

**Attachment B: Workshop Matrix: Key Issues Identified Through Community Feedback and Recommended Next Steps/ Revisions**

Key Issues from Community Feedback	Summary of Community Feedback	Considerations	Recommended Next Steps/ Revisions
<b>1. Infill housing menu for traditional residential areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Mix of community perspectives on infill housing types for traditional residential areas.</li><li>General support for houseplexes and new types of housing with suites, with concerns regarding parking and greenspace</li><li>Lower support for reduced size of duplex lots</li><li>Mixed support for townhouses. Single row townhouses more desirable than double row townhouses. Concern about concentration of townhouses.</li><li>Concern from many people about additional development in Fairfield and impacts to character, parking, greenspace, traffic impacts and infrastructure.</li><li>Some development professionals concerned that policies are too restrictive to support feasible townhouses and other infill housing</li></ul>	<p>Housing diversity and affordability expressed as key goals during early engagement by many in Fairfield. Support for most infill housing types in plan.</p> <p>Many concerns regarding duplexes have to do with increased density, character, loss of green space, parking, or concerns that all lots will redevelop. Many issues can be addressed through updated design guidelines.</p> <p>Redevelopment not expected to be rapid nor widespread due to restrictions on size and specifications, and high land values.</p> <p>Townhouse redevelopment already constrained due to lot size and height limits; removing opportunity for double row townhouses will only have small impact on future housing supply</p>	<p>a. Remove option for double row townhouses in housing sub-area 4 (near Ross Bay Village).</p> <p>b. Retain other options for infill housing in draft plan</p> <p>c. Staff review and consideration of additional parking and open space requirements (e.g. additional parking space required if more than one unit on lot)</p> <p>d. Incorporate open space guidelines into development of additional design guidelines for infill housing (2018-2020)</p>
<b>2. Townhouses near Ross Bay Village (“sub- area 4”)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Perception from many residents that sub-area 4 has been singled out for more intensive development</li><li>While some support townhouses, others are concerned about character, traffic and parking impacts. Strong concerns from area residents regarding suitability of townhouses. Townhouses in single row more desirable than in double rows, but some would prefer neither.</li><li>Concern from many residents about additional development or change in housing or Ross Bay Village, and impacts to character, parking, greenspace, traffic impacts and infrastructure.</li></ul>	<p>Townhouses originally proposed for sub-area 4 due to large lot size, proximity to urban village, amenities and transit, and continuity with area where townhouses considered in proposed Gonzales plan.</p> <p>Broad community support in early engagement for townhouses to achieve housing diversity and more attainable housing.</p> <p>Risk: Removing townhouse options reduces family-sized housing choices. Unlikely that many single row townhouses will be built in near future due to high land costs, and size and density restrictions in plan.</p>	<p>a. Remove “sub-area 4” as a distinct area; would become part of sub-area 1 (General Area).</p> <p>b. As per sub-area 1, remove option for townhouses in more than one row. Support other infill housing options indicated for sub-area 1. Single row townhouses would be considered on suitably-sized lots adjacent to villages and larger corner lots (same as sub-area 1).</p> <p>c. Re-instate option for small lot house development in this area</p>
<b>3. Urban place designation west of Cook Street Village (Cook Street to Heywood Street)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Draft plan proposes most of area be designated as “urban residential” up to 4 storeys, except for portion of Oliphant Street</li><li>Survey and open house results suggest support for draft plan concept from broader community.</li><li>Area residents have different views: some want traditional residential designation re-instated (as in OCP) to maintain diversity and existing housing; others prefer entire area designated urban residential, including Oliphant Street, to provide opportunities for those land owners to provide with more intensive forms of housing.</li></ul>	<p>Proposed revisions aims to strike balance between retaining diverse character and encouraging more housing near village. Several areas west of village have comparable character to Oliphant Street, at a smaller scale.</p> <p>Builds on “gentle density” concept suggested in draft plan feedback. Increases menu of housing options for traditional residential areas, in addition to townhouses, duplexes with suites already supported in draft plan.</p> <p>Unlikely to result in affordable housing from density bonus.</p> <p>Decreases housing capacity in this area.</p>	<p>a. Support “gentle density” approach:</p> <p>i. Re-instate OCP designations for traditional residential areas but expand option for larger houseplexes (4+ units), emphasize adaptation of heritage properties, ground-oriented housing up to 3 storeys, and creative housing on laneways in this area</p> <p>ii. Retain option for single or double townhouses in area</p> <p>iii. Add new policy to consider other new and innovative housing types that meet plan objectives</p> <p>iv. Consider reduced parking requirements for houseplexes with more than 3 units in this area</p>
<b>4. Infill housing east of Cook Street Village</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>General support for scale of housing in this area, with different perspectives on suitability of specific infill types</li></ul>	<p>Mix of perspectives on suitable housing types in this area</p> <p>Builds on “gentle density” concept suggested in draft plan feedback. Increases menu of housing options for traditional residential areas, in addition to townhouses, duplexes with suites already supported in draft plan.</p>	<p>a. Support “gentle density” approach:</p> <p>i. East Village sub-area (Cook Street to Chester Street): expand option for larger houseplexes (4+ units), emphasize adaptation of heritage properties, ground-oriented housing up to 3 storeys, and creative housing on laneways in this area. Retain option for single or double row townhouses; review site requirements to consider feedback.</p> <p>ii. Sub-area 3: expand option for larger houseplexes (4+ units), emphasize adaptation of heritage properties, ground-oriented housing up to 2.5 storeys, and creative housing on laneways in this area. Retain option for single or double row townhouses; review site requirements to consider feedback.</p> <p>iii. Add new policy to consider other creative, innovative housing types that meet plan objectives</p> <p>iv. Consider reduced parking requirements for 3+ unit houseplexes</p>
<b>5. Accommodate larger share of Fairfield’s growth through “gentle density”</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Accommodate larger share of Fairfield’s future development through infill housing in traditional residential areas</li><li>Types of housing could include secondary suites in more houses, large houseplexes, single row townhouses and house conversions and other innovative forms, to support goals for neighbourhood character, housing diversity, aging-in-place and affordability.</li><li>Gentle density approach could be limited to traditional residential areas or expanded to other areas</li><li>Desire for City resources to support affordability and implementation of gentle density</li></ul>	<p>Draft plan already supports most gentle density housing types suggested</p> <p>Departs from approved OCP growth model, which directed growth in and around neighbourhood villages to respond to community desire for less growth and change in traditional residential areas.</p> <p>Significant concern expressed from many residents regarding impacts of infill housing development in traditional residential areas (e.g. sub-area 4); gentle density would result in more infill housing.</p> <p>Gentle density concept would remove much opportunity for affordable housing from bonus density, streetscape improvements and other amenities. Smaller units may also limit opportunity for family-sized housing (3 bedroom+).</p>	<p>a. Encourage more gentle density in traditional residential areas around Cook Street Village and along Fairfield Road (sub-area 2), option for larger houseplexes (4+ units), emphasizing adaptation of heritage properties and creative laneway housing</p> <p>b. Continue to support other housing types as proposed in plan; review site requirements, open space and parking policies to consider feedback.</p>

**Attachment B: Workshop Matrix: Key Issues Identified Through Community Feedback and Recommended Next Steps/ Revisions**

Key Issues from Community Feedback	Summary of Community Feedback	Considerations	Recommended Next Steps/ Revisions
<b>6. Design of Cook Street Village built form</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>General support for principles, concept and policies in draft plan</li><li>Desire for more detailed policies or guidelines for specific built form design features: character, setbacks, massing, street wall, shading, impacts to street trees, transitions</li><li>Desire for design policies and guidelines to better capture the unique and eclectic spirit of the village</li><li>Many in community would like more certainty and specificity for design. In contrast, some development professionals have expressed concerns that plan policies/guidelines are too restrictive and may limit future design.</li></ul>	<p>Plan aims to strike balance a between clear design guidance, yet maintaining flexibility to respond to surroundings and future needs.</p> <p>Different perspectives in community regarding some design issues (e.g. setbacks, shading, height of individual storeys).</p> <p>Some desired details go beyond scope of neighbourhood plan or design guidelines, and are more appropriate to technical considerations during permit processes.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<b>7. Design of Cook Street Village streetscape and cycling infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Desire for more detailed design of streetscape within neighbourhood plan</li><li>Desire for on-street parking solutions that work for residents and businesses</li><li>Concerns regarding alignment of cycling route through village</li><li>Different perspectives on suitable design elements (e.g. plaza, shared use design for street)</li></ul>	<p>Schedule for detailed design of Cook Street Village cycling and pedestrian improvements set by City-wide AAA network implementation schedule (2021/2022), with consideration of needs of all neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan provides guiding principles and design objectives for future streetscape improvements. Planning for future land use and built environment in Cook Street Village can proceed without detailed design for streetscape.</p>	<p>a. Expand design principles in plan based on community feedback (e.g. recognize Lekwungen history, shading, character, lighting, community gathering, slowing traffic, artistic elements)</p> <p>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).</p> <p>c. Parking management strategy for Cook Street Village area identified as short-term action</p>
<b>8. Effectiveness of rental retention area policies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Skepticism about whether plan policies will be effective at retaining existing rental buildings and achieving affordable housing</li><li>Desire for density bonus contributions to be applied to more than on-site affordable housing</li><li>Desire for Fairfield to be a demonstration project for affordable housing</li></ul>	<p>Fairfield contains a substantial amount of the City's stock of rental buildings; upcoming work for Victoria Housing Strategy implementation, inclusionary housing policy and Market Rental Revitalization Strategy will provide more rigorous policy recommendations.</p> <p>OCP and other housing policies will apply in meantime.</p>	<p>a. Conduct additional analysis of policies related to density bonus (8.1.3.) through development of City-wide inclusionary housing policy</p> <p>b. Consider if neighbourhood specific policies are needed following Market Rental Revitalization Strategy and development of inclusionary housing policy (2018)</p>
<b>9. Northwest corner and Fort Street</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>General support for the concept, with some concerns (e.g. location of taller buildings, heights, commercial uses in specific locations, impacts to Pioneer Square, etc)</li><li>Some concerned about buildings heights in area, and would prefer lower scale in much of northwest</li></ul>	<p>Vision for northwest and Fort Street in draft plan continues OCP and DCAP policies for the area.</p> <p>Early engagement suggests more housing is suitable in this area, near downtown, jobs, amenities, and existing mid- and high-rise buildings.</p>	<p>a. Maintain direction in plan, with staff review for potential refinements for location of heights, commercial uses in certain locations and public space impacts.</p> <p>b. Some anticipated growth shifted from Cook Street Village area</p>
<b>10. Design concept for Ross Bay Urban Village (Fairfield Plaza)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Varied support: Many like reduced building height and concept; many others concerned about any future development on site; some would like more ambitious development.</li><li>Concerns about impacts on adjacent properties, parking, traffic and convenience, particularly from surrounding residents</li><li>Some confusion and misinformation regarding role and impact of neighbourhood plan policies</li></ul>	<p>Design concept refined based on community design workshop. Height has been reduced from 6 storeys in OCP to 3-4 storeys. Concept aims to retain commercial uses in future, while meeting community objectives for more housing diversity and walkability. Many design impacts can be addressed through design guidelines.</p> <p>Some design/ development professionals expressed concern that plan policies for design and height are too limiting, and may not result in redevelopment/ desired amenities due to lack of viability.</p>	<p>a. Maintain direction in plan, with revisions to land use and design policies to address concerns regarding transition, parking.</p> <p>b. Develop site-specific design guidelines, with focus on transition to surrounding properties.</p> <p>c. Remove images, to avoid concept being misconstrued as a development application.</p>
<b>11. Identification of potential heritage conservation areas</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Concern from homeowners that specific streets are identified as potential candidate areas; suggests that areas are pre-determined</li></ul>	<p>Council direction is for community-led approach to Heritage Conservation Areas</p> <p>Heritage values and geographic boundaries should be defined by community</p>	<p>a. Remove reference to specific street names/ areas in plan policies (10.2.3).</p> <p>b. Reword to reinforce citizen-initiated efforts to establish heritage conservation areas</p>
<b>12. Topics outside scope of neighbourhood plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Desire for plan to provide more detailed policies for various topics that either fall outside the scope of a neighbourhood plan or are being addressed through other City-wide initiatives (e.g. parking standards, urban forest, climate change, green buildings, stormwater management, affordable housing, all ages and abilities cycling routes, community amenity contributions, development process)</li></ul>	<p>Some issues are better suited to being addressed at City-wide level.</p> <p>City staff working collaboratively, across departments on these initiatives, to ensure that neighbourhood planning perspective is incorporated. Different timelines and project needs mean that not all work will completed for Fairfield plan.</p>	<p>a. Continue approach where neighbourhood plan provides general direction for these topics, with more detail provided by other initiatives</p> <p>b. Continue to share community feedback with relevant staff. Continue to make reference to concurrent and upcoming City-wide initiatives in neighbourhood plan.</p>