
- I. CAC
- J. Businesses
- K. Deliveries
- L. Boulevards
- M. Public washrooms
- N. Density
- O. Design
- P. Street Closure, Gathering Places
- Q. Public Art
- R. Parking
- S. Centre Lane
- T. Other Points of Interest

Summary assessments of the above categories

- A. Four storey buildings – there's general support for this. Several people expressed concerns about roof top patios and suggested these should be considered a storey
- B. Setbacks – there was some confusion about the difference between setbacks and stepbacks. There is strong support for setbacks and this is about equally divided between support for 2m and 3m.
- C. Stepbacks – clear support for substantial stepbacks at upper stories to keep buildings clear of tree canopy.
- D. Sidewalks – general support seems to be for a three metre sidewalk to allow for mobility devices, and avoid bottlenecks because of signs etc. Some remarks about weather protection, canopies.
- E. Centre lane – mostly support to keep it open
- F. Energy, LEED etc – support for a more rigorous standard. Comment about step code minimum level 3-4 was from an energy consultant who thinks Victoria's Climate Action Plan is weak compared with Vancouver. Otherwise refer to LEED and don't know about the Step Code and climate action plan.
- G. Trees – lots of support for protecting trees, both roots and canopy with setbacks etc. Best comment: “YAY setbacks! Room for connections. More trees = more happiness. I love the added green space.”

- H. Traffic speeds, slow and safe – a major concern is to slow traffic, though a few disagree. What these comments do not show well, but was raised in conversation, is the problem of speeding north of Oscar and south of May on Cook. A number raised issues about adjacent streets and need to consider impact of slowing traffic on Cook on those.
- I. Bike and bike lanes – mostly support for no bike lanes on Cook and bike route on Vancouver. The idea of a shared car/bike space in CSV seems acceptable to most. Some questions about the impact of the bike route on Vancouver. More bike racks.
- J. CAC – just three comments critical of current process.
- K. Businesses – not many comments, expressing a variety of views.
- L. Deliveries – general recognition of need to pay attention to how deliveries are made to businesses e.g centre lane, receiving areas, turning movements.
- M. Boulevards – some positive comments about outdoor rooms, also comments about need to protect some grass. I read these as acknowledging that a variety of boulevard treatments will be acceptable – some pavers, some seating, some grass.
- N. Public washrooms – something the steering committee did not consider. Clearly very important for some.
- O. Density – comments are mixed, most suggest restricting to low FSR, but a few also argue for increasing density to support businesses. My sense is that people acknowledge the need for higher densities, but disagree about how much is appropriate.
- P. Design – not much specific but general support for the sort of design proposals that were shown in the drawings
- Q. Street closures/gathering places – there was a lobby from Oliphant residents (most indicated they live on Oliphant) about a permanent closure west of Rexall. More generally the idea of closing a side street is regarded favourably but the assumption seems to be that this will be permanent rather than temporary. Comments suggest a need to review the link for school children crossing to and from James Bay to Sir James Douglas – whether it should be Oliphant to Oxford, or along Vancouver to Pendergast and Oscar.
- R. Public Art – several suggestions about need to incorporate public art, First Nations art, murals, possibly change a street name to reflect First Nations.
- S. Parking – a few comments, mostly suggesting need to maintain parking and specifically to get rid of charges in the Rexall parking lot. The suggestion about plug-ins for mobility scooters etc is interesting because it is something the City might have to consider more generally.
- T. Other comments of interest – There are two types of these: a) unspecified remarks about the entire display – there are at least 20 of these without any other comment. Overall the responses were very positive. b) One-off comments that can't be obviously classified, suggesting for instance that the ideas of "strategic location" and "large urban village" should be removed from the OCP, and that attention should be given to First Nations past and present.

All Responses:

A. Four storey buildings –

1. No to any more 4 storey buildings on Cook St/in the village. They would detract enormously from the environment/atmosphere that attracts people to the village. No to 4 storeys (too high) in the village
2. 4 storeys is too high for a village. 2 stories should be the maximum
3. No more than 4 storey sat most. We have a good village – don't ruin it
4. 6 Storeys too high for this area 3-4 stories
5. 3 or 4 storey max with mandatory 3m setback
6. 4 stories max
7. Fully support this vision especially 4 storey max with setbacks at 2,3. No dedicated bike lanes

8. For larger buildings the wider setback at street level helps. It is important to not go over 4 storeys. There should be setbacks to allow light for the trees.
9. Keep it to 4 storeys not 5 or 6
10. Limit to four storeys max
11. 6 storeys too high for this area. 3-4 storeys
12. 2-3 storeys would be better but 4 max for sure!
13. Do not ruin Victoria. Do not make it look like Vancouver. Keep lots of green space. Do not go over 3-4 storeys
14. 4 storey max. 3rd and 4th setback.
15. 4 storeys max
16. 2 storey maximum

Comments from Comment sheets about height (paraphrased)

1. Keep new buildings a 4 storeys
2. 2 storey maximum
3. Roof top patios are another floor.
4. Keep to 4 floors. FSR 1.5-2.1
5. 4 storeys max plus setbacks
6. 3 storeys
7. 4 storeys max
8. 4 storeys good, 3 better.
9. 3 storeys
10. Limits need to be strictly enforced
11. 4 to 5 storeys with setback at upper levels
12. No more than 4 storeys.

B. Setbacks/Patios [NOTE: there is confusion about difference between setback and stepback and “setback” is sometimes used to refer to “stepback”]

1. 3m sidewalk, 2m setback + NO bike lanes, more public gathering spaces. Support LEED Gold building standards
2. Like the distinction of materials of setback/sidewalk and gathering places
3. Pic-A-Flic development needs stepbacks, setbacks that meet specifications outlined here
4. 3 or 4 stories max with mandatory 3m setback
5. I support setbacks as long as there activating uses at grade.
6. PROTECT large trees, WATER them and maintain setbacks
7. The setbacks and terracing shown here are attractive. What I saw at 2 meetings for the Pic a Flic redevelopment looked nothing like this. I trust these changes will be required before full approval.
8. Setbacks are critical to maintain character of village [Added comment: and trees/crown)
9. Oliphant Develop. Needs setback. Developers must fit existing trees.
10. Maintain setbacks - especially between buildings (firebreaks)
11. This looks like a village we can be proud of. Ensure setbacks and terracing is enforced on all future development incl Pic-A-flic. No rooftop terraces overlooking single family dwellings
12. Wide 3m setbacks are great! Allows people to stroll and patronize local businesses
13. Above 2 stories serious setbacks needed to keep scale on street and protect trees. I support 3-5 metres.
14. I support 2m building setback but need 3-5 m after 2nd floor for both character and trees.
15. Like the clear delineation between setbacks and sidewalks
16. 6 storeys OK if serious setbacks after 2 storeys and increasing as you go higher
17. No dedicated bike lane. Density FSR 1.5-2.1, and rentals, 2m building setback
18. Keep the Village sunny!! Setbacks 5m at 2 storeys

19. Glad to hear of reasonable “setback” and setback proposals
20. Keep public property spaces distinct from private setbacks required. We need both.
21. Fully support this vision especially 4 story max with setbacks at 2,3. No dedicated bike lanes
22. NEED 2 m setback, trees saved, upper floors stepped back to ensure the health of trees and improve sightlines
23. Three meter setback for all new developments to make way for Place Making Transient Kiosk vendors
24. Trees need light + space so do people. Setback please
25. For smaller buildings to be replaced less street setback is OK IF the new building is not too large (3 or less stories) and setback
26. For larger buildings the wider setback at street level helps. It is important to not go over 4 stories. There should be setbacks to allow light for the trees
27. 2 or 3m setback is OK
28. 3 metre setbacks allow for scooters.
29. I support 2 metre building setback.
30. I support 2.0 m setbacks
31. I support 3-5m setbacks for trees
32. 3 m setbacks on new buildings
33. The key to development of the village is to keep the ‘open’ feeling. Not too high with good setbacks.
34. YAY setbacks! Room for connections. More trees = more happiness. I love the added green space
35. Yes to patios, display areas, seating areas. Creates ambiance and community.
36. Keep wide pedestrian area w/ room for patios
37. Stop approving patios that impede pedestrians and cause bottlenecks accessibility is a must
38. 3m minimum. Stop approving patio licenses that impeded the accessible sidewalk width
39. Stop giving patio licenses that impede on accessible sidewalks
40. Pic A Flic development needs to conform to setbacks identified here
41. Setbacks as suggested very important - need room for tree growth. And need sunlight in the village
42. More setbacks for Pic A Flic development and add setbacks to accommodate trees
43. I support 3-5 m setbacks on 3rd/4th floors. Need light, room for trees
44. This looks like a village we can be proud of. Ensure setbacks and terracing is enforced on all future developments. Pic A Flic no rooftop terraces overlooking single family dwellings
45. Each storey needs to be set back

Comments from comment sheets about Future Building (paraphrased)

1. Keep new buildings a 4 storeys
2. Concerns that the transition to higher density will be too quick, and taller buildings will come through variances
3. 2 storey maximum
4. No more boxes. They look awful
5. Roof top patios are another floor.
6. Keep to 4 floors. FSR 1.5-2.1
7. 4 stories max plus setbacks
8. 3 stories
9. 4 stories max
10. 4 stories good, 3 better.
11. 3 storeys
12. Limits need to be strictly enforced

13. 4 to 5 storeys with setback at upper levels
14. No more than 4 storeys.

C. Stepbacks

1. Stepbacks at 2nd and 3rd stories mandatory
2. Stepback for upper story - 4 or 5 floors max with stepback
3. Glad to hear of reasonable "setback" and stepback proposals
4. 3 meter setbacks 5m stepback after 2nd story - 3 meter sidewalks, DENSITY 1.8 FSR
5. I support this option (stepbacks) - trees need space for roots, so should have porous paving.
6. Protect the trees with 3-5 m stepbacks
7. I totally support this look for CSV. In particular: 2m building set(back) private business space; 3m sidewalk, public space; 3-5 m stepback after 2nd floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)
8. Keep trees. Setbacks sound like a great solution
9. 3-5m stepbacks are the only way to protect our Cook st trees. Make it policy
10. More setbacks for Pic A Flic development and add stepbacks to accommodate trees

D. Sidewalks

1. [On sidewalks] Plan shows 1.0m given over to sign boards etc with only 2.0m "clear zone". Very tight for pedestrians and mobility devices to share.
2. Residential properties - keep bushes and plants back off sidewalks. Especially with thorns
3. 3m sidewalk, 2m setback + NO bike lanes, more public gathering spaces. Support LEED Gold building standards.
4. Create a three block wide sidewalk and take out the traffic lights
5. Like the distinction of materials of setback/sidewalk and gathering places
6. Seating and open spaces away or not impeding sidewalks. Good Idea
7. If you allow minimum 3m sidewalks less likelihood of bottleneck. Happens all the time.
8. Keep sidewalks clear - accessibility + mobility issues
9. Private to public sidewalk - good setbacks
10. Like the clear delineation between setbacks and sidewalks
11. Sidewalks wide enough so motorized wheelchairs can pass one another
12. I like the 2m, 3m, 4.5 m combination for street level sidewalk
13. 3m sidewalk is good
14. 3 meter setbacks 5m stepback after 2nd story - 3 meter sidewalks, DENSITY 1.8 FSR
15. Please consider a city owned parking lot to replace Cook St roadside parking through commercial area. This would allow for wider sidewalk, greater public area, outdoor eating etc and dedicated bike lanes, sidewalks safer for mobility devices
16. Min 2m. You must have accessible sidewalks with 3m
17. 3m minimum. Stop approving patio licenses that impeded the accessible sidewalk width.
18. Setbacks are crucial for accessible sidewalks
19. Stop giving patio licenses that impede on accessible sidewalks
20. I support 3m sidewalk I totally support this look for CSV. In particular: 2m building set(back) private business space; 3m sidewalk, public space; 3-5 m stepback after 2nd floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)
21. Building setbacks to allow sunlight to streets. Separate café seating from sidewalks
22. Minimum 3m. Our population is aging and will increase - naturally accessibility needs will increase.
23. Winter and rain shelter needed

24. Absolutely need street lights like they have near Castle. Good for pedestrian flow.
25. Minimum 3m sidewalks – 5 m where possible. Great idea/plan. People/pedestrians priority.
26. Even sidewalks “uniform” “repair” !
27. Setting buildings back to the is visual difference between public and private space. Wide sidewalks great idea.
28. Permeable paving and sidewalks

Comments from Comment sheets about sidewalks

1. Wide sidewalks are needed
2. Do not impeded sidewalks
3. Keep merchandise off sidewalks

E. Energy Efficiency, LEED etc

1. LEED Gold standards are a must
2. Step code minimum 3-4 for commercial/MURB and 4-5 Single Family
3. 3m sidewalk, 2m setback + NO bike lanes, more public gathering spaces. Support LEED Gold building standards
4. Equal to LEED Gold or better
5. Yes – I support LEED Gold
6. I support required LEED Gold equivalent standards but it needs to be enforced
7. LEED is for look and little else. Passive is about lowering emissions
8. LEED certification is OVERRATED. Just be eco-friendly

F. Trees

1. No streetwalls. Trees create and shape the space.
2. Please keep the trees - the green is so beautiful
3. Loss of light and loss of tree canopy at Cook and Oliphant are significant and it's mid-summer. What will it be like in winter? Points 3 and 4 (on Strategies) are important
4. I support closing Oliphant permanently west of Rexall parking to ensure the extra traffic from the corner development moves onto Cook and not up Oliphant. We on Oliphant now look onto this huge monstrosity – have lost our tree/sky view looking east – closing Oliphant would be a nice concession to restore some peacefulness.
5. I love the ‘green’ gathering space corner at Cook and Park – do not remove any trees. (Oliphant Ave resident)
6. I trust that the “green” (Park and Cook proposal) does not mean the removal of trees in the corner of the park.
7. PROTECT large trees, WATER them and maintain setbacks
8. Thinking about protecting large trees in essential
9. Setbacks are critical to maintain character of village [Added comment: and trees/crown)
10. Oliphant Develop. Needs setback. Developers must fit existing trees.
11. I support protecting tree roots.
12. Buildings should fit trees
13. Pic-A-Flic leave the trees in place. Buildings should fit the trees.
14. Above 2 stories serious setbacks needed to keep scale on street and protect trees. I support 3-5 metres.
15. I support 2m building setback but need 3-5 m after 2nd floor for both character and trees.
16. I support 2 metre clearance around trees
17. 2 m clearance around trees
18. Trees are Cook Street
19. No idling” signage to save trees.

20. Love seating areas (around the trees)
21. Keep the trees
22. Let' s keep the village' s oldest tree! (The one Pic-A Flic) threatens
23. Great! Save the trees!
24. Maintain trees and canopy. Put power lines underground.
25. Look after the trees?? Do foundation excavations need to be right to the edge of the property?
Effect on tree roots.
26. Need more protection of trees on private property
27. Trees need light + space so do people. Setback please.
28. Climate change - different trees may need to be planted
29. For larger buildings the wider setback at street level helps. It is important to not go over 4 stories. There should be setbacks to allow light for the trees.
30. I support this option (stepbacks) - trees need space for roots, so should have porous paving.
31. I support 3-5m setbacks for trees
32. Protect the trees with 3-5 m stepbacks
33. Protect the trees and the light in the village
34. I support 3m clearance and balconies 2m from trees
35. There must be insistence that trees and landscaping are kept especially the special tree. Climate change
36. YAY setbacks! Room for connections. More trees = more happiness. I love the added green space.
37. Great ideas to protect the trees - thanks!
38. 3-5m stepbacks are the only way to protect our Cook st trees. Make it policy!
39. Keep all existing trees
40. Keep trees. Setbacks sound like a great solution
41. Buildings to accommodate trees not the other way around
42. More setbacks for Pic A Flic development and add stepbacks to accommodate trees
43. Protect the trees - they are Cook St.
44. Our Cook St Village trees are our treasure. Protect them! I support setback
45. I support 3-5 m setbacks on 3rd/4th floors. Need light, room for trees
46. I like the 3rd floor setback for daylight, trees and street scale
47. 2 metre clearance around trees
48. Need to set buildings back in a graduated way to accommodate the horizontal growth of the trees
49. Protect the trees

G. Traffic speeds – slow and safe [NOTE : Slow and safe got 3 unqualified YES! postits]

1. The speeds limit on Park Blvd 50km/hr. Did you know?
2. Slow down traffic through village all the way down to Dallas – enforce 30KM/hr
3. Slow Enough Already
4. Totally agree with street focus to promote slower, safer space/community
5. More crosswalks please and maybe speed bumps to slow traffic.
6. Keep parking on both sides of Oxford St. It slows traffic very well.
7. Slow Traffic. Yes!
8. Slow traffic please
9. Photo Radar or smiley face radar to slow Cook St traffic
10. Definitely need to slow traffic through village > Dallas Rd Speed Reader? Pedestrian Controlled lights?

11. Need to also slow traffic on Cook to Dallas. People leaving the village “gateway” at May will think they can speed up in front of a playground (added comment: “absolutely slow it down”)
12. Yes – slower speed limit
13. Address speeding after Village. People “floor it” as they have to drive slow through village. Pedestrians not safe
14. Need physical prompts to slow traffic – raised pedestrian crossings etc.
15. Slowing not Closing
16. Traffic already slow enough. DO NOT DO MORE. It is fine as it is.
17. Traffic needs to be ultra-slow – 10 km/ hr to share w/cyclists
18. Design to slow down traffic is needed. Narrower lanes, speed signs mixture of bikes and cars good
19. I totally support this look for CSV. In particular: 2m building set(back) private business space; 3m sidewalk , public space; 3-5 m stepback after 2nd floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting ; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)
20. I like the street plan (park-lane-turn) at reduced speed.
21. Speed limit reduced to 25 km/hr thru village?
22. Yes. Speed bumps on Vancouver – too fast now.
23. Attention to South Park School Students’ safety – playground crossing and both streets speeding (sad emoji)
24. At the playground right by the crosswalk a car is allowed to park so you can’t see a child or adult walking or running out. This is not safe.
25. YES! Please do things to reduce speed on Vancouver. Getting very dangerous
26. Do something about speeding inattention on Cook St
27. Is there any enforcement of speed limits?
28. Speed zones are meaningless without enforcement
29. Reduce speeds on streets to 30Km or below
30. Not looking forward to the increased traffic and speeders on Linden
31. The speed limit on Park Blvd 50km/hr. Did you know?
32. Yes – slower speed limit
33. Yes – slower speed limit
34. Have we thought of a speed zone that is consistent within the village – say 30Km
35. Cook St Village speed signs (all the same – say 30Km)
36. Higher density = safety issues for kids and pets. Surrounding communities will require lower speed limits 20km/hr
37. Speed bumps on all neighbourhood streets
38. Cook Street needs more traffic calming beginning at Southgate. 30 kms is ignored and traffic speeds through crosswalks.
39. Vancouver from Southgate to Park is now a shortcut with many speeders. Need traffic calming – think a bike lane is a good solution (Resident of 300 block Vancouver) More crosswalks please and maybe speed bumps to slow traffic.
40. Would like to see some thinking and planning for reduced speed limits in surrounding areas/streets. More density is less safe.
41. Please eliminate the centre lane- traffic density and speed don’t require it. Put a central green boulevard in its place.
42. Need to achieve major reduction in vehicle volumes on Vancouver to be AAA - need diverters to prevent Southgate to Fort shortcut
43. Think about Impact (with diagram showing circles with CSV in the centre)
44. A featured narrowing of street at south end of Village
45. I like the street plan (park-lane-turn) at reduced speed.
46. More public seating. More slower speed signs and “you are entering the village” on different streets entering the village.

47. Slow down traffic but don't impede it
48. Speed bumps!
49. Signage to announce entry into village – posted speed limit
50. Lower speed limit on Park Blvd to 30km; it is currently 50 km.
51. Enforce 30kph speed in Cook St Village

Comments from Comment Sheets about Slow and Safe (paraphrased)

1. CSV is already a bottleneck
2. Concerns that Linden will become the N-S preferred route
3. Emergency vehicles should be a top priority
4. It's already very slow
5. Make sure that sightlines are not blocked by signs
6. Need to leave a wide street, but pinch points are good
7. Prioritize people not cars
8. How will slow and safe impact adjacent streets?
9. Slow cars down
10. The village needs a city owned parking lot
11. Reasonable pedestrian space is needed
12. Slow down traffic
13. Yes. Anything that slows and reduces traffic in and around the village
14. I would love to see buses only through CSV
15. Ramps for level pedestrian crossings are needed.

H. Bikes and Bike Lanes

1. No bike lanes on Cook
2. Do Not put bike lanes on Cook
3. Do not put bike lanes on Cook Street – further develop Vancouver as needed
4. Vancouver is difficult terrain for older cyclists. Cook St is a much gentler slope
5. Move Bikes away from Cook St to Vancouver St
6. Make Vancouver a Bike Route.
7. Addition covered bike parking
8. We need ashtrays and more garbage cans and places to park bikes
9. Bike Parking
10. Combine Bike Parking and Bus Shelters
11. Would like designated bike lanes
12. Linden as designated bike route for NE bike traffic
13. No bike lanes on Cook
14. Vancouver from Southgate to Park is now a shortcut with many speeders. Need traffic calming – think a bike lane is a good solution (Resident of 300 block Vancouver)
15. Bike lanes need to be one direction on side of road, No Separated 2 way bike lanes! They are a death trap!
16. Bike lanes should on Cook Street and should be both directions. They are not death traps.
17. Yes to Cook St bike lanes. Opposition to bike lanes is irrational; based on fear and ignorance.
18. Strongly opposed to bike lanes on Vancouver
19. Greatly opposed to bike lanes on Vancouvers St it is already too tight with parking on both sides.
20. No Shared lane with bikes!
21. Would be great to have separated bike lane
22. Please no designated bike lanes
23. Bike Parking?

24. I think the painted zone next to the parking will like a bike lane and some drivers will expect bikes to move over.
25. This eliminates any need to separate bikes and cars – love it!
26. Bike lane on Vancouver not Cook
27. Bike lane belongs on Vancouver
28. 3m sidewalk, 2m setback + NO bike lanes, more public gathering spaces. Support LEED Gold building standards.
29. Get serious about alternative transportation. Put bike lanes on Cook, not relegated to hillier Vancouver.
30. Vancouver St – nothing fancy for bike lanes – just remove parking from two sides to one side.
31. Covered bike facility
32. No designated bike lanes on Cook. Vancouver St painted bike lanes NOT like Pandora and Cook [YES]
33. Encourage bikes on Vancouver st but DO NOT put in bike lanes
34. With bike lanes on Vancouver st where are the cars supposed to go? It's already a problem.
35. So when I want to get home and to bike Cook St to get there where do I go? Cook St is the thoroughfare and need bike lanes not parking.
36. Support Pendergast no through traffic – bikes and locals only
37. Looks good. No bike lanes please (I'm a cyclist)
38. No bike lanes
39. Design to slow down traffic is needed. Narrower lanes, speed signs mixture of bikes and cars good
40. No dedicated bike land. Density FSR 1.5-2.1, and rentals, 2m building setback
41. I support no bike lanes on Cook
42. Bike friendly but no bike lane
43. I support 2m set back and bike lanes on Vancouver
44. Bike parking > ensure enough at least what now exists – incentive to business to build.
45. Fully support this vision especially 4 story max with setbacks at 2,3. No dedicated bike lanes
46. Please consider a city owned parking lot to replace Cook St roadside parking through commercial area. This would allow for wider sidewalk, greater public area, outdoor eating etc and dedicated bike lanes, sidewalks safer for mobility devices
47. No bike lanes on Cook!! Get serious about safety.
48. Retain parking. Bikes/car can share. Maintain centre lane. Fire, police, delivery, service, safety, Suggest making Cook St a pedestrian precinct; 3-4 blocks, from 9am to 3pm daily. Bike and wheelchair access on lanes.
49. I support the design. I do not want bike lanes on cook St
50. No Bike Lanes needed in a 30 km/hr zone
51. Suggest making Cook St a pedestrian precinct; 3-4 blocks, from 9am to 3pm daily. Bike and wheelchair access on lanes.
52. I support the design. I do not want bike lanes on cook St
53. Retain parking. Bikes/car can share. Maintain centre lane. Fire, police, delivery, service, safety,
54. Love the shared street concept It's a win-win-win for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.
55. Yes to Vancouver as designated for bike traffic not Cook
56. Need lots of bike parking
57. CSV needs a bike shop. Any incentives?

I. CAC

1. Without a proper CAC/amenities policy none of this will be achieved
2. CAC needs better policy – money must come back to community
3. The means and cost to accomplish these improvements should be obtained through developer contributions. Where is the plan?

4. Make sure the City gets their DCCs from developers

J. Businesses

1. Agree Encourage locally owned
2. Do Not discourage national or foreign owned businesses
3. Please do discourage national and foreign owned businesses
4. Sorry I don't trust Cook St business owners. They are opposed to anything that doesn't serve their interests. Their views are often shortsighted
5. 6 storeys on Cook Str to increase density and support local businesses
6. Good to add more seating not tied to business – good for anyone to use
7. Wide 3m setbacks are great! Allows people to stroll and patronize local businesses
8. Bike parking > ensure enough at least what now exists – incentive to business to build.
9. I totally support this look for CSV. In particular: 2m building set(back) private business space; 3m sidewalk , public space; 3-5 m stepback after 2nd floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting ; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)

K. Deliveries

1. Please consider dedicated RECEIVING AREA for freight deliveries off road. Existing problem at Sutlej and Cook with freight trucks and local traffic in conflict. Don't repeat this and make problem worse with new builds
2. Centre lane is used regularly by delivery trucks
3. Retain parking. Bikes/car can share. Maintain centre lane. Fire, police, delivery, service, safety,
4. Lane widths – do not make the mistake of Pandora and Fort (not enough room for buses and large delivery vehicles)
5. I totally support this look for CSV. In particular: 2m building set(back) private business space; 3m sidewalk , public space; 3-5 m stepback after 2nd floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting ; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)
6. Centre lane is used regularly by delivery trucks

L. Boulevards

1. Please eliminate the centre lane- traffic density and speed don't require it. Put a central green boulevard in its place
2. I support the 4.5 m boulevard, good social area
3. I support the 4.5m boulevard
4. I totally support this look for CSV. In particular: 2m building set(back) private business space; 3m sidewalk , public space; 3-5 m stepback after 2nd floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting ; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)
5. Keep the grass
6. Who will maintain these? Does city have an enforcement plan or a budget after installation? (about planters)
7. Maintain boulevards as green space
8. Variety of public rooms offer exciting visual draws to pedestrians.
9. Yes (to outdoor rooms)
10. Love Outdoor rooms!
11. Don't remove all of the grass. It will become so much hotter with all that pavement.

M. Public Washroom

1. Please add a public washroom
2. No public washroom? That's odd....
3. Please add a public washroom

4. We must plan for public toilets with this Cook St plan. It is very important
5. Public unisex toilet facilities

N. Density

1. Please eliminate the centre lane- traffic density and speed don't require it. Put a central green boulevard in its place
2. Would like to see some thinking and planning for reduced speed limits in surrounding areas/streets. More density is less safe.
3. Density should be max 2.1 FSR
4. 6 storeys on Cook Str to increase density and support local businesses
5. Allow greater density along Oliphant Ave
6. Allow greater density west of Cook St
7. Allow great density along Oliphant west of Cook.
8. Higher density = safety issues for kids and pets. Surrounding communities will require lower speed limits 20km/hr
9. The design guidelines look good, but I'd like 5-6 stories . Need the density
10. No dedicated bike lane. Density FSR 1.5-2.1, and rentals, 2m building setback.
11. Density 1.5-2.1 please
12. 3 meter setbacks 5m stepback after 2nd story – 3 meter sidewalks, DENSITY 1.8 FSR
13. Make buildings fit existing trees. Reduce density for Pic-A-Flic Development
14. The vast differences between this lovely “gentle density” presentation and what is actually being approved does not create trust of our elected representatives. “Watch what they do, not what they say.”

O. Design

1. Definitely emphasize design that fits with character/ambience of village
2. The design guidelines look good, but I'd like 5-6 stories . Need the density
3. We agree. Adopt this design
4. ADOPT THIS DESIGN
5. I support the design
6. Design to slow down traffic is needed. Narrower lanes, speed signs mixture of bikes and cars good
7. Great design – thanks everyone
8. Maintain designing look and feel in the village
9. Add public sculptures and First Nations art/designs
10. I support the design. I do not want bike lanes on cook St
11. Colours. You gotta allow people a full palette.
12. I fully support these design guidelines

P. Street closures for gathering places

1. As a resident of Oliphant I wholeheartedly support the closures. Let Oliphant be the pilot for permanent closure and enhance it as a cycling walking corridor to the park.
2. Street closures will affect other streets who will be forced to take up traffic loads [Yes (written on post-note)]
3. I'm not sure if I support the road closures. Traffic will move Heywood from Cook etc.
4. No to closure of Oliphant St. It will just push traffic to neighbouring streets.
5. Only 1 street closure, if any/
6. (On street closures and plazas) – Yes to this
7. (On street closures and plazas) – Yes I like this
8. (On street closures and plazas) – Do the same on Oliphant west of Rexall [Yes]

9. As a resident of Oliphant and the Village I whole heartedly support this. Let Oliphant be the pilot for permanent closure.
10. Yes- I support this.
11. Permanent CHANGES or permanent CLOSURE – stop with manipulative vocabulary ‘improvements’
12. I support the concept of temporary closures to learn how the spaces work
13. Limit Street closure or else it causes more traffic pattern on smaller streets
14. 3m sidewalk, 2m setback + NO bike lanes, more public gathering spaces. Support LEED Gold building standards.
15. Like the distinction of materials of setback/sidewalk and gathering places
16. I love the ‘green’ gathering space corner at Cook and Park – do not remove any trees. (Oliphant Ave resident)
17. Permanent CHANGES or permanent CLOSURE – stop with manipulative vocabulary ‘improvements’
18. Close Oliphant west of Rexall. The trucks are rumbling the houses like crazy. Calm it down and keep trucks in commercial parking lots only.
19. Yes! Close Oliphant west of Rexall – (resident of Oliphant)
20. Close Oliphant west of Rexall. The trucks roar down Oliphant in a big hurry!
21. Do not close Oliphant to Cook Street
22. Do not close Oliphant to Cook Street
23. Do not close Oliphant to Cook Street
24. Strongly opposed to closing Oliphant to traffic
25. No to closure of Oliphant St. It will just push traffic to neighbouring streets.
26. Close off Oliphant at the Rexall parking lot!
27. Yes, Yes, yes. Close Oliphant west of Rexall (Oliphant resident)
28. Closing Oliphant may promote bicycles to go from Oliphant to Oscar via Cook St. In this sense closing Pendergast is better
29. I would love to see this (closing Oliphant west of Rexall) somehow work
30. I support closing Oliphant permanently west of Rexall parking to ensure the extra traffic from the corner development moves onto Cook and not up Oliphant. We on Oliphant now look onto this huge monstrosity – have lost our tree/sky view looking east – closing Oliphant would be a nice concession
31. Yes, please close off Oliphant west of Rexall. Pedestrian safety and Accessibility (resident of Oliphant)
32. Yes, Yes, Yes, and please close Oliphant west of Rexall. It is a gem of a street and the last of its kind between the village and the park. This will enhance the proposed AAA routing. Save Oliphant before it is lost forever (I am a resident of Cook Street Village)
33. Close Oliphant west of Rexall. The trucks are rumbling the houses like crazy. Calm it down and keep trucks in commercial parking lots only.
34. Support Pendergast no through traffic – bikes and locals only
35. Yes for Pendergast>
36. Like closing for “events” but permanent road closures may create traffic congestions
37. Mixed info – Oscar closed here but ‘greenway’ on display on right
38. I understand linking to park node, but think very carefully about Oliphant
39. NO don’t close Oliphant to traffic!!
40. No, No, No. Please don’t close Oliphant to traffic. All our streets are gems and will have increased traffic if Oliphant is closed

Comments from comment sheets about gathering places/public space (paraphrased)

1. Conundrum – mobility and access versus simulation of village
2. Concerns about adequate spaces for mobility devices
3. Occasional street festivals are a good ideas
4. No designated bike lanes and more parking
5. Temporary closures are good; get public input after each one
6. Strong support for outdoor rooms and places for gathering and public art
7. Keep merchandise off sidewalks
8. Cook Street has an opportunity to be a really great mixed use community and the publics spaces will facilitate this.

Q. Public Art

1. Create an Arts advocate position to assist in creating cultural spaces where we live.
2. A healthy culture includes diverse perspectives and narratives. Plan to make space for diverse income, age, vocation, abilities, and space for the Arts.
3. Curated art murals between 325-318 (see Vancouver Mural Festival)
4. Yes to Public Art (see Oak Bay)
5. Add public sculptures and First Nations art/designs
6. Change one or more street names to reflect First Nations
7. Public Art % of building mandatory for all developments
8. Most artists exist below the official poverty line; seniors too. Let's keep it affordable for all.
9. It is important to recognize that the arts and creative endeavours need space to connect and tell the story of the people. If the rents are high the artists will leave.

R. Parking

1. Parking is critical. Allow 2 hr on side streets
2. I support limiting building heights, increasing setbacks and creating safe parking options.
3. Retain parking. Bikes/car can share. Maintain centre lane. Fire, police, delivery, service, safety
4. Put power lines under the parking lanes
7. Do NOT pander to the automobile re parking capacity
8. Please consider a city owned parking lot to replace Cook St roadside parking through commercial area. This would allow for wider sidewalk, greater public area, outdoor eating etc and dedicated bike lanes, sidewalks safer for mobility devices
9. Vancouver St – nothing fancy for bike lanes – just remover parking from two sides to one side
10. Let's reclaim pay parking behind Rexall and make it free short-term parking e.g. under building on Sutlej should be promoted to alleviate non-residents parking in residential only zones.
11. We need a plan to gradually reduce parking and encourage walking and biking
12. Add side streets parking – keep Cook St parking
13. Greatly opposed to bike lanes on Vancouver St it is already too tight with parking on both sides.
14. Keep parking on both sides of Oxford St. It slows traffic very well.
15. Restore carpark behind med clinic and pharmacy to public use
16. Add wheelchair, scooter plug-ins.

S. Centre lane

1. Please eliminate the centre lane- traffic density and speed don't require it. Put a central green boulevard in its place
2. Keep the centre turn lane
3. I like the use of visual cues for the centre turning lane. Useful to have this lane.
4. Centre lane is used regularly by delivery trucks
5. Retain parking. Bikes/car can share. Maintain centre lane. Fire, police, delivery, service, safety

6. I totally support this look for CSV. In particular: 2m building set(back) private business space; 3m sidewalk , public space; 3-5 m stepback after 2nd floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting ; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)
7. Centre lane is used regularly by delivery trucks

T. Other Points of interest

1. Fully support this Vision – should be a model for other LAP groups
2. A very good set of goals and strategies. Strongly support.
3. All very good and important goals to maintain the village feel
4. Definitely maintain sunny open feeling of the village. This is what makes it unique.
5. Love Outdoor rooms!
[There are about twenty unspecified positive comments like this – though some appear to refer to particular drawings. There's almost nothing negative]
6. Remove “Strategic Location” from OCP
7. Remove the term “strategic location” from the OCP
8. Remove “large urban village” designation
9. Ensure the goals are fiscally responsible
10. A penalty system for Council when decisions are contrary to the new plan
11. Nothing about diverse housing, social housing, rental, low income
12. New = expensive; old = cheaper. Keep our old stock of housing.
13. Any plan is useless if developers are allowed so many variances
14. Street furniture should not allow sleeping
15. No Overnight Camping signs in village. Park Blvd- NO signs
16. I like additional seating and hang out areas, but how do we ensure it doesn't become a sleeping area for homeless after dark?
17. NO AirBnB. Equals Rentals + No densification
18. Louis Riel and John A MacDonald in one these courtyards (gathering places) and both their stories – good, bad and ugly
19. No to John A McD in Cook Street Village please
20. No more chicken hutches
21. Be sure to respect Beacon Hill Park Trust
22. This looks like a village we can be proud of. Ensure setbacks and terracing is enforced on all future development incl Pic-A-flic. No rooftop terraces overlooking single family dwellings.
23. Like idea of painted buffer (like Luke Ramsey)
24. Better to use paint than cement
25. Love the idea of a presence of First Nations past and present
26. Definitely adding First Nation peoples history is a great idea. Really support this idea.
27. Use Greater Victoria Placemaking Network's criteria citizen expertise for tactical urbanism
28. A Transport Artery and a Sleepy Village?? A Paradox.

Other Comments from the Comment Sheets of Interest (paraphrased)

1. What about affordable housing?
2. Lovely village as it is. Don't increase density.
3. I am saddened by the loss of trees, and can offer a chestnut tree to donate to the city (provides phone number).
4. Densification and change are inevitable. Either manage them or lose control.
5. Accessibility is crucial (i.e space for mobility devices)
6. Do not allow variances – stick to the rules

7. Cook Street has an opportunity to be a really great mixed use community and the public spaces will facilitate this.
8. This plan is too timid – we need more examples of a “living street.”
9. Costs are not considered.

Other Comments from Comment Sheets either unrelated to Pin-Up or impossible to classify

1. Fairfield needs a rec centre like the one in Oak Bay ideally with a library.
2. Garden waste pickup is needed in the neighbourhood
3. Bus fares should be lower
4. How is Cook Street character going to remain?
5. “I feel the ‘volunteers’ glaring at me and reading my sticky notes as I leave them.”
6. It’s sad – we’re heading for expensive modernization and away from the old small town feel;
7. I like PUBS power
8. I don’t trust the current council; rezone from large to small urban village.