

Draft Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan November 2017: Synthesis of feedback on the draft plan, by theme

The following table presents a synthesis of feedback received from the community regarding the draft Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan from November 2017 – February 2018. Comments are grouped in the following order:

Theme	Page
Transportation and Mobility	2
Parks, Open Space and Urban Forest	4
Future Land Use	5
Northwest Area and Fort Street	7
Cook Street Village	12
• East of Cook Street	
• West of Cook Street Village	
Ross Bay Village	17
Small Urban Villages	19
Urban Residential Areas	22
• Rental Retention Area	
• Transition Urban Residential Areas	
Traditional Residential Areas	24
• General comments	
• House with 2 suites or suite + garden suite	
• Townhouses in a single row	
• Townhouses in more than one row	
• Reduce the size of lot for duplex	
• Houseplexes	
• Small lot houses	
• Suites in duplexes, small lot houses or townhouses	
Housing Affordability	34
Heritage	35
Infrastructure and Green Development	36
Placemaking, Arts and Culture	37
Community Facilities and Well-being	37
Amenities	38

Transportation and Mobility

General comments

Some strongly emphasize the importance of active transportation infrastructure and a completed network, while others question this emphasis, the likelihood for such investments to shift the transportation mode share away from cars, and expressed concerns about reducing traffic and parking capacity.

Cook Street Bicycle Route

Many comments against idea of bike route or separated cycle track on Cook. Some in support of bike route on Cook. A few suggested designing bike route on Cook along with the parking, pedestrian crossings (i.e. whole public realm).

Vancouver Street Bicycle Route

Many suggested investing in cycling route on Vancouver (rather than Cook St.) since it has lighter traffic, is currently used by cyclists. A few indicated preference for Cook St as bike route rather than Vancouver. Concern that Vancouver is becoming busier, less safe for cycling.

Safety concerns

- Drivers not stopping for pedestrians is problem at Cook and Dallas
- Discouraged narrowing streets and intersections due to concerns about safety
- Incorporate findings of Sir James Douglas active travel plan
- Safety improvements to Moss Street (sightlines, travel speed) – use by children, cyclists

Pedestrian access issues

- Width and even surface of sidewalks (wide enough for walkers and electric scooters to pass) is important for pedestrian and assisted mobility
- Require owners to keep sidewalks clear of over-growth

Other Routes

- Concern that Packington Street is too narrow to support being a bike route
- A few comments show mixed opinions on a cycling route through Ross Bay Cemetery
- North/south cycling routes are a priority
- Mixed opinions on Dallas Road cycling route
- Mixed opinions on east-west connector through Beacon Hill Park / concern for Camas meadow
- Need bike path and lock-up east of Clover Point
- Consider stop signs on cross-streets of Brooke St. to allow East-West bike throughway
- Some concern that bicycle route on Richardson will make it more difficult to driven downtown via Richardson
- Concern there is an error in Map 3 showing a planned route between Vimy Place and Windermere. The gazetted laneway has never been developed.

Accessibility/mobility

Concern expressed for prioritizing needs of seniors and others for whom walking or biking is not practical. Specifically ensuring there is space for electric scooters on sidewalks and parking near daily needs.

Crossing Improvements

- Remove crossing enhancement symbol at Quadra and McClure (not safe place to encourage crossing)
- Improve crossing at Broughton and Quadra
- Mile 0 intersection needs crossing improvement
- Safety issue with crosswalk across Fairfield Road on east side of St. Charles.
- Pedestrian crosswalk light in Cook St. Village takes too long. Consider changing to instant-walk one (e.g. like on north side of N Park St. & Cook St.).
- Consider additional crosswalk(s) in Cook Street Village
- General support for improving pedestrian crossing safety (e.g. through better lighting, marking, raised crossings, better enforcement and education for drivers)

- Rebuild sidewalk on south side of Humbolt (in front of St. Ann's Academy)
- Assess safety of crossing at Fairfield Road on east side of St. Charles
- Linden & Richardson needs a cross walk for children to access both SJD & Central.
- Lighted ped. crossing needed at Rockland and Vancouver
- Crossing does not always feel safe a Moss & Fairfield
- The corner of Collinson and Vancouver Street is getting more and more difficult to cross as the traffic increases on Vancouver Street
- Fairfield and Linden is dangerous

Intersections

Concerns regarding traffic and safety at:

- Cook & Dallas
- Cook & Fairfield (ped safety with turning cars)
- Cook & Collinson
- Kipling & Thurlow (unclear that it's not a 4-way stop, safety for children crossing, reduce speed)
- Linden & Fairfield (Visibility)
- Linden & Richardson (Visibility, ped and bike crossings)
- Linden & Dallas Road (consider bike only entry off Dallas)
- Southgate & Vancouver (paint pedestrian crossings)

Various

- Concerns regarding speed bumps on Richardson St.
- Repairs needed to Chapman St.
- Better lighting on Cook between Oscar and Fort St. (north of Village)

Cut-through traffic

- Concern about cut through traffic on Arnold & Stannard

Routes

- Support for existing designated pedestrian or cycling routes (e.g. Moss St., St. Charles)
- Consider infrastructure improvements on Linden from Richardson to Dallas Road (e.g. cycle lane) and improved crossing at Linden and Dallas Road
- Consider making Cook St. and Vancouver St. one-way streets (i.e. a loop)
- Cook Street Village: Centre turn lane not wide enough to maintain flow of through lanes.
- Southgate Street: Reduce speed, add bike lanes, tree boulevard
- Desire to consider Moss Street as a route for improvements – key north-south pedestrian and cycling route, connecting Sir James Douglas, Central and Vic High. Many children use this route.

Speed

- Smiley face speed sign to reduce speed in Cook St. Village. Others wanted to avoid lit displays in village
- Reduce speed on Fairfield Road (e.g. 40 or 30 km/h)
- Reduce speeds on side-streets to be less than larger streets like Cook St. and Fairfield Road

Traffic Volume

Assess traffic volume and/or cut-through traffic on:

- Stannard/Richardson
- Arnold
- Moss St. between May and Fort (and relationship/impact to schools, traffic calming between schools)
- Rupert Terrace/Quadra
- Oliphant
- Vancouver

- Concern about lane narrowing on major streets like Pandora and Cook making it harder for larger vehicles, pickup trucks

On-Street Parking

- Many expressed concern about losing any on-street parking spaces (e.g. to bike lanes), and emphasized importance for accessibility and tourism/business.
- Suggestions to convert residential only parking near the village to 2 hour parking during the day.
- A few suggestions to make all parking (included residential only) paid.
- Encourage/require EV charging to be built into parking spaces of new construction.
- Suggestion to widen Oxford, McKenzie, Oscar Streets to support parking on both sides to support housing policies
- Suggestion to remove parking on one side of Oxford to make it easier to drive

Public Transit

- Many emphasized the need to improve extent and frequency of transit service in addition to / more importantly than improving cycling - noting needs of elders and others with accessibility concerns, and desiring to reduce the need to drive a car

Parks, Open Space and Urban Forest

General Comments

- Respecting, protecting, and enhancing the natural environment is another way to acknowledge the Lekwungen people and territory. Suggestion to explicitly state this in plan.
- Define “green space” and “open space” in the glossary, use terms consistently

Specific Parks improvements desired:

- Public outdoor pool in Beacon Hill Park
- Garden in Robert Porter Park
- Access off May Street into Moss Rocks Park / feels like private space right now (2 comments)
- Improved playlot in Bowsby Park
- Keep Green spaces, like Porter Park, natural. Concern about formalizing trail connections.
- Better maintenance at Hollywood park (Gonzales). Trees, natural areas and gardens.
- Linear parks, greenways for strolling (safe, green, placemaking) / let citizens lead their favourite walks and evaluate spots for improvements
- Concern re: noise level in parks (machinery, leaf blowers)
- Fence in playgrounds for safety
- Implement outcomes of Arts and Culture Master Plan in parks
- Improved lighting for use at night
- Pioneer Parking: Maintain as a gathering place for the northwest area of the neighbourhood; control massing on adjacent properties massing for afternoon sunlight
- Concern that townhouses adjacent to Hollywood Park would impact nature and reduce ability of people to enjoy the park
- Create maximum green spaces in urban area, also play and meeting spaces for interaction with people and environment

Urban Forest

Comments supportive of enhancing the urban forest on public and private land, with concerns for stronger tree protection on private land (esp. with development), tree health on boulevards, and concern that infill housing will reduce the potential for the urban forest because of site coverage and/or parking. Specific comments include:

- recognize heritage trees, maintain characteristic Japanese cherries over time
- replant trees that have been cut down by developers / due to disease
- retain the regular architectonic spacing of street trees along corridors (and same species).

- Concern that density of new development seen as impacting urban forest. Others prefer balance (allowing new housing while protecting trees and greenspace) or prioritizing people (housing) and greenspace over cars/pavement.
- Under 4.15 Community Stewardship (p.40). It needs to be explicitly stated that the UF cannot be maintained and enhanced by Parks alone. Needs community partnerships to support this work.
- Indicate specific completion dates for Urban Forest Master Plan
- Once urban forest implementation plan action complete, integrate into neighbourhood plan.
- Concern regarding allergies due to male trees
- Concerns regarding blasting of rock, impacts on aesthetics, groundwater, trees, structure of adjacent houses.

Waterfront

Strong support for further waterfront planning.

Various comments supporting different uses:

- Cars/parking: some people (including seniors) use car to access this amenity; or like to sit in car at Clover point in winter
- Bicycles: support for bicycle lane; bicycle parking at key access points to beaches; safer crossings of Dallas Road. One suggestion for bicycle route down Linden, crossing at Dallas Road
- Pedestrians: space separated from cyclists; safer crossings
- Dogs: contain/fence dog park so others can also enjoy green space; enforce leash or no dogs on beaches where restricted)
- Activities and amenities: picnicking and Frisbee (separated from dog park); maintain nature/protect bluffs; add washrooms at Clover Point.

Urban Food Production

Differing comments on urban agriculture:

- Some would like to see allotment gardens in parks; others oppose use of park space for allotment gardens.
- Some support for orchards, edible landscape trees; others opposed (keep park space / don't want people driving to orchard)
- Concern about controlling deer / deer as a challenge to urban food production
- Some would like to see gardens in multi-unit residential, and rooftop gardens permitted in single-detached or infill housing
- When asked what the draft neighbourhood plan missed, several comments indicated urban food production
- Concern regarding "messy" appearance of boulevard gardens.
- Suggestion that a community garden would be great for all those living in multi-unit residential buildings.

Ross Bay Cemetery

- Desire for policies related to cemetery (e.g. opportunity for more burial plots or memorial walls added; desire for more planning for the site).
- Some concern about cycling route through cemetery.

Future Land Use

Affordable Housing

- Many comments asking to define affordable housing as used in the plan / concerns that it won't be affordable
- Desire to support growth that includes diverse income and household types. A smaller number of comments opposed affordable housing for a number of reasons, or opposed to density bonuses for affordable housing.
- Some concerned about all amenity contributions being directed to affordable housing, favouring other amenities or a mix.
- Specific comments regarding affordable housing are contained in the individual sections (Northwest Area, Urban Residential Areas and Cook Street Village in particular).

Terminology

- Desire for more clear or direct terms be used (e.g. instead of “support”, “consider”) in the document.

Commercial areas - general

- Suggestion to consider the changing nature of work in the next 20 years - & its impact on design/planning.
- More description desired for plans for pocket commercial in Fairfield? Desire to protect existing commercial/ employment uses, and maintain flexibility for the future.
- Specific concerns regarding isolated commercial uses (e.g. Collinson and Vancouver) – see Rental Retention area for specifics.

Rezoning

- Some questions/lack of clarity on relationship between the plan and rezoning.
- Some question/ concern that the plan will result in the pre-zoning of the entire neighbourhood.

Variances

- Concern that too many variances being granted, and structure of Board of Variance. Desire for neighbourhood plan policies to be stronger with respect to variances.

Density, Housing growth and change

Variety of comments in support of, opposed to or expressing concerns about density, growth and change in a general way (in addition to specific concerns detailed in following sections). Some would like to accommodate added housing in a variety of ways; others would prefer no changes to existing patterns. Some comments focus on the Traditional Residential areas, other on the Urban Residential areas or the neighbourhood as a whole.

Desire to establish neighbourhood-specific housing growth targets. Specific comments include:

- Desire for planning to be based on these numerical targets
- Incorporate 2016 census into plan and analysis
- Concern that City has already hit much of the projected growth for next 30 years in OCP. Is more growth needed?
- Desire to examine the limits to population growth in the city
- Concern that plan is not connected to Official Community Plan or regional targets
- Concern that Official Community Plan targets should not drive neighbourhood planning
- Concern that the City’s zoned capacity was found to be sufficient to accommodate city-wide identified population growth from 2008 to 2041 (13,500 apartment-type units and 2,700 ground-oriented units).
- Desire for plan to further detail current age, housing type and tenure and identify changes expected as a result of the plan.

Community Amenity Contributions

- Some comments that Victoria is not receiving sufficient contributions and/or affordable housing from new development. Specific comments that Victoria should seek the same levels of community amenity contributions as cities in the Vancouver Area receive

Gentle Density Approach

“Gentle density” proposal was suggested by a number of people, to accommodate all new housing in smaller buildings largely within and compatible with Traditional Residential Areas. Belief that this approach will result in more affordable housing for a range of incomes. Suggestions to support this include identifying areas for gentle density; creating an ombudsperson or “Gentle Density concierge” to assist in approval of gentle density proposals, and provide assistance to meet affordable rent targets.

Concerns include planning for amenities, protecting the urban forest, planning for transit, concern for the pace of change, loss of character, and protection of neighbourhood diversity.

One comment on the “hub theory” that assumes hubs should have greater height and density. Concern that this may be a planning fad/experiment; that Victoria has many older hubs with diverse older buildings; and that even four storey development can mean the loss of older buildings, streetscapes and trees, more expensive housing, and boxy design.

<p>School Capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several comments regarding capacity of schools and if they can accommodate additional housing. • Another comment indicated that school enrollment at Sir James Douglas is primarily due to French Immersion program, and that the in-catchment student population is relatively low. • Another concern that plan does not do enough to provide family housing, and with the increasingly expensive housing and older demographic, school enrollment will decline.
<p>Infrastructure Capacity</p> <p>Several concerns that plan does not address infrastructure capacity, that infrastructure is not sufficient, that development does not contribute to infrastructure, or that taxes would need to rise as a result of growth.</p>
<p>Taxation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that City plans for more housing in order to gain tax revenue (negative / positive comments) • Concern that added housing in the Traditional Residential areas will require more services/infrastructure leading to higher taxes (See infrastructure, above)
<p>Parks Capacity</p> <p>Several concerns that the area does not have sufficient parks and/or parks improvements to accommodate new housing units and additional families. Concern that new development does not contribute to park improvements. One concern that rising home prices and older demographic will change needs for parks. Another concern that new units without large backyards will increase demand for parks.</p>
<p>Plan focus</p> <p>One question on why the plan focuses on identifying types of infill housing, visualizing added multi-unit development, and defining zoning requirements and site/built form parameters, and thus seems to be a plan to be used by developers, City staff, Council and members of the Community Association Land Use committees.</p>
<p>Northwest Area and Fort Street</p>
<p>Fort Street Corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for a separate plan for the Fort Street Corridor, spanning neighbourhoods, for consistency. Fort Street is called out as an area of unique character in the Downtown Core Area Plan, but is split between several neighbourhoods and plans. • Fort Street is the “Urban Village” area for the northwest, consistent with its vision in the Downtown Core Area Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Emphasize small storefronts, interesting and lower-scaled street walls ○ Consider sunlight access esp. on north sidewalk, with new development
<p>Northwest Area Identity</p> <p>The plan should emphasize an identity for the Northwest area (e.g. “Cathedral Hill” or “Pioneer Park” area) as a distinct area, near but not in downtown, characterized by heritage landmarks, Royal theatre, Pioneer Park and views of Olympic Mountains .</p>
<p>View Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for maintaining views of Olympic Mountains on Quadra Street. Request to consider view corridor from Fort Street and Quadra Street. • Suggestion to define a similar view corridor along Vancouver Street.
<p>Pioneer Park</p> <p>Desire to emphasize Pioneer Park as a gathering place for the area. Comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pioneer Park has seen more activity and use over the last few years, and correspondingly less visible social ills • Sunlight, especially in the afternoon, is important to enjoyment of the park and may be compromised by development scenario proposed

- Many people use the park and Broughton Street as a walking route to/from downtown in the evening
- A crossing is needed at Quadra and Broughton
- Consider storefronts along Quadra opposite the park

Walkability

Several comments regarding the need for walkability improvements in the area (e.g. crossing at Broughton and Quadra) as more people, including seniors, will live in the area. General concerns for added traffic, and added curb cuts on Broughton Street disrupting pedestrians.

Streetscapes

- Concern to maintain walkable streets and urban forest throughout area
- Some want more explicit direction on streetscape improvements
- Some are concerned that streetscape concepts (e.g. “living streets” on Collinson and McClure) are unfunded.
- Comments to maintain Burdett and Vancouver as green, walkable streets
- Concern that Broughton Street will have too many curb cuts, too close together, to be comfortable for pedestrians
- Concern about access or services on dead-end streets:
 - that underground parking exiting off Convent Place would be a problem, because some of the houses have on-street parking and there are already the number of cars entering and exiting from the apartment blocks. Suggest new building be supported but be accessed from Quadra.
 - support for more development, but services (garbage, loading zones, parking access) are maxed out on McClure Street – a dead end street with many service vehicles daily.

Amenities and Affordable Housing Contribution

- Some concern that all amenity contributions would go to affordable housing, rather than publicly accessible amenities, and that vision for area improvements (e.g. “living streets”, walkability) are not funded.
- One comment that public spaces will become a tax burden.

Affordable Housing and Amenities

- Recommendation that affordable housing should be in perpetuity or else that amenities in the form of better design and publicly-accessible amenities be preferred. Concern that period of affordability will be short while massing, design and density will remain after affordability period.

Rental retention

- Suggestion to add blocks between Burdett and Rupert Terrace to Rental Retention area to prevent displacement, because many renters live here in older buildings.

Building massing, density and heights west of Quadra Street / north of Rupert Terrace:

General agreement that density and height are appropriate near downtown. Some see proposed densities or heights as too much for this area. Specific concerns include:

- Proposed density north of Courtney Street will result in buildings too close together. Concern that existing example (Escher) is too dense for the height and lot size. Varying opinions on lower density and/or more height with more slender and separated buildings.
- Heights esp. as they impact Quadra Street, Pioneer Park and Fort Street. Suggestions include lower height east of Blanshard Street; or lowering height mid-block for a lower height nearer Quadra Street.
- Concern that building massing and design should relate to Pioneer Park (in addition to other landmarks and the playlot at the Courts).
- One comment wanting to see a variety of building heights (not uniform).
- Concern that height in blocks between Burdett and Rupert Terrace will lead to displacement or block views from existing 4-storey buildings.
- Concern that development will displace Food Ecodistrict.
- Some concern that development in the Northwest will take away from character of Fairfield.

- Concern that area will be “sterilized” with towers and concrete podiums housing professional offices; desire to keep residential, differentiate from downtown.
- Concern that developers will build to maximum, eliminating existing heritage buildings and potential for row houses and lower density forms in this area.
- Concern if there are plans for Rose Manor, a seniors residence owned by BCHousing and run by Kiwanis, as it appears as a potential redevelopment site in the Fairfield Plan?

Building massing, density and heights between Quadra Street and Vancouver Street:

General support for added housing in this area, with others disagreeing.

Comments in general support found the proposed heights appropriate, and felt the area can accommodate more population.

Many comments find height/density appropriate with specific concerns:

- maintain pedestrian-friendliness
- maintain greenery, street trees (specific comment re: Burdett)
- include affordable housing
- add amenities / enhance public spaces
- height should relate to context of what is next door to proposed development
- don't detract from Cathedral
- South of Collinson should remain 4 storeys; 6 storeys should start north of Collinson where there is an existing taller building (2 comments). Reasons given for this are that the triangular block bounded by Fairfield Road, Vancouver Street, Collinson St. and Quadra St. narrows to the west, not lending itself to large buildings; there is an attractive selection of single family homes some designated and some of heritage interest; this block has a charming character and Fairfield Rd. is a pleasant pedestrian-friendly connector for residents and tourists between the Inner Harbour and Cook Street Village; access and egress to parking is already a challenge. There is already a 6 storey building on the north side of Collinson.

Some feel heights/densities proposed are too much:

- A number of comments indicating that maintain a 4-storey height limit is preferable.
- One comment that the 4-storey height is an essential element of the neighbourhood feel and ambience of this area (as important as limits in Cook Street Village or Traditional Residential areas)
- One suggestion that the maximum height be 5 storeys, with mid-block walkways
- Concern that heritage houses will be dwarfed by 6 storey buildings
- Concern that there is not sufficient land for more development
- Concern 6 storey height belongs in downtown core only; concern that density is spreading towards Fairfield
- Suggestion that the area contain a variety of heights, through a limit on the % of buildings that can be 6 storeys (one suggestion 40%)
- One concern not to change the OCP regarding density or to allow more density or businesses on Vancouver Street (traffic concerns).

Some want more density:

- Several comments that taller buildings or more density are appropriate
- Suggestions that 8 storeys of 30m would be appropriate
- Reasons include that the area is convenient for seniors to walk to services
- Comments that more height would be acceptable if affordable rental units are included, if contributions are made to enhance green spaces, or with artist live/work units

Population, housing type and tenure

- General support to see accommodation of housing as city grows. Some opposition to density in general, population change in general, or concern that density in the northwest is seen as a “tradeoff” for lower heights elsewhere.

Specific concerns include

- Concern that new units will be small (under 500 sq. ft.); desire for family-sized units in multi-unit buildings.
- Concern that overall number of rental units will be reduced. Differing concern that too many rental units would change the balance away from homeownership.
- Concern that policies will result in displacement of renters. One specific concern about displacement south of Burdett Avenue; recommendation that this area be included in the Rental Retention policies.
- Concern to have pet-friendly units
- Concern that there is too much emphasis on housing supply rather than demand; that adding housing, esp. smaller units, will not lead to affordability to middle and low income individuals.
- Comment that population is already being accommodated in Fairfield and further policies are not needed; or asking to justify population growth
- Concern that population increase has led to increasing traffic on Vancouver Street
- Concern that development will be rapid and that the two blocks north of Courtney Street could house 1,500 people on two blocks in near future
- Comment that Fairfield have lovely parks and lots of green space, and no change in density / population is needed.
- Comment that people want to live in separated houses, not multi-unit buildings.
- Suggestion for artist live/work 4-8 storey buildings should be encouraged in the North West corner and in the Cook Street Village - close to services and transportation. Perhaps also at Moss and Fairfield as well.
- Comment that there should be no more social housing in this area

Heritage

Desire for more attention to heritage structures (not just those designated/registered)
 Concern that heritage apartment buildings be protected

Culture

Comment regarding recognizing and improving the Royal Theatre (see also Placemaking, Arts and Culture)

Commercial Uses (also in Urban Residential Areas)

- Clarification that public input was for commercial use at grade in a rezoning of existing zoned service station at the southeast corner of Collinson and Vancouver, not at all corners. Reason given is to provide opportunity for some sort of community gathering space (e.g. coffee shop, etc.) if residents are added, and consistent with “living street” goals.
- Avoid encroachment of bars, stores, marijuana shops; keep residential.
- Comment that various commercial or institutional uses exist in the northwest and urban residential areas including a hotel, hospital, offices of the Red Cross, dentist, auto repair and flower shop, places of worship, YMCA, convenience store, bed and breakfasts, upper Cook Street near Meares) and these should be recognized as acceptable uses. (see correspondence for more detail). (note: several of these are recognized for continued commercial use in the plan, including the area of Cook Street near Meares, and the Cook-Fairfield intersection).
- Strong comment that no isolated commercial uses be mentioned in the plan (re: Vancouver and Collinson). Reasons include that this calls out a single property; that if one is mentioned, all properties including those with grandfathered business uses be mentioned; that the owner does not wish to sell; that both service station use and building are part of neighbourhood’s heritage; that lot is too small for mixed use development.
- Another comment indicated that locations that are less than ideal retail locations (e.g. Moss and May village) may offer more affordable rents for varied businesses compared to Cook Street Village
- Comment that figure 14 is unclear and was read by some to indicate commercial uses on Collinson east of Quadra Street

Parking

- A few comments concerned that there will be no or insufficient parking in new multi-unit buildings, or that the City did not have developed parking standards.
- Some concerns for the impact of curb cuts on the pedestrian environment.
- Comment that multi-storey residential buildings with underground parking do not achieve the City’s stated goals of promoting sustainability and walkable mixed use residential areas and employment centres or reduce the use of private fossil fuel vehicles.

Transportation and Mobility

- Concern that bicycle lanes and removal of parking are causing traffic congestion.

10% additional density for affordable housing

Various perspectives:

Comments in support focused on this being necessary in a growing community, that affordable housing can't be provided without added density, that affordable housing is needed, and suggestions that a portion of all units or affordable units be 2-3 bedrooms to support families (several comments).

Concern that affordable housing really be affordable to moderate income families. Concern that City did not seek enough from development. Concern that 10% (or even 20% or 30%) below market is not affordable when considering 30% of income for modest income households.

Those who offered qualified support included that affordable housing be secured in perpetuity; that the City should set a mandatory requirement for what % of units should be affordable; that this is one way of getting affordable housing but the City relies on it too much; the if required, this is the best part of the neighbourhood for it; that sufficient parking is needed; or that the City's density bonus policies were not strong enough to get sufficient contributions.

Comments opposed to this policy fell into several groups:

- Some wanted affordable housing but not additional density, and felt the City could create stronger requirements.
- Similarly, some were concerned that despite City policies, added density would result in the displacement / eviction of renters in older buildings with affordable rents, and that new housing would not be sufficiently affordable to these residents.
- Some were generally opposed to density and its impacts (e.g. traffic, loss of quiet, character)
- Some felt that policies regarding density, and policies to achieve affordable housing, should not be linked and that density should not vary between market and non-market housing;
- Some believed affordable housing would be better achieved elsewhere. Suggestions include in Cook Street Village (because it's more attractive to developers); as suites, duplexes and townhouses in Traditional Residential areas; in more affordable parts of the city; or further from the city.
- Some felt that affordable housing was inappropriate/unachievable in new development in Fairfield where land prices were very high and new development would not be affordable.
- Two comments were opposed to affordable housing for "low wage earners" or formerly homeless people

Design guidelines for the northwest area and Fort Street Corridor:

- Desire to create guidelines concurrent with plan, with public consultation with residents (several comments on need for engagement; 2 comments on guidelines being part of this plan, not developed later; several said need to see guidelines before commenting)
- Concern that Fort Street Corridor have coherent design and planning given how many neighbourhoods it is divided into
- One concern that Planning department does not follow guidelines

Variety of input into guidelines:

- Fit in with neighbourhood (several comments)
- Various specific development types mentioned:
 - Traditional design (suggestion this is what tourists come to see)
 - Don't want to replicate heritage but align with or enhance the aesthetic of the neighbourhood; more modern buildings should be allowed
 - Mid-century design in keeping with existing style
 - Some support modern designs; others are concerned with the appropriateness or quality of these designs
- Want to see a variety of building heights
- Concern for how "green" building can be, more than what they look like
- Desire to retain green space through landscape requirements; protect views; mass buildings to keep streets beautiful

- Some concerns that design guidelines not be too prescriptive. Concerns include that design is subjective; that creativity be maintained; that it is ok for “new to look new.”
- Concern for transitions: gradual, no new building “tower over” its neighbours (example given of Cook and Oliphant)
- Keep it looking residential
- Concern that concrete, glass storefronts with offices, and lack of landscape would make area look like downtown. Suggestion to keep it looking residential / like Fairfield / distinguish from downtown.

Some concern or lack of support for new guidelines:

- Suggestion that the existing guidelines are appropriate
- Concern that 'Fit' is a subjective term and can be leveraged by existing homeowners to prevent new developments from taking place; that the existing OCP guidelines should be met
- Concern that higher buildings do not fit with the surrounding properties despite guidelines
- Maybe - Concern that guidelines created by government would be a “reaction” rather than solution.

Cook Street Village

Height and/or density

Various comments and perspectives:

- Some would like to see lower height limits in policy: Suggestions include one-storey or two-storey limit; others suggesting 3 storeys consistent with existing Cook Street Village guidelines and developments. (reasons given include access to sunlight; concern for traffic; general opposition to density; concern for ambiance / becoming more city than “village”, concern for parking, liking current makeup of the village; concern for displacing existing residents or businesses; general opposition to density; concern that change is the result of “social engineering”).
- Others support 4 storeys as proposed or with qualifications regarding design (see below). Reasons for supporting include that this is more appropriate for the village than the 6 storeys in the OCP; a desire to maintain mountain views for residents; that Cook Street Village should be a small urban village.
- Some would like to see higher limits, generally 6 storeys but some 5 (reasons given include to support added housing; that this height is appropriate to village; concern that we won't see added rental housing if development is constrained; desire to improve public areas; allows more people to live in village; increases vibrancy).
- Some would like more flexibility in heights. One comment to “leave the door open” for more height where designs offer more community amenity at ground level and step back height. One comment would prefer heights be based on surrounding context.

Urban design

Various comments and perspectives:

- Sunlight: Concern for access to sunlight on public spaces. Various comments include having a step-back above the second (or first) floor, limiting height, or having greater step-backs.
- Step-backs: Some would like to see greater step-backs for upper floors; the Cook Street Village Residents' Network suggests 3 metres.
- Setbacks: Some would like to see greater setbacks than the 1m proposed in the plan, or would like the guidelines to require variation in set-backs. Others believe that greater setbacks are not business-friendly
- Streetwall: Some would like a lower streetwall (2 or even 1 storey). Others would like to see guidelines require variation in street wall heights to avoid uniformity. Some would like to emphasize openness, sunlight access or variation of existing building pattern rather than a “sense of enclosure”
- Tree size/health: Concern for the impacts of underground parking and construction on the health and size of street trees/replacement street trees. Suggestion for underground parking setback.
- Architectural elements: Comments desiring more guidelines for architectural elements (canopies, variety of windows). Suggestion to look at guidelines for established neighbourhoods (e.g. Toronto; note example of “sky view”). Desire for rain protection.
- Views: Concern to maintain mountain views for current residents

- **Eclectic character:** Concerns include: “Keep the eclectic, unique feel of the village” is most important statement in this section / character of the village; fit historical, hip vibe, not glass and concrete; keep unique / don’t be too prescriptive, keep organic / make new buildings pleasant to be around, recent development is ugly. Concern this goal is not incorporated into guidelines.
- **Clarity:** Concern that guidelines be clear, not negotiated, that language in plan is not strong enough
- **Gathering spaces:** Support for common gathering spaces, roof top gardens; concern for privacy of neighbours
- **Unique pattern:** Concern the guidelines do not capture the unique pattern of the village – “no mention of the deflections of Cook Street at Oscar and at May, or of the offset side streets and streethead views these create, or of the variety of lot sizes and shapes ... buildings sizes and styles, or of the fact that the village has an established historical character even though it has no heritage designated buildings.”
- I would like to see the Community and Business Vitality Principles rewritten to be phrased in more general terms (see correspondence). I would also add two principles.
 - Make Cook Street a complete street that will support all modes. (...overarching idea for AAA bike routes and active transportation, and improvement of pedestrian crossings, etc.)
 - Encourage strategies to make Cook Street a **Green Urban Village**. (... covers policy proposals to reduce storm-water run-off and to maintain the urban forest, and to the goal in Chapter 11 in the Draft Plan to “Promote and encourage sustainable building design and green infrastructure ...”)

Business vitality

There were a number of comments regarding business vitality. These comments included:

- Concern from both residents and businesses that the Plan does not recognize Cook Street Village businesses are not “local serving” but rather locally owned businesses supported by the greater Victoria area / that Cook Street Village is a destination.
- Concern that new businesses in the village will not support everyday needs for local residents (e.g. affordable groceries; pharmacy; hardware; bank), but will gentrify neighbourhood (e.g. “higher-end” “boutiques”, potential loss of grocery store or pharmacy). Concern that without providing for local needs, village will not really be “walkable”. Concern to maintain/enhance offering of grocery shopping
- Formal submission supporting additional residential density and additional commercial space as strategies to support the vitality of Cook Street Village businesses.
- Some support additional commercial space, more businesses and vitality. Others believe commercial space should be limited and the current village protected
- Concern that part of the appeal of Cook Street Village as a destination is surrounding heritage character/houses, connections to Beacon Hill Park and pleasant walk to downtown.
- Concern to maintain on-street parking, establish a parking management plan.
- Suggestion for stronger policies requiring new buildings to contain a variety of commercial unit sizes which support local businesses.
- Concern to maintain locally owned businesses.
- Concern about rising commercial rents.
- Concern to see the community and vitality principles written in more general terms, and to add policies to make Cook Street a complete street supporting all modes; and to make the village a Green Urban Village.

Housing

- Concern about net loss of rental units (31 fewer rental units between 2016 – 2017 per CMHC). Suggestion for policy of no net loss of rental units for Cook Street Village area

Streetscape

- **Traffic:** Concern that traffic is too fast in the village which impacts both safety and noise levels; desire to make village “sticky” (suggestions include through more crosswalks, narrower lanes; corner bulb-outs; removing centre turn lane) to slow traffic.
- **Parking:** Desire to develop a parking strategy. Many support “no net loss of on-street parking.” Others support “no net increase of on-street parking.” / Concern that sidewalk can’t be widened if parking is retained / Consider car access for seniors, those who drive / many businesses rely on many customers coming by car / Consider delivery vehicles /

suggestion to allow use of sidestreets for business parking / concern that added housing on sidestreets will conflict with business parking / all on-street parking should be paid / private parking should be free

- **Timing:** The CSVBA would like to see Council address how the AAA plans to service Cook St Village now, not in two years when it will be implemented. The small businesses in the village are in expensive leases, many will be re-negotiating, and they are held financially accountable to the length of these leases. The small business community is feeling very vulnerable.
- **Shared Street:** Desire to strengthen policies to explore a shared travel area (some mention similarity to Government Street) to slow traffic, maintain parking and accommodate different modes. This idea suggested by both CSVRN and CSVBA.
- **Street Furniture:** Desire for a variety of street enhancement (benches, tables, bike racks, planters).
- **Lighting:** Add pedestrian friendly lighting / (downcast, low, non-polluting)
- **Public Art:** Incorporate art, whimsy (e.g. in street furniture) / Desire for public art
- **Culture:** Desire to recognize Lekwungen history through design or interpretation.
- **Accessibility:** Concern that streetscape design and materials be accessible to people with mobility limitations; avoid materials like cobblestones; concern that bicycle lanes adjacent to on-street parking make exiting a car difficult for those with limited mobility.
- **Boulevards:** Concern for reducing mud in the wet season while maintaining permeability / identify best practice boulevards in front of Oxford Foods
- **Vendors:** Suggestion for space to allow business carts
- **Street Trees:** Desire to maintain large trees / one suggestion to consider trees that aren't as messy as horse chestnut
- **Dog "Parking" Area:** Concern that because many people like to walk their dogs to/through the village, they then enter storees and this can cause problems for people with allergies. Also desire doggy bag dispensers and receptacles.

Parking Requirements (Buildings)

- Some concerned that new development will not have parking, or will not have sufficient parking.
- Others believe that parking standards should be reduced within the village to encourage less automobile use; that parking standards are not consistent with neighbourhood's vision for the future (CSVRN) given that 55% of residents walk, bike or take transit to work.
- Suggestion that plan identify a transition to less automobile use over 25 years.
- Request for data on the number of vehicles, mode shares, # parking spaces, and estimated population in Fairfield today and in 25 years (to inform parking discussion)?

Gathering spaces

- Different opinions on gathering space. While survey results show strong support for public spaces (in line with earlier feedback), some see the spaces as unnecessary and feel that a well-designed streetscape together with businesses and patio seating comprise the gathering space. (Some specific comments that plaza spaces are not needed if streetscape is designed well and businesses are attractive; that the park is nearby; that spaces will be difficult to finance or take tax dollars to upkeep).
- Some would like to see the street designed to be closed during events (either in addition to or instead of a plaza space)
- Suggestion to close one sidestreet where it meets the west side of Cook Street (to limit cut-through traffic/potential for plaza)

Transit

- A number of comments regarding the need for better transit to the village; concern that plan does not sufficiently address transit.
- Question of how the plan can better address transit given BC Transit's jurisdiction.
- Suggestion to extent the village to the Fairfield/Cook Street corner (as identified in the previous plan for the village) as Fairfield Road is an identified Frequent Transit route for BC Transit.

Active Transportation

- General support for an east-west connection through Beacon Hill Park, with desire for more specificity of route between Cook Street and the park. One comment in opposition to accommodating more bicycle traffic in the park.

Urban Forest

- Concerns about loss of trees with new development
- Specific concerns regarding new underground parking and construction damaging existing trees and limiting the size/species of replacement trees; small size of trees in planters; extent of pavement on site removing tree planting spaces.

Community Space

- Some would like to see more community space. This includes enhanced activities at drop-in centre; arts activities; need for flexible work spaces; more ways to connect; desire for recreation facility/gym.
- Concern that current community centre activities appeal to seniors and families with children but leave out others;
- Desire for childcare facility. CSVN report that some participants feel this is more important than public spaces as an amenity.

West of Cook Street Village**Transportation and Mobility**

- Concerns for traffic calming; that new bicycle lanes will drive more auto traffic to cut through local streets west of the village. Suggestions include speed humps; closing the end of one street west of Cook Street).
- Desire to further develop connection to park; consider traffic calming; suggestion to close one side street just west of Cook Street.

Traditional vs. Urban Residential Housing

Comments split between maintain all Traditional Residential designations west of Cook Street Village, vs. changing to Urban Residential. Competing petitions from residents have been submitted (each with over 20 signatures).

- Both sides cite support from residents, believe their proposal will most provide affordability, and that laneways can be utilized for creative development.
- Reasons for maintaining Traditional Residential include: wishing to maintain the scale and compatibility with existing housing; many houses have heritage character and have recently been renovated; there are many houses containing suites, fourplexes; Traditional Residential infill can be done by owners while new apartments are built by developers; cluster of early 1900s houses on Oliphant, Pendergast and South Vancouver Street which are significant and included in heritage walking tours, and have been converted to multi-units; lower density will encourage retrofit of existing rather than demolition; new development can be designed consistent with existing character (but don't want a Heritage Conservation Area or designation); new multi-unit housing is expensive; the charm of Cook Street village comes from surrounding character houses which provide a link to Beacon Hill Park; smaller houses and gardens provide the character of the neighbourhood; concern for maintaining the character of Vancouver Street. If the area remains Traditional Residential, the key suggestions include maintaining building massing near the front of the lot, plus laneway development (rather than a strict # units), maintaining greenspace and trees; new development keeping with character of existing houses; and flexibility to add density (e.g. fourplex + garden suite).
- Reasons for changing to Urban Residential include: Nearby areas have 3-6 storey developments; this is a good location for housing; that retaining this lower density is inconsistent with the surroundings and planning practice; that seniors and younger population want walkability to amenities; finding that character of new developments on side streets (e.g. Park Street; Southgate Street) attractive; greater density allows more housing; young people want multi-unit housing near amenities; previous owners would've added density here is permitted by the City; preventing density leads to urban sprawl, pollution, less amenities and affordability; some existing houses, especially at the edge of the proposed Traditional Residential pocket, are impacted by adjacent, close transition from development in Cook Street Village, will be further impacted by future development, and should be allowed to redevelop rather than be maintained.
- There are differing opinions as to whether Oliphant should be maintained as a Traditional Residential area on its own, or if it should be consistent with the other currently Traditional Residential areas west of Cook Street Village (whichever direction is decided).

East of Cook Street Village

General Development Pattern

A variety of perspectives were presented on development in the areas east of Cook Street Village. Comments included:

- Some support the proposal as appropriate near the village, an attractive alternative to either larger apartment buildings or expensive single-detached homes (both of which are already plentiful in Fairfield); allows more families to afford to live here.
- Some generally oppose changes proposed, feeling that impacts on density, parking, population, single-family homes, character or community are too great.
- Some want to see more housing / more density can be added; feel restrictions will drive up the cost of housing).
- Concern that policies are too vague.
- Overlap with comments on Traditional Residential areas (see below), including:
 - Some generally oppose any change in density or housing composition, population in Traditional Residential areas / want to reduce possible density / want single detached with suites only.
 - Others support more density, housing added.
 - Desire to emphasize retaining/reuse existing homes
 - Concerns regarding parking
 - Concerns regarding greenspace and trees
 - Different views on whether suites are desirable / undesirable
 - Concern to restrict short term vacation rentals of suites

Design concerns

- Concern to maintaining transitions between new and existing development. Specific concerns regarding height, massing, privacy, noise impacts, loss of mature landscape
- Some concerns that guidelines should apply to all types of structures including single-detached
- Concern for transitions from the village to lower density development

Housing Types

- Some feel apartments are fine here, or with qualifications (e.g. 3-4 bedroom units; if they have shared outdoor areas; 2-3 storey apartment buildings). One comment it is unclear why apartment buildings are not supported; and another comment supporting 2-3 storey apartments along Cook Street south to Dallas Road. Other comments fear that multi-unit housing will expand and replace the character of smaller houses and gardens, or should be excluded from Linden Street, Wellington and Faithful.
- Some would like to see more units in houseplexes.
- Different opinions about townhouses as part of character of neighbourhood (some do not see it as appropriate; some want them scattered; some support townhouses in one row but not complexes; some see as attractive housing for families; some are concerned about lot consolidation; some cite existing developments positively (e.g. Oliphant and Heywood), others concerned about urban residential density townhouses (e.g. 451 Chester Street).
- Some who are concerned about townhouses feel that houseplexes, house conversions and/or laneway houses are more consistent with existing character.
- Desire to explore laneway housing more (suggestions include laneway houses for a variety of development types; 2-3 storey laneway housing; laneway housing preferable to townhouses fronting the laneway)

Loss of existing houses or character

- Concern for the replacement of older housing stock, preference for house conversions, desire to maintain a mix of housing

Parking

- Suggestion to widen Oxford, McKenzie, Oscar Streets to support parking on both sides.
- Suggestion to remove parking on one side of Oxford to make it easier to drive
- Concerns for parking if housing is added both in the village and infill housing east of it
- One comment supports decoupled parking (parking rented or sold separately from units) for infill housing and reducing parking requirements for small infill units.

Ross Bay Village

Varied opinions on **height, density, land use, design and massing**, outlined below.

About 1/3 of commenters would like to see Fairfield Plaza remain as is, as a one-storey shopping centre with surface parking, and feel the City should not support any future changes in height or land use. Reasons for this include:

- Many appreciate the diversity of businesses in the current centre. Comments include that the centre includes many convenient local-serving stores and services (e.g. dentist, bank, barber, pub, liquor store, pet store, dry cleaning, restaurants, gas station, etc.) that they feel may not be included in a redevelopment; services are in proximity to residents; many businesses are locally owned; the centre offers low rents; and the centre is lively already.
- Many like that the surface parking lot makes it accessible, is easy for seniors, that an auto-oriented centre provides for everyday needs and complements Cook Street village; that on-street parking nearby is already tight; don't like underground parking; that many residents of Fairfield, Gonzales and Oak Bay drive here for convenience; and concern parking in redevelopment would be hard to navigate (like Tuscany Village in Saanich).
- Concern that a redevelopment as shown in the concept would not have underground parking (concept drawing was not clear) and thus was not realistic for this type of centre.
- Concern that any added density would result in traffic impacts to area streets, including St. Charles, Fairfield Road and Stannard.
- Concern about transitions to surrounding development (including shading, wind). Suggestion for transition to be 2 storeys or greater setbacks.
- Some concerns that current owners bought with expectation of being in a quiet neighbourhood / did not expect these types of changes / are concerned about being next to a 3-4 storey building; or have lived in the neighbourhood for a long time and did not expect the shopping centre to redevelop.
- Some simply believe added density, residential use or population is inappropriate. Comments include change/density/height is inappropriate for neighbourhood; height does not support sense of community; current visual impact of one-storey centre is minimal; Thrifty's is already busy; that most residents are opposed to development; that the development is too much too fast; that it will impact school capacity; or that it is too far east on Fairfield to have density.
- Some concerned about soil types – earthquake risk and feasibility of underground parking
- Concern that Fairfield Plaza is a unique, iconic shopping centre / like mid-century modern design / part of Fairfield's heritage / area near Ross Bay Cemetery is unique.
- Some do not like the design of new suburban centres with mixed use (e.g. Tuscany Village; Eagle Plaza near GVH; Uptown) and feel redevelopment here would be similar.
- Concern about delivery hours changing
- Some concerns that the owner does not want to redevelop or that the site is too small for redevelopment
- Concern that Gonzales neighbourhood was not involved in discussion
- One questioned need for public spaces.

A few comments favoured a maximum of 2, 3, or 2-3 storeys as more consistent with the area.

Approximately 1/3 of comments either supported the proposed direction, or offering qualified support or specific suggestions/concerns. Those who were supportive indicated preference for a mixed-use character; support for housing or

affordable housing; belief that single-storey centre with parking lot does not foster community; belief that redevelopment could support more restaurant choices. Concerns included:

- Concern that parking will be hard to access.
- Concern that design will be generic. Comments included concern it would look like various suburban centres in the Victoria area; that it will still be a strip mall with housing.
- Concern that transitions won't be sensitive/ not confident City will enforce sensitive transition. Suggestions for 2 storey transitions or greater setbacks, more specificity.
- Concern to ensure affordable housing is included. Specific mention of 3BR units for families.
- Comment that 4 storeys is appropriate along Fairfield Road, opposite Ross Bay Cemetery; with attention for transitions important to neighbouring housing.
- Several comments wishing to see amenities, mentioning medical offices; library; community room; child care.
- Several comments wishing to see improved transportation around the plaza, including crossings, intersection, bicycle access on Fairfield Road, and transit.
- Want public realm well-integrated.
- Want convenient (surface) parking for seniors.
- Concern to have a diversity of shops, including grocery, hardware store as well as smaller shops.

One comment favoured 3-4 storey development, with the opportunity to consider additional height up to 6 storeys if supported in a future public process.

Some comments supported 6 storey development. Reasons offered for this included that development at 3-4 storeys is not viable and will not happen during the life of the plan; that a 3-4-storey redevelopment will not support adequate housing or affordable housing; that 6 storeys is needed to support underground parking; wanting to see redevelopment occur faster; concern that without change the strip mall will remain and become run-down; that the area should be consistent with Fort Street east of Cook Street; that areas outside of the Northwest and Urban Residential parts of Fairfield should contribute to housing; and that development should include transitions to surrounding area.

Name of Area

- Several comments indicated that the name "Fairfield Plaza" should be used and "Ross Bay Village" does not mean anything to area residents.

"Transitional Townhouses"

A variety of concerns focused on transitional townhouses shown on Stannard Ave. or St. Charles Street:

- Concern that townhouses are not appropriate adjacent to the shopping centre. Concerns include proximity to single-detached homes; townhouses not being a character element in the community; not wanting to sell; concern that single lots do not have the dimensions to support townhouses in two rows, and so developers would seek variances for setbacks; concern about transitions; change to feel of block; not being a good neighbourhood for townhouses; parking.
- Concern that 3-storey townhouses adjacent to Hollywood Park will negatively affect the ecology and enjoyment of the park (and possible Ross Bay Cemetery), and suggest limiting to 2 storey buildings with 9.1 metre setbacks.
- Concern that a lot at the corner of Earle Street and St. Charles appears to be excluded from having townhouses and question if there is a different development concept being considered there.
- One suggestion that no townhouses be approved until after redevelopment of Fairfield Plaza occurs

Current traffic

- Concerns regarding current traffic, including that the Fairfield-St. Charles intersection is difficult; that the entrance to the plaza is difficult for cars to navigate; that crossings of Fairfield could be improved; and that better bicycle and transit access is needed.
- Concern that existing parking at Fairfield Plaza is hard to navigate.

Small Urban Villages

Format

- Comment that combining the sections for Five Points and Moss and May villages is confusing
- Desire to rewrite the plan to make it clear what exists in these areas in 2018 and how the plan changes this

General support / opposition

A number of commenters supported the proposal, or offered qualified support; while others are opposed to changes in this area. Specific comments are in the following sections.

- For those who supported the proposal, reasons included wanting to see more housing, believing this is appropriate development in the area, or wanting to see more business vitality and places to gather.
- For those who offered qualified support, reasons included a preference for 3 storey limits at Moss and Fairfield, concern for design, concern for public realm improvements, parking, and concern for affordable housing.
- Key reasons for opposing changes to the existing village included general opposition to density or population change; concern for traffic and parking; transitions and proximity to single-detached houses, impacts on quality of life; feeling that the current village and businesses meet needs, believing 4-storey buildings are too much density in a primarily single-detached neighbourhood, not wanting more businesses. One comment was concerned this would lead to gentrification. A number of commenters opposed enhancements to public spaces. Some believe change should be incremental in nature to protect existing businesses, or that the area should remain as is “for the time being.”

Height / Urban Form / Density

Various comments on building height. A number of comments would like to limit this area to 3 storeys. Others believe the proposed height is appropriate. A few comments would like to see 2 storeys. Some would like to limit it to remain as it is (no change). A few would like to see more density and height. Specific comments include:

Specific comments in support or providing qualified support include:

- 4 storey buildings provide needed housing, support underground parking, is appropriate
- More shops and density is desirable
- Housing is needed
- 4 storeys is too restrictive; it could be higher; support higher buildings with underground parking
- Support taller buildings close to the intersection and don't let them spread towards adjacent areas
- It would depend on the design of buildings and public spaces, what businesses are there
- Support this form - if you look at large cities, there are small groceries and services at the corners, and townhouses or other buildings in between.
- Moss and May: as long as there is a gradual transition to blend with the single detached houses on Moss street

Reasons for supporting 3 storey buildings at Five Points Village include:

- Existing buildings have a pleasing aesthetics; show off the vistas toward Dallas Road
- 4 storeys would be too tall for the residential neighbourhood / character houses / impact directly adjacent homeowners
- 4 storeys would feel too enclosed/too much shade/there are not enough trees
- There are many areas for infill already
- Concern that buildings in addition to Fairfield United Church will be torn
- Keep to the OCP limit (3 storeys)
- 3 storeys is appropriate outside of downtown
- Concern that in a family neighbourhood with lots of parks, higher density and commercial use is not needed (until downtown is full)
- Too many areas with higher density too close together; concern that apartment buildings will spread / be approved adjacent to villages
- Concern that density/height be limited to 1.5 fsr/3 storeys (with no density bonusing) consistent with Fairfield at Lillian/Wildwood Village in proposed Gonzales Neighbourhood Plan

Comments for limiting height at Moss/May:

- Concern that 3 storeys is out of character of may create increased demand for commercial growth.
- Suggestion that 2 storeys is more appropriate

Businesses - General

- Suggestions to support specific types of businesses: use floor area limits to favour small businesses; use retail specific zoning to meet the needs of residents; support grocery stores, pet stores, hardware stores to get people out of cars.

Businesses - Five Points Village:

Varied comments mainly support maintaining the number and space of businesses as is, recognizing the commercial history of this area, and requiring commercial uses at grade. Some comments favour increasing the amount of business space or strengthening its vitality. Others question the ability of businesses here to thrive or provide needed services; or opposing more commercial space due to traffic and parking concerns. Specific comments include:

- Concern for the retention/continuation of Moss Street Market, as an important event for the city; heard that it is not viable in its current form
- Concern to limit business hours so as not to affect existing environment of homeowners
- Desire for medical emergency building and schools / feel plan displays lack of care for children and the sick.

Businesses - Moss and May Village:

Some concerns for introducing commercial uses at Moss and May. Comments include limited potential due to proximity of Cook Street Village and Ross Bay Village; that this is primarily a residential neighbourhood; that retention of housing should be prioritized; that uses like medical building don't serve the neighbourhood. Others state that a coffee shop would be welcome here (as existed in the past), and that location provides more affordable rents for some uses (e.g. yoga studio).

- Support for businesses that add to the community such as yoga and hair care (currently there), coffee shop, convenience store
- Concern that the Moss/May location does not have the population to support businesses, is too close to Cook Street Village and Ross Bay Village, and that the plan may result in empty storefronts, and that City should do market research.
- Concern buildings like the medical services building do not add to community
- Suggestion that locations like Moss and May are opportunity for lower commercial rents to support businesses like yoga studios.

Design

- Concerns about sunlight access and limiting the height of streetwalls, stepping back upper storeys, having balconies
- Concern to include greenery, space for sufficient tree plantings (setbacks)
- Concern that the area include greenery, nice places to sit, public spaces – not just private residences
- Concern for sufficient setback to allow space for pedestrians, including seniors
- Concern that design of buildings fit the area / concern about modern, boxy type buildings (example of Fairfield United proposal)
- Concern for strong/specific design guidelines to ensure compatible transition from development to existing small scale single family residential area.
- Concern that plan is too restrictive on building heights, types and density
- Concern about privacy, e.g. balconies facing adjacent residential properties

Urban Forest

- Concern that there are enough trees
- Concern that trees will block sunlight

Heritage

- Concern to retain historic buildings
- Concern about other buildings in addition to Fairfield United being town down

Housing

- Suggestions to include affordable housing for families (3-4 bedrooms); that affordable housing near a school would be valuable; reserving housing is more important than adding commercial use at Moss and May
- I don't want subsidized or public housing (in our residential neighbourhood).

Traffic - Five Points /Fairfield Road:

- A number of comments cite that there is too much traffic on Fairfield Road, that it is hard to turn left, concern for safety near school; that it will be congested with more development or destination commercial; that the City should provide traffic impact data; or that any changes should be based on caution and case-by-case analysis of traffic impacts.
- Many comments are concerned about parking. Comments include that there is insufficient parking to support the proposal; that planners should provide a traffic and parking analysis; that new buildings include parking / sufficient parking; that businesses should provide free parking for clients; that 4 storeys of Fairfield Road is appropriate in order to support underground parking; that people still drive to “walkable” areas.
- Concerns regarding transit include moving the transit stop down due to congestion when school in session, or that focus should be on convenience and cost of transit and not on bus stop design.
- Some comments on pedestrian safety. One comment feels that the pedestrian scramble concept is more appropriate for a major city than this village. Safety for school children important
- Some comments on the need for bicycle parking; wanting bicycle lanes on Fairfield Road; or not wanting bicycle lanes on Fairfield Road due to perceived traffic impact. (note: concept and plan policies do not address bicycle lanes at this location)

Traffic - Moss and May:

- Would like to see more bicycle parking, speed humps or narrowing to slow traffic if more development occurs

Public Spaces

A number of comments saw public space enhancements as an important benefit and/or offered suggestions for these areas.

- Suggestion to integrate art (“Art and Culture district”), support temporary public art and festivals, create gathering place
- Suggestion to incorporate accessibility
- Support for greenery, garden, trees; concern that concept doesn’t show step-backs to accommodate large trees; concern that underground parking will preclude large trees
- Desire for spaces to sit
- Concern spaces will be too sterile
- Concern not to impede traffic flows at intersection
- Concern that residents have input into design
- Belief that a quality public realm supports local businesses

A number of comments opposed or questioned public space policies. These comments, organized by theme, included:

- Concern that an “attractive public space” is a matter of opinion and may be unneeded; that the existing small plaza and the space at Sir James Douglas is sufficient; that further gathering space may not be needed given the small number of businesses and lower density areas
- Concern that there is no data indicating that these spaces will be used and if they are worth the cost
- Concern
- No need to do this. There already is a nice gathering area at the corner of Moss and Fairfield, and many people gather for the Moss St market every Saturday at the school / Public space already exists
- Suggestion to enhance the gathering space at Sir James Douglas instead
- Suggestion for “dog parking” to keep them out of businesses?
- Suggestion that no enhancements beyond street trees are necessary.

Infill Housing adjacent to villages

- Various comments in support, opposed or identifying concerns

- Some would like to see infill housing, including townhouses; others would like to see area remain predominantly single-detached
- Concern for parking
- Concern that multi-storey apartment buildings would be approved next to or in between villages
- Concern for character, charm of area

Environment

- Suggestion that if development impacts the quality of life of a taxpayer, there must be fair compensation

Boundaries

- Concern that the southwest corner of the Moss and May intersection is excluded from the village, and that two non-residential properties on May St (the Orthodox Church and the Tombstone Manufacturing shop) are not identified in the plan.

Urban Residential Areas

Rental Retention Area

“Rental Retention Area”

Comments that labelling an area “Rental Retention” is misleading because there are a mix of tenures here; creates impression rentals will be concentrated here and not elsewhere in the community; stigmatizes area; or makes it unclear if new strata development is acceptable.

Height and Urban Form

As in the Northwest, various opinions on proposed heights and urban form. Some support 6 storeys; others 4 storeys. A few would like more height and density (8 or 10 storeys) and a few would like to see 3 or even 2 storey limits in this area.

Reasons for supporting the proposal include:

- That housing is needed and appropriate in this area
- That Fairfield Road should support transit
- That affordable housing is needed
- Concern that the 6-storey area not be expanded, and that there are housing units large enough for families

Reasons for opposing development of 6 storeys is varied and it includes:

- General opposition to density
- Feeling that 6 storeys is too high or that the area should remain predominantly 4 storeys
- Not wanting more population / people moving here
- That it is not equitable to reduce height in Cook Street Village without reducing it here
- Desire to require affordable housing for all development without allowing buildings over 4 storeys of with added density
- Desire to have lower scale buildings without and let the market determine housing prices
- Suggestion that density can be added within a 4 storey limit
- Concern that if 6 storeys is supported in the plan, developers will push for more density or for even more height
- Concern that density will encourage demolition and that rental replacement policies will not be effective
- Land is expensive so efforts to include affordable housing are not warranted here
- Suggestion apartments should be built farther from the city
- Concerns for infrastructure (see general Traditional Residential comments, above)
- Would like to see Traditional Residential extended to all side streets and Urban Residential limited to NW boundary and corridor streets. Avoid displacement of existing renters, encourage medium-density Traditional Residential.
- Concern that the area north of Southgate Street contains a mix of 4 storey apartments, duplexes and single family homes and that 6 storey buildings would overwhelm these.

- Concern that 6 storeys will block views and “shade out” existing apartment buildings, duplexes and houses, impact light and ambience of area
- Desire to retain and enhance existing 4 storey buildings
- Concern that the OCP indicated there is already sufficient capacity at 2.0 fsr.
- Concern about added traffic

Reasons for supporting more density or height than proposed:

- Belief that limiting density drives up the cost of housing and limits opportunities for affordable housing
- Land is expensive so density needed to support affordable housing
- In some cases, buildings over 6 storeys could fit in

Concerns about specific areas:

- Concern about having a good transition to Traditional Residential areas
- On Burdett Street across from Traditional Residential areas, stacked townhouses up to 3 storeys and 1.2 fsr are more appropriate for transition in height and scale from Urban Residential to Traditional Residential and would provide a valuable housing choice (petition presented to Council in May 2017 with 105 signatures).

Other comments:

- If 6 storey buildings are allowed in areas that don’t already have them, this policy should be applied across Fairfield as character of “Rental Retention” area is as worthy of protection as anywhere else.

Rental Retention Policies

- Suggestions to strengthen rental replacement policies:
 - Extend the “no net loss of rental units” policy to apply to 2 or 3 rental units.
 - Require housing agreements specifying affordable rent levels for all new developments
 - Make this an area for introducing and evaluating new and innovative approaches to rental retention.

Boundaries and Transition

- One commenter would like to see the Traditional Residential area maintained west of Linden Avenue.
- Some comments concerned about transition between Urban Residential and Traditional Residential areas.
- Would like to see Traditional Residential extended to all side streets and Urban Residential limited to NW boundary and corridor streets. Avoid displacement of existing renters, encourage medium-density Traditional Residential.

View Corridors

- Suggestion to define a view corridor along Vancouver Street, similar to one on Quadra

Affordable Housing

- Varying opinions on affordable housing. Comments were generally supportive of affordable housing policies but concerned about ensuring they are effective.

Reasons for offering support or qualified support included:

- Suggestion that Fairfield be a demonstration neighbourhood for Inclusionary Zoning; that higher heights/densities be contingent on affordable housing being included; that stronger policies be adopted; need to ensure developers contribute to affordable housing; ensure affordable housing is on-site, not elsewhere; City Density Bonus policy is not effective in getting contributions
- Need affordable housing / new rentals are expensive / rents on existing rentals are high / employees need housing / becoming unaffordable to retirees on fixed incomes
- Need units large enough for families 3 bedrooms / 2-3 bedroom units / shared outdoor space
- There should be clear limits on what rents are considered affordable / 10% - 20% below market rents is not affordable (several comments)
- Consider affordable homeownership, affordable financing for buyers
- Ensure affordable housing is permanent for the life of the building.

- Support affordable housing goals, but not added density
- Like the policy direction but concerned this will lead to demolition and eviction nonetheless
- Living near downtown is a privilege / need to be diligent about who qualifies for nonmarket housing
- Support affordable but not subsidized housing
- Concern about policy that all contributions go to affordable housing (suggestions for art, greens spaces, neighbourhood improvements, play areas for kids, public amenities for all to enjoy, childcare)
- More pet friendly rentals

Reasons for not supporting the affordable housing goals included:

- Concern that local tax money will be needed for affordable housing or that affordable housing reduces tax revenue
- Concern that it is unrealistic to have affordable housing in an area with high land values; that land is cheaper farther away (in city or outside of city)
- Prefer market to determine housing prices / housing is a private sector activity
- Suggestion that if condos (rather than rental units) are built, the tax rate could be reduced
- Concern that renters do not have the same regard for properties as owners who pay high home prices and taxes, will devalue properties
- Concerned about preserving buildings which are not energy efficient or seismically safe, uneconomical to retrofit, and might be replaced in the market
- Concern that only a few people benefit from affordable housing units
- Concern that amenity contributions add to cost of housing

Scattered Commercial Uses

- See Northwest Area and Fort Street Corridor for details. (overlap)

Transitional Urban Residential Areas

- Phrase “Consistent with existing development” is unclear – concern that this could indicate expansion of existing Urban Residential areas rather than maintaining current pattern
- Suggestion to maintain character
- Don’t increase traffic
- Some comments support more housing: All areas of Fairfield should contribute to additional housing; allow 2-3 storey apartments along Cook Street south to Dallas Road
- Several suggestions to allow apartments along Fairfield Road near transit

Traditional Residential

General

- Concern that the words “Traditional Residential” imply one type of architecture or housing.
- Recommendation to include map of larger lots which accommodate certain housing types mentioned in the plan.

Growth and Population Change

- Some comments that these areas should stay as they are, feeling that most of the neighbourhood should be maintained as single-detached houses (some with suites being acceptable). Reasons expressed for this include liking quiet, liking large lots, having bought into a single-detached neighbourhood, concern for the value of housing, concern that the plan should primarily consider existing homeowners/residents rather than future residents, suggestion that there are other areas more appropriate for diverse housing types. Specific concerns include that new housing will impact character, parking, traffic, or adjacent neighbours; that new development may impact encourage
- Other comments support increasing housing choice, adding options that allow people and families to live in the neighbourhood, or that all parts of the neighbourhood contribute to supporting added housing.

- Specific concerns regarding housing choice, impacts (e.g. traffic, parking, greenspace, character, neighbours) are detailed in the following sections.

Housing

Several concerns regarding housing. These included:

- A need for more 3-bedroom housing for families;
- A desire for mortgage helpers and rental suites to allow a broader range of residents to remain in Fairfield;
- Comments that some infill housing types are the only way people/families can stay in the neighbourhood / desire to stay in city
- A desire to see all parts of Fairfield contribute to housing goals and rental housing;
- Concern that new housing will not be affordable;
- Concern that Fairfield's Traditional Residential areas should maintain the types of housing that support those who chose a low-density area to live
- That lot assemblage for some infill housing types may cause displacement or disrupt community;
- That new development may drive up land values due to development potential; or, alternatively, that new development will reduce value of existing houses.

Parking

Many comments regarding parking supply. Parking was the most specific concern cited for opposing or being concerned about additional housing. A small number of comments alternatively suggested that housing and green spaces be prioritized over parking, and that other modes of travel be encouraged. Comments varied, key themes include:

- Varied opinions on future trends in car ownership (that households will continue to own as many cars as today; that they will have more cars [e.g. as children live at home]; vs. that changes in behavior and technologies like car share and automated vehicles will lead to lower car ownership.
- Concern that infill housing will bring additional cars, impacting on-street parking and traffic. Specific comments include that parking is tight already; that residents and their visitors to have to fight for parking; that most families own multiple cars; that seniors and families with small children must drive; that there is a lack of on-street parking to support the proposed changes; concern that some streets with parking on one side
- Many additional comments support infill housing only where sufficient parking is accommodated on-site. For suites, some suggest parking for each suite; others suggest one additional parking spot if there are two suites (e.g. 2 spots for a house with two suites).
- Concern that backyards would be paved for parking, reducing greenspace and trees.
- Some concerned about impacts if many changes occur on one street (e.g. if all houses have 2 suites).
- Suggestion for residential-only parking; suggestion to use a residential permit system to limit suites to one on-street space. Others don't want resident-only parking, finding it disruptive.
- Concern that if nearby urban villages don't provide everyday needs, that driving behaviour won't change.
- Concern that transit is not sufficient to provide an alternative to owning a car.
- Concern that there is always pressure to waive parking requirements (for aesthetic reasons, and to encourage trees), this will create future long-term problems.

Traffic

Many concerns regarding traffic (mirroring concerns about parking) from added population. Concerns include:

- that additional traffic will reduce livability and safety on local streets; that as larger streets get more congested, more traffic will cut through local streets; that local streets may become less comfortable for children or cyclists;
- that turn lanes and traffic signals may be inadequate for future growth;
- that additional road capacity is needed;
- that the combination of additional housing and bicycle lanes will make it harder to drive;
- concern that plan is based on people not driving cars, which is unrealistic

Others see a shift from travelling mainly by automobile (comments such as add more bicycle lanes to support added housing; or that the focus should be on housing people and keeping greenspace, not on cars.)

<p>Transit</p> <p>Desire for better, more frequent transit to support additional populations, or feel that current transit does not support a shift away from automobile use, in order to support added housing.</p>
<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Several comments regarding adequacy of infrastructure – sewer, water, parks, transportation.</p>
<p>Schools</p> <p>Several comments regarding capacity of schools and if they can accommodate additional housing. Another comment indicated that school enrollment at Sir James Douglas is primarily due to French Immersion program, and that the in-catchment student population is relatively low. Another concern that plan does not do enough to provide family housing, and with the increasingly expensive housing and older demographic, school enrollment will decline.</p>
<p>Design</p> <p>Many concerns regarding design of new housing. There are varying opinions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that new houses, duplexes or townhouses are not compatible with neighbourhood character due to modern / boxy design, flat roofs • Others wish to see more creativity and accepting of modern design • Some wish to see more compatible design, not necessarily mimicking existing design • Concern that housing being built does not have sufficient setbacks, that too much space is paved rather than landscaped, or that there is too much massing impacting adjacent properties • Concern that infill housing types (e.g. townhouses, duplexes) are not compatible with character of what is largely a single-detached area.
<p>Heritage, Loss of character houses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the loss of existing houses/character due to infill housing, and its overall impact on the neighbourhood • Suggestion that in traditional residential areas, policy should state that the retention and conversion of an existing house should always come first, before demolition and replacement is considered. • Concern that the neighbourhood contains many arts and crafts homes which have been restored and densified through house conversions, which will be more affordable than a new townhouses. • Concern that the majority of character homes in the neighbourhood are neither designated nor registered but their replacement with townhouse would destroy the traditional character of the neighbourhood.”
<p>Green space and trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many concerns regarding maintaining green spaces, space for growing food, urban forest if new development occurs. Concern that new housing types may not be consistent with urban forest goals; or that housing and urban forest goals should be balanced. Several comments would like to see stronger and more proactive protection of trees where additional housing is considered. Two comments saw urban forest as not a priority within city, except in parks/natural areas. Several comments not wanting to pave backyards for parking.
<p>House with 2 suites or suite + garden suite</p>
<p>Support / Opposition</p> <p>Comments in support tended to be general, seeing this housing type as appropriate, as a way to accommodate housing, help homeowners, and conserve existing buildings. Some comments pointed out that this already exists and the City is playing “catch-up.”</p> <p>Many comments offered qualified support. Concerns include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that parking be integrated on site • Concern about alterations to the existing house

- Concern about loss of tree canopy
- Concern that this be done only on larger lots and no trees be lost no alterations to existing house
- Concern to enforce restrictions on short-term rentals
- Concern that if many property owners do this, there will be parking problems, less food growing space, stormwater issues
- Concern that this divides family homes in favour of small units appropriate for single people and students.
- Concern that variances are not allowed unless there are exceptional circumstances.
- Concern that existing residents will be negatively affected by parking and traffic etc.
- Concern that this will encourage subdivision

Comments in opposition focused on similar concerns to those regarding infill housing in general. Some specific concerns were expressed about garden suites and parking (see housing types and parking, below). Specific concerns include:

- traffic and on-street parking (below)
- more massing
- reduces feel of community
- may impact property values
- impacts existing residents, does not benefit them
- more demand on infrastructure
- Repurposing of homes with one Secondary Suite and a Garden Suite meets and exceeds the OCP growth requirements

Suggestion for even more housing options:

- Give home owners the option to include 1, 2 or 3 suites. Places to live for renters, extended family, caregivers, students.

Regulatory Barriers

Many saw this as a good direction for existing owners to add housing to the neighbourhood. Concerns for barriers to accomplishing this goal:

- City process, make it easier for homeowners (rather than developers) to make these types of changes.
- Suggestions to produce a guide for homeowners; to have a dedicated planning positions or ombudsperson; to examine regulations; and to survey owners who've recently added suites to see what issues they encounter.

Health and Safety

There is a lot of housing that abuses this to provide easy low-income housing that is unsafe or unhealthy right now. Promoting additional affordable housing is great, but if the incentive is to rent out cheap units then there may be little incentive to address safety concerns (mould, poor construction, etc.) which I have seen frequently in these situations.

Housing Types

- Suggestion to allow strata subdivision of suite and garden suite in this case.
- Concern that a house with 2 suites or a suite and garden suite is in effect a triplex. Comments included:
 - One secondary suite per a house unless the house is redeveloped into 3 suites. At least 2 off-street parking spaces.
 - Concern that it will be a for more amenable to landlords renting all suites than to owner living on site
 - Suggestion that if this is done, it should be done as a house conversion to 3 units
- Comments that this already happens and could allow legalization of existing suites.
- Some general opposition to garden suites. Concerns included:
 - causes lots of friction between homeowners, for little gain in density.
 - limits green space and landscape

Parking

Most comments are general – either qualified support (provide off-street parking) or opposition (too much impact on on-street parking). Some specific suggestions include:

- One parking spot per unit
- 2 parking spots where a main house + 2 suites/ suite + garden suite exists

- Don't pave over the backyard (for parking)
- Go to on-street residential permit parking and limit each suite to 1 permit
- Can on-street parking be added to streets that have it on one side now?

Economics

- Concern that this "upzoning" will increase land values

Retention of Existing Houses

Several comments supportive of this initiative as a way to retain existing houses. Other comments expressed concerns:

- Concern about emphasis on retaining existing houses - to meet current codes, it would essentially be completely gutted
- Concern that some landlords abuse this to provide housing that is affordable but unsafe or unhealthy (examples of seeing mould, poor construction, etc.) with little incentive to upgrade.

Townhouses in a single row

- Many people supported townhouses in a single row as an attractive living option. Specific comments included:
 - that townhouses are too limited by the plan; that more 3 bedroom units are needed to accommodate families;
 - that the idea of landscaped lots for townhouses is positive;
 - several comments like single row but not townhouses in more than one row
- Some offered qualified support. The primary concerns were design/architectural fit; parking; greenspace/landscape.
- Some expressed preference for a fee-simple option.
- Some supported townhouses in a single row, but not in more than one row.
- Many comments about design, with differing opinions:
 - Preference for a peaked roof/historic feel
 - Needs to be architecturally compatible, but not mimic existing houses
 - Let new be new, "modern, bright, creative" designs
 - Avoid long rows of identical townhouses
 - Avoid generic, beige townhouses
 - several comments point to specific examples (e.g. Oliphant at Heywood) as what they would like to see more
- A number of comments opposed the development of townhouses.
 - General concerns referred to density; added population; or that townhouses are not appropriate in a primarily single family neighbourhood.
 - Specific concerns include impact on green spaces; desiring to maintain the neighbourhood as single-detached homes; traffic; on-street parking; design (especially modern designs); and impacts on land prices (either increasing or devaluing land values).

Other infill types preferred

Some who do not see townhouses as the right fit support other infill types:

- Some comments that houseplexes, heritage conversions are more compatible with neighbourhood character than townhouses. Specific concerns include that townhouses replace existing houses, have a different style, may appear "cookie-cutter".
- Suggestion that small lot houses are more compatible with detached character.

Stacked townhouses

Suggestions to consider 2.5 - 3 storey stacked townhouses projects. Reasons given include fewer internal stairs, can include accessible units, support ageing in place, and that units are located along the street.

Suitable/unsuitable locations

- Some are opposed to townhouses in sub-area 1 (general areas). Reasons include to retain character of neighbourhood and single-family feel, avoid congestion, avoid tearing down existing houses.

Townhouses in more than one row

General comments, support, location

Opinions on this housing type were split; many comments were in opposition to this housing type in sub-area 4 or offered qualified support.

Comments offering support:

- Preference for this type of housing as more attainable in price than single detached homes in Fairfield
- Concern that this type of “medium-density” development offers a choice other than apartments (which may not be attractive to families, those with dogs, those desiring a yard) and expensive single-detached houses.
- Suggestion that these be allowed in more areas / anywhere.
- Townhouses are the most sustainable type of housing in terms of environmental impacts.

Comments offering qualified support or specifying locations:

- Suggestions that these types of developments are appropriate if scattered (adds to diversity; not dominating any one street; a few complexes are fine)
- Concerns that these are not appropriate in sub-area 4 for a number of reasons (see Sub-area 4, below)
- Concern that this is not appropriate next to single-detached homes/on a street dominated by single-detached homes
- Concern that they not look like an identical row of units
- Suggestion that these are appropriate near Cook Street Village. (Others disagree)
- Concern that this type of development does not fit the character of traditional homes near Cook Street Village, and would be appropriate elsewhere in Traditional Residential areas.
- Suggestion that these are appropriate along Fairfield Road and parts of Cook Street; or along Richardson Street
- Suggestion to support these on single lots so as not to require consolidation

Comments in opposition to this housing form. In addition to concerns commonly expressed in Traditional Residential areas (traffic, parking, character, loss of existing homes, greenspace), specific concerns include:

- Concerns that this development type in particular is dense/would change the character of the area
- Some comments that while townhouses in single rows are appropriate, townhouses in more than one row are not
- Not liking the look of townhouses in more than one row
- Concern for green space, lot coverage
- Concern for land speculation, lot consolidation
- Concern about location of machinery (exhaust, vents, etc.) near property line impacting neighbours
- Concern that this housing form does not allow for fee-simple ownership of rowhouses
- Concern that they may become run-down or doorways not facing the street may attract crime
- Suggestion that only townhouses in a single row be allowed on scattered sites east of Cook Street Village, while laneway housing of 2-3 storeys be supported instead.
- Suggestion that the plan should not allow townhouse “complexes” because they work well with a master plan and a lot of land, but that in other areas they break up neighbourhoods (e.g. in Richmond)
- Concern that density can better be achieved in forms like character conversions.

Design

Comments regarding design:

- location of exhaust/machinery
- transitions to adjacent development, privacy, shading
- Suggestion to allow rooftop gardens, relax parking requirements
- Concern about fitting in architecturally/ avoiding boxy design
- Concern that entries of some units do not face street
- Concern that townhouses at 451 Chester Street do not have green space

Stacked townhouses

Some would prefer to see an option for stacked townhouses at 2.5 – 3 storeys rather than townhouses in more than one row. Advantages seen are that development is focused at the front of the lot and that ground-level units can be accessible, supporting accessibility and aging in place.

Sub-area 4

Many comments in opposition to these changes in sub-area 4:

- Concern that this encourages land speculation and lot consolidation
- Concern for property values (either that this will increase property values, making housing less affordable; or that it will decrease property values)
- Concern that area is almost all single-detached homes/ quiet, green / has many children and that added density (allowing 10 townhouses where 2 houses were) will destroy character, increase congestion and accidents, noise and loss of views
- Concern that sub-area 4 is being treated similarly to area near Cook Street Village: Neighborhood in sub-area 4 (north of Fairfield) is very different from that right next to cook street village (or major roadways such as Fairfield).
- Suggestion that this housing form might be more appropriate near Cook Street Village, along Fairfield Road or Richardson Street.
- Concern that sub-area 4 does not have laneways to separate properties or access parking
- Concern that townhouses in more than one row will seriously impact on adjacent residents' quality of life with respect to noise, open space, light, privacy and loss of mature landscaping and trees, enjoyment of their back yards
- Concern that developments are too big for this area
- Concern for too much density if Fairfield Plaza also redevelops
- Concern that townhouses, while accommodating more families, will not be affordable, but rather higher-cost and more crowded, and will not provide accessible units for ageing in place
- Concern that some provisions (e.g. setback, lot depth policies) differ from Gonzales plan
- Some comments that townhouses in a single row, or scattered developments in more than one row, can be beneficial but that the proposed changes are too much for one area

Development concerns

- Concern that one single-detached house would be left between two townhouse developments of more than 1 row
- Concern that some lots are too small to accommodate duplexes with suites and would be devalued if adjacent lots have townhouses in more than one row.
- Concern that city will buy houses to build this housing form
- Concern that developers will seek variances to build on lots smaller than the policy indicates

Interests of current residents

- Concern that this housing type is biased towards people who do not live yet live in the neighbourhood, over the interests of those who do; that it will benefit developers; and that it will impact investments of people who've paid to live in low-density areas.

Reduce the size of lot for duplex**General comments**

Comments were split between support, specific concerns, or opposition.

- General comments in support thought this was a good idea, that there are many underutilized lots or that we need to make better use of land, that lot sizes for all houses should be reduced, that triplexes and fourplexes should also be considered ("Remember... the goal is density increase, not 'perceptions of high density.' Through creative design it's possible to achieve both"), that this seems similar to a house with a suite, which shouldn't need that large a lot, that this is ok as long as setbacks and height restrictions are observed.
- General comment in opposition included concern for the character of Fairfield; that lower density should be the goal; concern for impacts on property values of single-detached homes; concern that the plan is more about the people who do not yet live in this community as opposed to those who call it home, that this type of density makes for

crowded living spaces; that the smaller lot won't be reflected in the sale price (new units won't be affordable); Fairfield is too crowded already..

Green Spaces

- Concern that proposal will reduce overall green space, remove trees and garden space, increase pavement and footprint of buildings.
- Concern that development will reduce quality of life for neighbours, possibly loom over neighbours, possibly shade adjacent gardens
- Concern that duplexes will be attractive to people don't like gardening / growing food; that duplexes should have plenty of land around them for residents to enjoy and garden, and large backyards for children or pets.
- Concern that the City does not enforce a requirement that 1/3 of a lot be landscaped.
- Concern for stormwater management on site
- Design guidelines are needed to limit hardscape and retain greenspace
- Support for design which can provide front and back yards
- Concern that size of individual units will be too small

Design, Massing

- Concern that side-by-side units on a small lot will cover too much of the lot and not fit in well with surrounding area.
- Concern that proposal is acceptable as long as proponents don't try to increase height too (be sensitive to neighbours).
- Concern to retain the sense of neighbourhood and green, there needs to be space for trees and gardens - not building up to the edge of the lot.
- Concern that this be considered but that City needs to develop proper design criteria for new duplexes on smaller lots to ensure compatibility with neighbours, limitation on "hard surface" etc. / "Small lot" housing can work but design is important.

Housing Cost

- Comment in support if this includes affordable livable housing for families (3-4 bedrooms)
- Concern that decreasing width of lot won't lead to more affordable housing, but benefit the developer and increase housing costs per sq. ft.

Houseplexes

General support, concerns or opposition

Many comments regarding houseplexes mirrored comments regarding other forms of infill housing. Some favoured no or limited changes to Traditional Residential areas; others favoured the addition of housing.

- Many comments in opposition echoed comments regarding infill housing in general, or were of a general nature. These concerns include: opposition to added housing, density or population; concern for on-street parking; concern for retaining trees and green spaces; concern for maintaining general character of area; concern for adequacy of infrastructure and school capacity; concern for pace of change.
- More specific comments are included by topic below.
- Some were concerned that the plan is supporting houseplexes throughout the neighbourhood.
- Many comments in support identified possible benefits to housing, that this housing type can maintain character, or offered qualified support. Comments include:
 - Houseplexes would allow people who rent in and/or grew up in the neighbourhood to stay
 - This could provide strata housing
 - Allows for densification while retaining character
 - Encourage larger (2-3 bedroom) units to support families / support if this includes larger units and green spaces
 - Support for houseplexes with laneway housing near Cook Street Village; desire for "gentle density"
 - Consider smaller units with shared space
 - Concern these are disappearing rapidly from the neighbourhoods/ makes neighbourhood attractive
 - Support only if backyard is not paved over for parking
 - Support if an existing character house is not demolished

Scale and Height

Desire for scale compatible with surrounding housing:

- Suggestion that this is better than either townhouses or 3 storey buildings
- Suggestion to limit to 2.5 storeys / avoid tall buildings
- Suggestion to allow 2.5 stories above a habitable basement, as long as height limit is met
- Suggestion to maintain the character, size, design of surrounding area
- Comment that this has already been done successful and in well-supported projects in neighbourhood and should be supported as a “transition” form leading into the traditional neighbourhoods.

Others feel appearance will be out of place:

- Concern that these would be large buildings and out of character or unattractive
- Concern that this will impose on existing neighbours who have smaller single family type homes / this much extra housing is not needed
- Concern that this seems like an apartment block

Design Concerns

General desire for design to fit in with existing pattern/character:

- Suggestion that this is the preferred infill type, as long as the design fits in with the neighborhood / that houseplexes that look like houses are much more appropriate for this area than either townhouses or apartment buildings
- Concern that this has been done well and that other examples detract from the neighbourhood, “scream ‘look at me!’”
- Suggestion that they fit in with old home designs / new structures sensitive to the existing, traditional Fairfield houses
- Concern not to allow flat roofed designs.

Heritage

- Suggestion to only (support houseplexes) where the existing house cannot be lifted/converted., and that this be expressed as a strong policy preference for retention and conversion of existing housing stock, as house conversion has been successful and the plan should not encourage demolishing existing buildings regardless of whether they aren't Heritage.
- Concern that the majority of character homes in the neighbourhood are neither designated nor registered but their replacement would destroy the traditional character of the neighbourhood.

Green space, trees, setbacks, shading

General concern for green spaces and trees. Some see this housing type as in conflict with green spaces. Others feel that on-site parking is to be prioritized.

- Suggestion to keep setbacks for light and urban forest, places to grow food / define setbacks in plan
- Concern that allowing more houseplexes will shade adjacent gardens, increase pavement and reduce overall greenery, ability to grow food, and enjoyment of outdoors.
- Concern that “Key words to this are: 'on lots of sufficient size’” and that variances may allow larger buildings than should be allowed.
- Suggestion that this is a better option (than small lot houses) for retaining landscape and green space as long as the lot is large enough.
- Concern that, like strata conversions, the backyard is paved and neighbors on the surrounding sides are looking at a parking lot
- Concern that off-street parking is required resulting in paved back yard / neighbours looking at a parking lot
-

Parking

- Concern for needing at least 1 parking space per unit of
- Some support this housing type as long as off-street parking is provided; others do not like paving of backyard (see above)
- Suggestion for decoupled parking (where parking spaces are sold/leased separately from units) and lower parking requirements for small units

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that these make on-street parking difficult / examples of impact of existing house conversions
<p>Location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that these are too big / “mega” complexes for sub-area 4
<p>Other concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about noise Concern that this detracts from sense of community as single family home owners don’t know strata owners Concern about land values (on comment that without mitigating policies, this will lead to increases in land value due to the value of new strata units; one other comment concerned that infill housing will decrease house values).
<p>Small lot houses</p>
<p>Green Space</p> <p>Comment that small lot houses in particular impact green space, trees and that some attached housing forms are preferable in preserving green spaces.</p>
<p>Suites in duplexes, small lot houses or townhouses</p>
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many felt this is appropriate or important housing to provide opportunities for more families to live in Victoria, to add rental opportunities in all parts of neighbourhood, and would be great additions to the neighbourhood as opposed to larger homes with fewer people in them. Others feel that these housing types are not appropriate to the neighbourhood. Most concerns mirrored general concerns (not wanting to see population growth; parking, traffic, noise on local streets; infrastructure; general opposition to density; wanting to preserve areas of single-detached homes; diverse housing found elsewhere in Victoria).
<p>Parking</p> <p>Many concerns related to parking and traffic impacts on local streets. Many comments mirror general comments (see above). Some specific comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion to require all parking on-site / concern that if a current duplex has 2 spaces, how can more units be added? Suggestion to look for ways to provide more on-street parking (some streets have parking on one side) Suggestion to consider tandem parking with permeable surfaces, and parking off lanes where they exist
<p>Suites in Duplexes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion to allow in new duplexes only – to respect interest of those living in other half of duplex who will be impacted if neighbours add a suite. Suggestion that a garden suite would be more appropriate as it has less direct impacts on neighbouring duplex unit. Suggestion to consider larger buildings if you want suites in duplexes / concern that the existing restrictions on floor area make for cramped spaces. Some duplexes are easily adaptable to legal suite. Do on case by case basis. One comment to allow duplexes with suites on any lots in sub-Area 4 if townhouses in more than one row are allowed next door. (Concern that single-detached homes will be devalued).
<p>Suites vs. main units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some concern about how suites would be distinguished from main units.

<p>Green spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern for green space, amenity space on lots. Other view is that lot sizes should be relaxed as people don't need large lots anymore.
<p>Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion to ensure that city 'pre-identifies' mature trees to ensure retention as redevelopment occurs.
<p>Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion that population growth can be supported by gently increasing density using existing buildings and adjacent unused lot space rather than large scale disruptive developments, which require a high return on investment which pushes housing costs up further.
<p>Housing Affordability</p>
<p>Comments on Proposed Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for providing options for affordability. Need for affordable housing / many renters paying 50% of income for rent / new rentals are expensive and older rentals are becoming expensive Some are opposed for several reasons (believe that land values are too high in Fairfield to make affordable housing viable, more appropriate elsewhere; desire to limit change in built form; belief that housing prices should be set solely by the market; preference for market-rate homeownership units). Desire for stronger policies (clarify rent levels considered affordable; 10-20% below market not affordable especially if replacing an older unit being demolished; apply rental retention concept city-wide; inclusionary zoning; removing covenants as was done in Capital Park reduces trust in legal agreements to secure housing) Suggestion that Fairfield Neighbourhood Plan target households earning between \$20,000 and \$60,000 a year as identified in City's Housing Strategy. Desire to see a more aggressive amenity contribution approach / specific target for percentage of affordable units, length of affordability, income targets and unit sizes for new development. (Concern that Cook and Oliphant paid no CACs nor provided affordable housing (10% below market not being affordable). Concern that proposed policies will not be sufficient to prevent renovictions or generate sufficient new affordable rental units
<p>Other Policy Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion that Fairfield be a demonstration neighbourhood for Inclusionary Zoning (at least 10% of units) and new housing types (e.g. small units with shared common spaces) Suggestion to consider incentives: 10 year tax exemptions for affordable rental, similar to City's heritage tax incentive program; incentives to retain and renovate existing buildings Suggestion to look at other models, less dependence on private sector (land trust; coop housing; work with CRD, BC Housing)
<p>Displacement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about renovictions / concern that proposed policies will not be sufficient to prevent renovictions or generate sufficient new affordable rental units Concern about people being pushed out of neighbourhood / want more rental housing in core rather than Westshore where transportation costs are higher Desire for City to lobby Province to have more ability to protect tenants from eviction or "renoviction" and not just when there is a rezoning. Concern that younger people can't afford to live here and are moving elsewhere
<p>Housing supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that plan focuses too much on housing supply, with the assumption that this will help address affordability. Suggestions that other methods of creating affordable housing receive more attention in the plan.

- Concern that total number of rental units near Cook Street Village has declined by 31 units from 2016-2017 and that the total rental supply should be monitored
- Concern that housing supply is more than keeping pace with population growth –with 113 units built for every 100 people added from 2001-2016, and that 7% of housing units are unoccupied. Concern that there is not a housing shortage, but rather a mismatch between modest family residences and upscale residences or small apartments being built.

Parking

- Suggestion to significantly reduce parking requirements in housing along transit routes and in Cook Street Village (CSVRN; several comments); see high parking requirements as incompatible with neighbourhood’s vision for the future and citing that 55% of residents walk, bike or take transit to work.. Other comments are very concerned about parking availability. One comment supports decoupled parking (parking rented or sold separately from units).
- Concern to keep rents low for non-car-owning households

Household types

- Concern for housing needs for various people and household types (employees, aging renters, retirees on fixed incomes, families (2-3 bedrooms / outdoor space)
- Concern that City focus housing efforts on young families meeting this income range / concern that housing market is imbalanced towards high income retirees.
- Concern that the plan does not address housing for people affected by homelessness, considering that it is difficult for people to address health issues, find a job if they do not have safe housing. An additional comment for “no more social housing.”

Amenities

- Concern that not all developer contributions go to affordable housing, but would like to see other amenities (public space improvements, etc.)
- Suggestion that affordable housing should be affordable in perpetuity / suggestion that if not affordable in perpetuity, other public amenities are preferred because once the affordability sunsets, the impact of the development/building design remains.
- Suggestions to strengthen rental replacement policies:
 - Extend the “no net loss of rental units” policy to apply to 2 or 3 rental units.
 - Require housing agreements specifying rent levels for all new developments
 - Make this an area for introducing and evaluating new and innovative approaches to rental retention.

Heritage

A number of respondents are concerned about **loss of older heritage buildings and houses** with development. Specific concerns include:

- Suggestion that in traditional residential areas, policy should state that the retention and conversion of an existing house of heritage merit should always come first, before demolition and replacement is considered.
- Concern for protecting heritage buildings not just on register or designated / that most buildings of heritage merit are not on the register or designated
- Concern that new multi-unit development in the northwest, urban residential areas or new infill development will replace heritage buildings.
- Concern for heritage character apartment buildings.
- Concern about possible new apartment buildings on Linden Avenue, which is full of heritage houses
- Concern that the plan says nothing about preserving the heritage character of the buildings in both [small urban villages]
- Suggestion that City should require a heritage review of any property before an applicant can file for demolition.
- Concern at how little heritage conservation is recognized in the plan, including rental “gentle density” conversions.

Concerns regarding Heritage Conservation Areas:

- Suggestion to remove references to specific streets for Heritage Conservation Areas. Concerns included that many residents were not in support, that this may be interpreted in the future that these areas should be considered for HCAs, that the areas were selected and evaluated by the City and not the community, and that it may sound like conservation efforts be limited to these areas
- Suggestion to have a third-party evaluation of HCAs, consider larger areas /disappointed with HCAs being eliminated / I'd support much wider use of Heritage Conservation Areas than that currently contemplated / the small number of tiny heritage conservation areas was a shock. This planning tool came out while I was studying conservation. We discussed conservation areas as suitable for large areas, like much of Fairfield or a number of Gonzales Arts-and-Crafts streets.
- Suggestion to teward policies to support and facilitate a community-led process and champions to proposed heritage conservation areas
- Suggestion to refer to provincial guidelines on how to establish citizen led guidelines (refer to provinces guide)
- Suggestion to facilitate a citizen-led and initiated effort to establish a Heritage Collaboration group. This group would establish heritage values as guides for Fairfield and would work with the city, homeowners, NGOs, developers to facilitate a process where solutions are found for renovations and construction that preserve and enhance heritage values. This approach would broaden awareness of heritage values and contribute to culture change on this important issue.

Survey

- Suggestion/request that the city fund fa survey of streetscapes by a knowledgeable third party, for Fairfield and Gonzales.

Incentives

- Suggestion to mention the Heritage Grant Program administered by Victoria Heritage Foundation, available to home owners of homes with heritage, in Chapter 10
- Suggestion to develop incentives other than tax breaks

Other

- Suggestion to have an arts, culture, heritage and parks advisory committee, perhaps through the F/G Comm. Association.

Infrastructure and Green Development**Green Building Requirements**

Desire for more specific green building requirements, specific to Cook Street Village / Fairfield Neighbourhood. Suggestions include:

- Requiring levels of green building in rezoning / stronger requirements / consider specific features (e.g. green roofs, permeable pavement)
- Use LEED standards as a requirement / for rezoning
- One suggestion that community members, rather than staff, suggest green building standards
- Several suggestions for developing stormwater requirements for new development

Infrastructure Capacity

Several concerns that plan does not address infrastructure capacity, that infrastructure is not sufficient, that development does not contribute to infrastructure, or that taxes would need to rise as a result of growth. (note: Several commenters were unaware of City's infrastructure master plans and Development Cost Charges.)

Climate Change

Some would like to see climate change risk factors, including sea level rise threats to Dallas Road bluffs and the Ross Bay area, considered.

Others would like more focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Natural Hazards

Some would like to see land use proposals in the plan consider soil types and earthquake risk, particularly around Cook Street Village and Ross Bay Village (Fairfield Plaza).

Construction quality

Concern that new buildings are built to last 30-40 years as opposed to older buildings which last over 100.

Construction waste

Concern that construction waste from teardowns is costly to our environment and though more of this waste is recyclable now a huge amount still ends up in the landfill. Suggestion to see construction waste impact on the environment factored in as a hard cost within the plan re housing development.

Placemaking, Arts and Culture**Public Art**

- Suggestion to incorporate art, whimsy into streetscape of Cook Street Village, Five Points Village
- Concern that public art is only valuable if residents like it. Suggestion that artists work with the community, involve the community *not just board) in selecting art.

Events and venues

- Suggestion to allow house concerts / music venues
- Suggestion for more arts and culture (not bars), that everything closes early in Cook Street Village.
- Concern for the need for affordable arts in the city as a whole.
- Comment that the Royal Theatre in its current configuration is audience-unfriendly and difficult to stage productions. Suggestion that if some form of amalgamation occurs, it may be time to rethink the whole property, including heritage designation.
- Suggestion for live/work buildings for artists in Northwest area or Cook Street Village, possibly Five Points village

Other

- Concern for a strong focus on #12 Art, Culture and Placemaking for to make this community a vibrant place to live and work.
- Suggestion to have an arts, culture, heritage and parks advisory committee., possibly through the F/G Comm. Association.
- Suggestion for a community Art & Culture District at Fairfield and Moss

Community Facilities and Well-being

A number of comments:

- Consider reconciliation with Songhees/Esquimalt; consider community efforts to rename streets or places
- Suggestion for more events in drop in (community) centres (“like Vancouver”).
- Suggestions for added facilities in Cook St. Village: Community drop-in centre for families / seniors / youth pop up library / art maker space.
- Suggestion to consider child care space rather than public gathering spaces as an amenity for Cook Street village, to support a more diverse neighbourhood
- Concern that single people, who are not in families, and not seniors feel left out of community centre programming.
- Suggestion for a gym near Cook St. Village please – concern for lack of amenities in this area with the nearest gym 30 min walk away.
- Concern about noise level, noise pollution from traffic, construction machinery, parks maintenance.
- Desire for see policies on community gardens/orchards and integration into development. (see Parks, Open Space and Urban Forest for more detail)
- Suggestion that a community garden would be great for all those living in mutli-unit residential buildings.

- Concern about the impacts of deer.
- Question on what is meant by supporting diversity? Affordable housing like cooperatives could support more diversity of incomes, households.

Amenities

Prioritization of improvement categories

At public open houses, participants were given the opportunity to prioritize preferred categories of amenities. The results were as follows:

- Affordable Housing (47 dots)
- Public Space Improvements in Cook Street Village (40 dots)
- Pedestrian and Cycling Improvements (36 dots)
- Improvements to Waterfront Parks (29 dots)
- Placemaking and public space improvements in small urban villages (28 dots)
- Improvements to other neighbourhood parks (22 dots)
- Community centre spaces (12 dots)
- Design guidelines (added by participants; not considered an amenity) (7 dots)
- Skate park, waterpark, lego shop (added by participants) (3 dots)

Cook Street Village:

- Support for affordable housing, public realm improvements, public art, community centre space/programming, or child care.
- Some questioned the need for public space beyond streetscape, trees and patios.

Ross Bay Village

- Suggestions for a number of amenities if redevelopment occurs, including medical facilities, space for classes, meeting space, library branch

Five Points Village (Fairfield at Moss Street)

- Various comments on public spaces. A number of comments questioning the need for such spaces; others advocating street furniture and trees is sufficient, and others seeing such spaces as desirable or key elements of the small urban village. See Small Urban Villages for details.
- Suggestion for an Arts and Culture district.

Urban Agriculture

- Several comments desiring community gardens and orchards. One suggestion for locating this in Beacon Hill Park.

Amenity Contribution Policy

- Several comments wanting stronger amenity contribution or affordable housing policies for rezoning
- A number of comments questioned directing all contributions to affordable housing, particularly in the Northwest area but also in the Rental Retention area; a desire for public improvements was expressed.
- Some felt the current policy was ineffective

Individual Suggestions

- Pool at Beacon Hill Park
- Gym at Cook Street Village (commercial)
- Maker space
- Live/work housing for artists – in Northwest area or Cook Street Village
- Library – Cook Street Village or Ross Bay Village (2 comments)

- Community sportsplex on Quadra Street
- Medical facilities
- Schools
- Community space
- Child care
- Placemaking
- Skatepark
- Waterpark
- Lego shop

Process

Some concerns about **format of events and input opportunities**:

- Concern that vote by stickers not a fair way to determine support/ people voting without understanding.
- Concern that sticky note posting at Open Houses was designed to limit discussion
- Concern that renters' forum was not sufficiently attended, invitations were not broad or early enough, and sufficient data was not provided.
- Desire for more two-way conversation with the City and discussion among stakeholders.
- Concern about the length of the survey, the time it takes to complete it
- Once comment that "pizza and a planner" meetings are unrepresentative/undemocratic. Other comments that this was a valuable method of engagement to both learn about the plan and provide input.
- Some would like a higher number of people to be engaged.
- Concern that drawings and concepts in the plan diverged from early community input
- Concern that urban design workshops (charrettes) were not sufficiently open to the public and/or did not cover a full range of issues (e.g. specific street design for Cook Street Village).
- Request for additional engagement opportunities: meeting with sub-area 4 residents and owners; additional area-specific meeting; general community meeting for other neighbourhood-wide topics
- Concern that breaking survey up by topic minimizes overall impact to neighbourhood
- Desire for overall view of proposed changes for both Fairfield and Gonzales.
- Feeling that choices in survey/ outreach are not the ones the neighbourhood wants.

Concern that insufficient **outreach** was conducted

- Many people were unaware of the plan (including people living in Sub-Area 4)
- Feeling that targeted outreach to sub-area 4 was needed due to the potential level of change and that little change has taken place here in the past; that sub-area 4 was not clearly indicated in promotional materials
- Some mailings were not in a City of Victoria envelope, but as a postcard
- Unclear what methods were used to reach hard-to-reach populations (including those under age 40, and renters)
- Suggestions for door-to-door flyering, presence at grocery stores and coffee shops, posters in rental buildings, circulate notices through Parent Advisory Council
- Concern that any changes to a local area plan be subject to judicial review, and that the engagement held at open houses not be considered without proof that those putting dots on the board are utility and tax-paying residents
- Unclear how feedback from public would be reported.
- Overall, pretty good

Concern about **level of engagement**

- Concerns regarding the composition and selection of working group – ("...comprised of Urban Development Institute representatives, and other business members outside Fairfield ... with no opportunity for community to put forward their representatives.")
- Desire for greater level of involvement, two-way conversations with City, dialogue with other community members, and that greater time is needed for this to happen and for participants to be informed.

- Concern that the contentious plans for Cook St Village and the northwest corner of Fairfield are undermining the equally important discussions that should be taking place about intensification in the other parts of the neighbourhood

Desire to **support more informed input**

- Some comments to educate people to understand a density bonus, zoning, etc. to provide more informed comment.
- Desire for more information in order to provide input (e.g. affordable housing definition, population projections)
- Desire for information to be provided about the current baseline (e.g. how would the plan be different?)
- Desire for additional demographic data and housing projections; number of vehicles, mode shares, # parking spaces, 2016 census information

Some would like **more time for engagement**

- Concerns regarding short time span between draft (Sept 2017), November Open House and deadline for comment; the holiday season; staff change early in the plan; absence of some working group members; low numbers of survey results; and neighbourhood groups questioning some changes which were not apparent until November.
- Additional comments desired more time to get things right; that development is proceeding quickly, that neighbourhood working groups need more time to consult residents and provide meaningful feedback; that more people need to show up; that a longer process would give people time to understand what is proposed, give more meaningful feedback and feel their voice is heard.
- Desire for plan to take as long as it needs for everyone to feel they have provided all of the input they want to, and be heard.

Some were concerned that people outside of Fairfield neighbourhood could **participate in survey**

- Concern that it is inappropriate for people to submit feedback on areas they have little knowledge of, or are not invested in
- Concern that the survey could be completed by people who do not live in the area
- Feeling that it is the residents in this area who should have the say in what goes on here.
- Concern people supporting more housing may be developers and people living elsewhere who want to move to Fairfield

Plan Scale

- Suggestion for separated plan for Fort Street Corridor
- Consider one plan for Fairfield and Gonzales together.