

## Janet Hawkins

---

**From:** G Henderson [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, Jul 21, 2015 9:33 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings; Councillors; Lisa Helps (Mayor)  
**Cc:** Rob Woodland; Ludo Bertsch; Gerry Howell Jones  
**Subject:** 2015 Strategic Plan Grant Applications that Impact Public Space  
**Attachments:** 2015\_IvyPlace\_Mayor & Council.docx

TO: Mayor and Council, City of Victoria

RE: Ivy Place Right-of-Way Enhancements  
Island Transformations.Org Educational Society

We would like to add the attached document to Agenda Item I (3)  
(Unfinished Business, 2015 Strategic Plan Grant Application that  
Impact Public Space) for the City Council meeting of July 23, 2015.

We would be very grateful if you could ensure that this document is  
considered during that Agenda item. Many hours have been spent by  
volunteers in bringing the project to this meeting's decision-point.

Respectfully,

Irwin Henderson  
President, ITO

Ludo Bertsch  
Project Coordinator

# Clarification Note for Mayor and Council

## Re: Ivy Place Right-of-Way Enhancement

### **Why is the Ivy Place project significant?**

- Enhancement of an existing Garry Oak ecosystem and much-used walkway
- Supports all the City's Strategic Objectives, including engaging community and stewarding natural water systems
- Adds to the Greenways Plan complete with an existing natural ecosystem and helps build its legacy through a showcase project
- Ivy Place was part of the original proposal for the Ryan Street Greenway in 2003, which is now a neighbourhood success.
- Leverages a small city investment (less than \$2,000) into a high-value grassroots community investment
- Close collaboration with the City and engaging neighbours will ensure high-quality work
- Although small in size, the project enables significant walk connectivity for the whole neighbourhood
- The steps are simple, efficient and down-to-earth: design plan, collaborate, pull invasives, plant native plants, improve entrances.
- The community volunteers are now ready to start.

This submission was written to inform councilors and mayor that **The Ivy Place project is actually simple, compared to similar projects:**

- The Ivy Place walkway has been established for many years with a clear separation from vehicles. Other Greenway projects have had the complexity of defining and separating walkways from vehicle use and introducing fences and other barriers.
- The natural ecosystem at Ivy Place is already there, while other projects have had to build up the natural areas from scratch.
- Neighbours using wheelbarrows and hand shovels will suffice for Ivy Place
  - no major construction work will be needed.

Note: Further information provided in backgrounder, see next section.

## **Ivy Place - Backgrounder**

We believe the staff comments in the “2015 Strategic Plan Grant Report” (June 29, re: complex) and "2015 Strategic Plan Grant Applications that Impact Public Space" report (July 16) regarding the Ivy Place project require a response and clarification to do justice to the project.

### *Summary Response to July 16 staff report:*

- 1) lack of a detailed design plan not a shortcoming, but essential to engaging participants and creating clear vision
- 2) collaborative effort with City means that our plan would be approved by the City before moving ahead with investments
- 3) project has already started neighbour consultation; developing full neighbourhood consultation with clear detailed plan is simple
- 4) maintenance/replacement program to be developed with ITO during detailed plan stage, using best practices from similar projects
- 5) Ivy Place is a well-established walkway suited to be added Greenway plan

### *In more detail . . . . .*

- 1) The staff report seems to imply a shortcoming in our project by not including a detailed design plan. In our Ivy Place project document, we clearly showed that our first step is to develop the detailed plan within the project (in Section 6), which we believe is prudent. Instead of deciding beforehand the details of plan, we believe a more appropriate and engaging approach is to involve a range of participants. We suggest that staff's comment should be considered a note of interest rather an indication of a shortcoming of our project document.
- 2) The staff report also seems to imply that we had not anticipated approval by staff of our detailed plan prior to investments. Perhaps staff overlooked our note in Section 4, where we discussed the collaborative effort with City in the plan. This means that our document already shows that the plan would have to be approved by City before moving ahead.

Therefore, we agree that the action (b), "a detailed design and long-term plan be approved by staff prior to investing in pathway improvements and plant material", submitted by staff is appropriate, but we believe it should be considered a clarification note rather than an indication of a shortcoming of our original project plan.

- 3) We feel that the staff report also seems to imply that we have had to provide public consultation before our project begins. We already have started with a core group of 8 volunteers in the neighbourhood, 4 of which live next to or within 50 meters to work on the general plan. We believe a detailed plan developed within the project itself will engage public consultation of a wider group of the neighbourhood through collaboration (Section 4) and will actually simplify the work through clarity. As noted before, the project advancement beyond the plans will require staff approval and so that gives assurance to the City that there will be appropriate engagement of neighbourhood residents.

So, we agree that the action suggested by staff, "the proponents engage in public consultation with the neighbourhood residents", but emphasize that it should be part of the project itself and not as a requirement before commencing the project.

- 4) We note that the staff report recommends a maintenance and replacement program be developed with ITO. We note we included maintenance as part of the detailed plan outlined in the first step (Section 6). We agree that it would be appropriate and more efficient to include the clarification as suggested by staff: "An agreement be drafted with Island Transformations Org Educational Society outlining the applicant's responsibility for the maintenance and replacement of the pathway and plants".
- 5) The staff report mentions that Ivy Place is not presently on the City's Greenway Plan, but this should not prevent the project from proceeding. The Greenways Map was developed over 10 years ago and has not been updated since. Ivy Place has been used for many years exclusively as a walking corridor, and so its use is not changing.