



## Cook Street Village Design Workshop Engagement Summary

Draft Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan  
September 2018

In collaboration with City staff, the Cook Street Village Steering Committee undertook a design workshop on July 26, 2018 to explore key land use and urban design issues, and develop draft concepts to guide growth and public realm improvements in Cook Street Village. Following the design workshop, the resulting concepts were shared with the public through a “pin-up” in the storefront at 319 Cook Street from August 7-14, 2018.

During the pin-up, approximately 400 people dropped by the storefront and shared 389 written comments regarding the concepts for Cook Street Village.

The following sections provide an overview of the main themes evident in the comments, as well as a categorized inventory of the full set of comments, transcribed verbatim. These themes have been developed through analysis of written comments by the Cook Street Village steering committee.



### Summary assessments of categorized comments

- A. Four-storey buildings – general support for this. Several people expressed concerns about roof top patios and suggested these should be considered a storey
- B. Centre lane – mostly support to keep it open
- C. 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.
- D. 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.
- E. 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.

- F. Community Amenity Contributions – just three comments critical of current process.
- 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. Businesses – not many comments expressing a variety of views.
- I. Deliveries – general recognition of need to pay attention to how deliveries are made to businesses e.g centre lane, receiving areas, turning movements.
- J. 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.
- K. Public washrooms – something the steering committee did not consider. Clearly very important for some.
- L. 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.
- M. Design – not much specific but general support for the sort of design proposals were shown in the drawings
- N. 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.
- O. Public Art – several suggestions about need to incorporate public art, First Nations art, murals, possibly change a street name to reflect First Nations.
- P. 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.
- Q. 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.
- R. 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.
- S. Stepbacks – clear support for substantial stepbacks at upper stories to keep buildings clear of tree canopy.
- 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 my impression is that 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 comments by category**

### List of Topics

There is no significance to the order of the categories below. Comments were sorted by key word(s) for each topic and are reproduced in full below. A number of comments appear more than once because they referred to several topics.

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

### **A. Four story buildings –**

1. No to any more 4 story buildings on Cook St/in the village. They would detract enormously from the environment/atmosphere that attracts people to the village. No to 4 stories (too high) in the village
2. 4 stories is too high for a village. 2 stories should be the maximum
3. No more than 4 stories at most. We have a good village – don't ruin it
4. 6 Stories too high for this area 3-4 stories
5. 3 or 4 stories max with mandatory 3m setback
6. 4 stories max
7. Fully support this vision especially 4 story 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 stories. There should be setbacks to allow light for the trees.
9. Keep it to 4 stories not 5 or 6

10. Limit to four stories max
11. 6 stories too high for this area. 3-4 stories
12. 2-3 stories 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 stories
14. 4 storey max. 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> 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 stories max plus setbacks
6. 3 stories
7. 4 stories max
8. 4 stories 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. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

**C. 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

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

1. The speed 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

#### **E. 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?
- 58.



## **F. 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

## **G. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> floors. Need light, room for trees
46. I like the 3<sup>rd</sup> 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

## **H. 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 2<sup>nd</sup>

floor; 4.5m boulevard public sitting ; keep centre turning lane 3.2m for delivery trucks; slower speed limits (Oliphant owner)

### **I. Deliveries**

1. Please consider dedicated RECEIVING AREA for freight deliveries off road. Existing problem at Sutej 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

### **J. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

### **K. 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

### **L. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.”

#### **M. 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

#### **N. 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.

#### **O. 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.

#### **P. 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 setback after 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 setback after 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

#### **Q. 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 remove 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 Sutej 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.

**R. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> floor for both character and trees.
17. Like the clear delineation between setbacks and sidewalks
18. 6 storeys OK if serious setbacks after 2 storeys and increasing as you go higher
19. No dedicated bike lane. Density FSR 1.5-2.1, and rentals, 2m building setback
20. Keep the Village sunny!! Setbacks 5m at 2 storeys
21. Glad to hear of reasonable "setback" and stepback proposals
22. Keep public property spaces distinct from private setbacks required. We need both.
23. Fully support this vision especially 4 story max with setbacks at 2,3. No dedicated bike lanes
24. NEED 2 m setback, trees saved, upper floors stepped back to ensure the health of trees and improve sightlines
25. Three meter setback for all new developments to make way for Place Making Transient Kiosk vendors
26. Trees need light + space so do people. Setback please
27. 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
28. 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
29. 2 or 3m setback is OK
30. 3 metre setbacks allow for scooters.
31. I support 2 metre building setback.
32. I support 2.0 m setbacks
33. I support 3-5m setbacks for trees
34. 3 m setbacks on new buildings
35. The key to development of the village is to keep the 'open' feeling. Not too high with good setbacks.
36. YAY setbacks! Room for connections. More trees = more happiness. I love the added green space
37. Yes to patios, display areas, seating areas. Creates ambiance and community.
38. Keep wide pedestrian area w/ room for patios
39. Stop approving patios that impede pedestrians and cause bottlenecks  
accessibility is a must
40. 3m minimum. Stop approving patio licenses that impeded the accessible sidewalk width
41. Stop giving patio licenses that impede on accessible sidewalks
42. Pic A Flic development needs to conform to setbacks identified here
43. Setbacks as suggested very important – need room for tree growth. And need sunlight in the village
44. More setbacks for Pic A Flic development and add stepbacks to accommodate trees
45. I support 3-5 m setbacks on 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> floors. Need light, room for trees

46. 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
47. Each storey needs to be set back

Comments from comment sheets about Future Building (paraphrased)

13. Keep new buildings a 4 storeys
14. Concerns that the transition to higher density will be too quick, and taller buildings will come through variances
15. 2 storey maximum
16. No more boxes. They look awful
17. Roof top patios are another floor.
18. Keep to 4 floors. FSR 1.5-2.1
19. 4 stories max plus setbacks
20. 3 stories
21. 4 stories max
22. 4 stories good, 3 better.
23. 3 storeys
24. Limits need to be strictly enforced
25. 4 to 5 storeys with setback at upper levels
26. No more than 4 storeys.

## **S. Stepbacks**

1. Stepbacks at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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
- 11.

## **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.

## Fairfield Gentle Density Survey Engagement Summary

Draft Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan  
September 2018

In collaboration with City staff, the Gentle Density Steering Committee undertook a Gentle Density Survey, open from July 27, 2018 through August 19, 2018. The purpose of the survey was to explore levels of support for various housing types in certain areas and lot types within the Traditional Residential parts of Fairfield. During the engagement period, community members could also stop in at a storefront in Cook Street Village to get more information on Gentle Density and provide input.

Based on 303 survey responses and conversations with nearly 400 people who visited the storefront, public feedback indicated:

- Broad support for the goals of allowing for a greater diversity of ground-oriented infill housing to meet future housing needs, increase housing choice and provide flexibility
- General support for a broader range of housing types, including those with more density (e.g. larger houseplexes) near Cook Street Village and along Fairfield Road
- Mixed support for townhouse forms that are either stacked, in more than one row and/or including a courtyard, with approximately half of respondents supportive of these types on certain lots (e.g. larger lots, corner or laneway lots, near Cook Street Village and along Fairfield Road). Those in support saw them as attractive, attainable options for families who want to stay or live in Fairfield, as part of the housing mix; others were concerned about retention of open space, lot coverage and character
- Concern for the provision of housing which is affordable to current residents, future families and moderate-income households, and/or rental tenure
- Concern for respecting the neighbourhood's character through context-sensitive design and scale of buildings, maintenance of green space and tree planting, and encouraging retention and adaptation of existing buildings
- Concern for providing parking on-site and/or reducing impacts to on-street parking, balanced by concern for green space, with some wanting a forward-looking policies which consider future demand, transportation demand management, and efforts to encourage more sustainable mode split



## Quantifiable Results at a Glance

Levels of support for various housing types: *Percent indicating strongly support or support (by location)*

Dark grey = question not asked				
Light grey = support less than 50%				
Blue = 50% to 59%				
Lighter green = 60% to 69%				
Darker green = 70%+				
	Near Cook St Village & along FF Rd (%)	Other residential areas		
		Standard Lot* (%)	Large lot** (%)	Corner, laneway, double frontage lot (%)
Detached house only	40.1	50.0	43.1	45.3
House with suite or garden suite	76.1	76.3	69.0	72.8
Existing house with suite & garden suite	74.6	71.8	72.3	74.7
Existing house with 2 suites	78.1	79.5	74.4	77.0
Duplex	78.3	75.3	75.2	74.4
Duplex with basement suites	73.3	70.3	73.1	73.2
Duplex with garden suite(s)	73.4	65.8	69.7	67.8
House conversion (generally 3-6 units)	74.4	63.7	77.1	73.8
New Houseplex	66.2	55.4	64.2	67.6
Larger Houseplex (generally 6+ units)	54.2	37.3	50.4	49.0
Townhouses - single row	66.0	52.4	60.9	57.9
Townhouses - stacked	50.4	N/A	46.0	46.4
Townhouses - courtyard / 2 rows	54.1	N/A	N/A	51.4
Small 3-storey apartment buildings	54.0	N/A	43.9	44.6

\* Standard lot = 50' wide, approx. 6,000 sq. ft.

\*\* Large lot = over 7,000 or 7,200 sq. ft., either wider than 50' or exceptionally deep lot

## Importance of Parking and Open Space on site

	Extremely important	Important	Neutral	Somewhat unimportant	Extremely unimportant
All needed parking be provided on-site?	36%	25%	12%	17%	10%
Open space be retained on-site?	53%	32%	8%	6%	1%

## Demographics

Age	
Under 20	0%
Under 40	23%
40-59	39%
60+	38%
Gender	
Female	51%
Male	40%

Tenure	
Owners	78%
Renters	22%
Residence	
Live in Fairfield	78%
Live in Gonzales	7%

## Gentle Density Survey: Comments

### Near Cook Street Village and Along Fairfield Road (194 responses)

Themes and # times they occur

Theme	#	Summary
General	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Many general comments in support, support with caveats, some in opposition; often with other specific comments</li><li>• Mix of housing = lively and eclectic neighbourhood</li><li>• Consider climate change, sustainable transportation, listen to youth, plan for future, need diverse housing / detached housing near centre of city is not viable</li><li>• Bought into Fairfield for what it is (socially and density), spent \$ buying and renovating. Some density ok but current proposals go too far.</li><li>• Will ruin charm</li><li>• Stable neighbourhood makes people happy; density causes fights to break out between neighbours</li></ul>
Affordability	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Gentle density does not meet housing need or provide affordable units</li><li>• Don't need to make room for all who want to live here; need affordable units</li><li>• Support it if it adds affordable housing</li><li>• Concern for commodifying housing, gentrification, benefiting owners and/or developers, displacement of existing working poor, seniors, fixed incomes</li><li>• Need affordable rentals</li><li>• Limit parking to support affordable rentals</li><li>• Need more density to address needs</li><li>• Suites favour affluent owner over rights of renter (city does not inspect)</li><li>• Rental suites with absentee landlord cause bylaw issues, not enough enforcement</li><li>• Would oppose larger developments unless they have affordable component</li><li>• Fairfield not suitable for affordability, or market can't provide it (public sector needs to)</li><li>• Emphasize increasing rental stock</li><li>• Supportive housing should be in plan</li><li>• 25 year vision should provide opportunities for affordable housing – not likely to happen with overhead on development of many small lots</li><li>• Mix and address different income levels</li><li>• New development appeals to new residents with money, not needs of current owners and renters</li><li>• Use incentives to support cooperatives, social housing and group homes</li><li>• Single-detached homes not affordable to most families</li><li>• Limiting growth to single-detached will enrich current owners, protect investment – what about others?</li><li>• Very hard to find rental housing with more than 1 or 2 bedrooms</li><li>• Make denser housing attractive for long-term residency – e.g. soundproofing (this is why people choose detached housing)</li></ul>
Parking	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Off street parking needed for 2 or more units</li><li>• On street parking is one solution but makes roads dangerous</li><li>• Not space for parking on a single property</li><li>• Impacts of parking on green space, trees, adjacent property</li><li>• Garden suites don't leave room for parking</li><li>• Proximity to downtown = less driving</li><li>• Gentle density will lead to congestion</li><li>• Driving is a nightmare</li><li>• Mitigate increase traffic and parking (doesn't say how)</li></ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in condo building from seniors to all ages on FF Road meant more 2-car households, parking on side streets</li> <li>• On-site parking for each unit</li> <li>• On-site parking for visitors, tradespeople</li> <li>• Acceptable if there is enough street parking</li> <li>• Consider one-way streets to add on-street parking</li> <li>• Need better transportation options – denser neighbourhood = healthier</li> <li>• Paid street parking or park on your property</li> <li>• Some of street parking should be specified</li> <li>• Don't spill out onto streets</li> <li>• Consider supporting multi-modal transportation through planning guidelines</li> </ul>
Locational	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove area between Chapman and May east of Linden</li> <li>• Remove area between Chapman and May</li> <li>• Fairfield Road and CSV different – FF Road more appropriate for density such as apts, townhouses in two rows (vs. keep it lower density)</li> <li>• Add medium-density west of Cook Street</li> <li>• Put 4-6 storeys on Cook St., keep charm of lower-density areas (comment like Annex in Toronto)</li> <li>• Southgate should include thoughtful gentle density and multi-modal/pedestrian friendly design</li> <li>• Allow gentle density in all areas</li> <li>• Put gentle density only on main streets (ex: bus routes) but not local streets</li> <li>• City should grow outwards to avoid congestion</li> </ul>
Character/ Design	27	<p>Prefer traditional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shafer is a good example</li> <li>• Setbacks consistent with present</li> <li>• Size/massing next to neighbours</li> <li>• Greenspace</li> <li>• New should look like houses in neighbourhood</li> <li>• Architecture siting and landscape important (as in video)</li> <li>• Respond to context</li> <li>• Don't like apartment look at Moss and May</li> <li>• Some gentle density, but keep unique character</li> <li>• Roof shape</li> <li>• Larger new builds should be sensitive to context</li> <li>• Control design, size of single-detached houses</li> <li>• Gentle density will ruin charm near village</li> </ul> <p>Traditional and modern can mix; variety of styles already exist; avoid faux heritage (one comment)</p>
Greenspace, trees	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children need place to play</li> <li>• Family friendly = some green space</li> <li>• Trees – climate change, aesthetics, ecology, stormwater, character of neighbourhood</li> <li>• Concern that density or parking will reduce trees</li> </ul>
Higher density/ apartments	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow taller apartment buildings (several)</li> <li>• Need more housing near downtown, we are capital city not small town</li> <li>• Gentle density preferable to taller apartment buildings to maintain character (several)</li> <li>• Allow gentle density single-detached to 6-plex, but not apartments, we have too many</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow apartment bldgs in traditional residential areas to be more equitable, and encourage gentle density in areas that are already dense to protect these area</li> <li>• Allow more density west of Cook Street</li> <li>• Gentle density should replace apartment capacity and targets in OCP</li> </ul>
Retention	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer conversions</li> <li>• Don't allow more density than what's already there if a teardown</li> <li>• Protect heritage houses; HCAs</li> <li>• Tourism, uniqueness, "charm"</li> <li>• Conversions</li> <li>• Incentivize conversions and garden suites over teardowns</li> <li>• Avoid large-scale developments (single lot preferred)</li> <li>• Don't tear down, convert</li> <li>• Pressure or incentivize conversion to higher density</li> </ul>
Family friendly	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add gentle density; single detached increasingly unaffordable to most families</li> <li>• 3br, 2 ba affordable units</li> <li>• Townhouses</li> <li>• Affordable apartment buildings</li> <li>• Housing capacity not keeping pace</li> <li>• Retiring couples need attractive options to downsize</li> <li>• Area is attractive to live in – limiting to single-detached houses will protect investments of owners, what about others?</li> <li>• Less tiny units; gentle density results in smaller units, but we need to keep young families and provide options for downsizing.</li> <li>• Need density to preserve Fairfield as a family neighbourhood</li> <li>• All options serve different life stages</li> <li>• Very hard to find rental housing with more than 1 or 2 bedrooms</li> </ul>
Housing types	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like townhouses (mention that this form is attractive to families)</li> <li>• Row houses to 3 storeys don't take away from quaint feel</li> <li>• Houseplex of 6 units too big</li> <li>• Apartments needed</li> <li>• No double row townhouses</li> <li>• Row townhouses &amp; houses with more suites</li> <li>• Townhouses, unlike houseplexes, are required to have a greater level of sound insulation (verify)</li> <li>• Single detached houses increasingly unaffordable, limiting to this form will benefit current owners but not support future families, those seeking to downsize, and will not maintain a family neighbourhood</li> </ul>
Services	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger developments contribute to services</li> <li>• Bylaw enforcement needed (noise, garbage) if density added</li> <li>• Gentle density will lead to congestion of services</li> <li>• Focus on schools, underground utilities</li> </ul>
Process	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentle density results in small units; we need to keep young families and provide options for downsizing. Feel many support this view but being drowned out by strident voices opposing all development</li> <li>• Asking same questions – hoping to get different answers from those who aren't tired of process?</li> <li>• Believe process is biased either towards developers or to NIMBY's</li> <li>• Term gentle density is a "sham"</li> </ul>

## Other Residential Areas (151 responses)

Themes and # times they occur (Note: Comparison of frequency may not relate directly to frequencies in the earlier table, as fewer comments were submitted to later questions in the survey)

Theme	#	Summary
Parking	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some concerns are very general ("parking!")</li> <li>Some are concerned that enough parking be provided on-site; others want parking policies that encourage alternative modes or account for future changes</li> <li>Some are concerned about loss of greenspace</li> <li>Some want more efficient use of on-street parking (e.g. charge for it); others concerned that there is not enough or that residential only needs stronger enforcement</li> <li>Some concerned about traffic congestion</li> </ul>
Character and Design	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns that new housing address compatibility of character, setbacks, massing, etc.</li> <li>some want traditional character in new build; others see diverse character as positive</li> <li>some want to avoid large modern single detached homes</li> </ul>
Housing type	30	<p>Varied comments about which housing types may or may not fit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some see all types fitting, meeting needs</li> <li>Some see denser types as not fitting or not fitting everywhere (e.g. larger lots, lots with 2 frontages or laneways), impacting greenspace, etc.</li> <li>Those who support for townhouses often mention preference for this type as family-friendly housing</li> <li>Some want to see policies achieve a mix of housing types</li> <li>Small number believe neighbourhood should be single-detached only, this is what they bought into, that it is desirable to maintain it as expensive</li> <li>Some want additional housing types: co-ops, shared living</li> </ul>
Affordability	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns for affordability of new housing, availability of rental housing, displacement of residents</li> <li>Some see gentle density as preferable to single-detached houses only, in meeting future needs for young families</li> <li>Others see gentle density as too favourable to current homeowners and upper-middle-income buyers, gentrifying neighbourhood</li> <li>Some desire greater density and more affordability (apartments)</li> <li>Some desire more affordability and retention of older housing stock (e.g. conversion), protecting renters</li> <li>Some support gentle density only if it includes rental and/or affordable housing</li> <li>Some would like incentives for current homeowners to add suites; others see gentle density as too financially beneficial to homeowners</li> <li>A few see affordability or attainable housing as undesirable in Fairfield, or that it can't be provided by the market</li> </ul>
General comments (support/oppose)	29	<p>Various comments in support of or in opposition to policies, or indicating general preferences.</p> <p>Issues such as general concerns about density, environmental footprint, meeting housing needs, community/knowning neighbours.</p>
Greenspace	24	<p>General concern for preserving greenspace, trees; strengthen tree preservation; don't fill lots with development; don't pave over backyards; consider ecological benefits of trees; address stormwater</p> <p>Few comments that large lots are better used to accommodate more housing</p>

Higher density / apartments	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more apartments to provide for affordability or meet housing need (various comments about location and size)</li> <li>• Apartments on Fairfield Road (more than gentle density) but not near Cook Street Village</li> <li>• Gentle density should be used to transition from higher to lower density residential</li> <li>• Gentle density should replace the opportunity to build apartments anywhere</li> <li>• Gentle density is preferable to apartments in Trad Res areas</li> <li>• Apartments should be spread more throughout the neighbourhood for greater equity</li> <li>• More housing is suitable near downtown</li> </ul>
Location	12	<p>Variety of locational comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add apartments in Traditional Residential areas to more equitably distribute (and possibly limit urban residential areas to adding gentle density to balance/protect)</li> <li>• See Cook Street Village and Fairfield Road as different <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Support more than gentle density on Fairfield Road, or more intensive gentle density (apartments, townhouses in 2 rows); or</li> <li>○ sees lower density as appropriate east of Moss Street</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some see most gentle density types confined to CSV and Fairfield Road</li> <li>• Some see streets like May and Moss (e.g. collectors) as appropriate for more gentle density, with lower scale on local streets</li> <li>• One comment (email) sees area from Moss Street west as appropriate for houseplexes, and east of Moss Street appropriate for lower-density forms, due to existing character of larger homes in the west</li> <li>• Some want gentle density throughout the neighbourhood or city</li> <li>• Some want transitions between higher density (urban residential) and lower density</li> <li>• Two comments that gentle density belongs in other neighbourhoods or on the westshore</li> </ul>
Retention of existing	10	<p>Concern for loss of historic character or homes</p> <p>Support/preference for conversions</p> <p>Some see diversity of periods/design as positive; retain heritage homes and add modern homes</p> <p>Concern for tourism, uniqueness</p>
Height/massing	7	<p>Some concerned about size of new development, impacts on neighbours</p> <p>Some want 4 storeys or more</p> <p>Some want to avoid 4+ storeys</p> <p>Some see 3 storeys as appropriate or needed; others as too much; others as not enough</p>
Process	7	Varying concerns about different groups having too much influence or not enough: renters; families; homeowners; developers
Need for family housing	6	See affordability, size of units, unit type (e.g. townhouse), presence of greenspace
Services and amenities	3	<p>Desire for new development to contribute to infrastructure, amenities</p> <p>Concern that existing services (sewer, hospital, schools) are not adequate</p> <p>Some concern that bylaws be enforced (noise, garbage collection)</p>
Green building	2	Support for green building/sustainability requirements