

## Matrix of Revisions to Proposed Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan and Official Community Plan Amendments

The following provide a summary of public input received, proposed changes to the proposed Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan and proposed OCP Amendments, and considerations and rationale, organized by topical area. Note Policy numbers refer to policies in the plan proposed for adoption dated April 2018.

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<b>Traditional Residential Housing Areas</b>			
<p><b>OCP Amendment #1: Commercial use where an existing house is retained, north of Craigflower Village:</b> High level of support for proposal (combined survey and open house support of 73%). Specific concerns regarding: clarity if this applies only to existing houses; if there are design guidelines.</p>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 6.10 specifies that this applies to the reuse of existing houses</li> <li>City-wide Development Permit Area 16 design guidelines would apply to buildings with a commercial use</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to proposal</b></p>
<p><b>OCP Amendment #2: Consider buildings up to 3 storeys, and limited commercial services or community-serving uses, at Pioneer Cooperative:</b> Moderate support for this change (combined survey and open house support of 56%). Specific concerns regarding: extent and impact (traffic) of community-serving commercial uses, desire for 3 storey development to add affordable housing options; impacts to directly adjacent properties and yards, overall compatibility; suggestion that 2 ½ storeys is more appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Minor changes recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise Policy 6.4.6., 6.10.2. to indicate a limited area of floor spaces for community-serving uses, which do not result in excessive traffic impacts on local streets.</li> <li>Add to Policy 6.4.5.:“New development should be designed, considering siting and massing, to minimize impacts on access to sunlight and privacy for adjacent properties.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal for modest additional height is consistent with OCP 13.24: Support the regeneration or redevelopment of older ground-oriented rental and cooperative housing developments by considering higher density redevelopment proposals on these sites if the same number, size, and tenure of units is maintained on-site, and the general rent level identified.</li> <li>Clarifies original intent for community-serving uses, concern for traffic impacts</li> <li>Design guidelines are more appropriate tool to address transitions (than limiting overall height of a large site). <i>Applicable Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial</i> address transitions to lower-density development.</li> <li>Proposed density is consistent with OCP and relatively low, likely to result in mixed building heights with open space</li> <li>Coop is well located near E&amp;N Trail, services and amenities</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to proposal</b></p>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>OCP Amendment #3: Consider 3 storey development up to 1.5 fsr adjacent to Catherine Street at Edward Street Village:</b>                      High support (combined survey and open house support of 72%) for this proposal. Specific concerns include transitions to and compatibility with adjacent development; desire for more commercial space; desire to support urban food production; suggestion that development be limited to 2 ½ storeys.</p>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed <i>Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> address specific concerns such as setbacks, landscape, privacy, massing, and compatibility of design.</li> <li>Establishes consistent form and character with proposed village properties for a unified feel to the block.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Change to proposed DPA Guidelines:</b>                      Add an additional guideline regarding compatibility with adjacent lower-scale development to the Proposed <i>Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i></p>
<p><b>OCP Amendment #4. Consider 3 Storey development, up to 1.2 fsr, south of Esquimalt Road:</b>                      Support (combined survey and open house support of 64%) for this concept. Specific concerns include: height (too much/appropriate/too little), compatibility with existing streetscape and single-detached or house conversions; impacts on adjacent development; inability to support public benefit contributions at the proposed height and density; desire for more housing located near transit, the downtown, services and amenities; if proposed densities are not viable, will lead to retaining industrial uses at the foot of Mary Street; suggestion to support 2 ½ storeys here.</p>	<p><b>Minor change recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify design guidance by the addition of Policy 6.9.12.: <u>“To encourage building design which responds to existing context, with attention to streets or areas with a strong pre-existing character.”</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed height and density support housing diversity by supporting townhouse and courtyard housing forms with underground parking.</li> <li>Proposal responds to immediate existing context which ranges from single-detached and character conversions to 3-storey townhouses and multi-unit development.</li> <li>Appropriate location for housing near Frequent Transit, future shops and services, and within walking distance of downtown.</li> <li>Existing Development Permit Guidelines (DPA 16) address compatibility and contextual design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to proposal</b></p>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>OCP Amendment #5. Consider 2 ½ storey development in Traditional Residential areas to support infill housing types:</b> Moderate support for this proposal (combined open house and survey support of 57%). Concerns expressed regarding added traffic, population, while others cited the ability to meet green building goals.</p>	<p><b>Minor change recommended:</b> Clarify in Policy 6.6.1. that 2 ½ storeys is intended to support certain infill housing types. Clarify in Policy 6.6.1. that design guidance addresses sensitivity to adjacent development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal does not change total density supported.</li> <li>• Supporting an additional half-storey in infill housing types, with height limited by zoning, is meant to provide an equivalent option to building two storeys above a projecting (above-ground) basement, which is already supported.</li> <li>• Meant to enable a range of infill types and preserve green spaces.</li> <li>• All infill housing must still meet Development Permit guidelines regarding massing, transitions, privacy and shading.</li> <li>• Will not result in changes to existing zoning or single-detached properties.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to proposal</b></p>
<p><b>Urban Agriculture</b> Concerns regarding space for urban agriculture (concerning high-density development in Traditional Residential areas).</p>	<p><b>Revisions recommended:</b> Two proposed changes from Traditional Residential to Urban Residential have been removed (south Mary St., Russell at Skinner Streets). See Urban Residential section of this matrix.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing infill zoning (e.g. existing duplex zoning) contains an open site space and rear setback requirement, and the City would build on this practice in future zoning.</li> <li>• Proposed <i>Design Guidelines for Intensive Residential - Townhouses and Attached Dwellings</i>, and existing DPA 16 (which would apply to other development types with 3 or more units) require open site space</li> <li>• Testing of infill proposals (e.g. density, setbacks) show these proposals support open site space and tree planting spaces.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Changes recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove proposed urban residential areas on south Mary Street, Russell at Skinner Streets.</li> <li>• Add more specific <i>Design Guidelines for Intensive Residential - Townhouses and Attached Dwellings</i></li> </ul>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>Skinner Street:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different opinions about proposed scale (townhouses and houseplexes up to 2.5 storeys + basement, and up to 1 fsr, with specific design guidelines for compatibility) of Traditional Residential development on Skinner Street:</li> <li>• Some feel draft plan proposal for 3 storey apartment buildings, or even more height, was more appropriate to provide housing near transit, downtown, and large urban village.</li> <li>• Others feel the proposal still provides too much potential to develop that would be out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal represents a compromise which addresses concerns for height, rhythm of street frontage, massing (through half-storey) and character</li> <li>• Houseplexes are limited to 4 units unless the proposal can demonstrate that the site achieves both site landscape and parking objectives</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Skinner Street Residential Corridor – proposed Development Permit Area</b> Specific Development Permit Guidelines were proposed for Skinner Street, in addition to the <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i>. However, with the removal of potential mixed-use development at Skinner Street and Russell Street, this area is no longer eligible for designation as DPA for purposes of revitalization.</p>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<p>The following guidelines would apply to the area which had been identified as the Skinner Street Residential Corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For development of 3 or more units which meet the definition of Attached Residential in the proposed DPA 15F, the proposed <i>Design Guidelines for Attached Residential Development</i> would apply.</li> <li>• For other development of 3 or more residential units, the existing Development Permit Area 16 would apply, and development would be reviewed against the existing Design Guidelines for: Multi-Units Residential, Commercial, Industrial</li> <li>• Staff finds these two guidelines to sufficiently address issues of compatibility and contextual design.</li> </ul>	<p>Changes Recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include Skinner Street Corridor in proposed DPA 15F: Intensive Residential – Attached Residential Development, rather than the previously identified DPA 7A: Corridors – Skinner Street Residential Corridor.</li> </ul>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>Small lot houses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that small lot houses on 220m<sup>2</sup> lots, if they include suites, would function more like 2 smaller (1 BR) rental apartments rather than a house attractive to a family with children.</li> <li>Concern that few sites would benefit from a reduction in the small lot size, unless demolition (which is not supported by existing small lot policy) is allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Revision to plan recommended:</b>            Revise policy 6.15.2.a) to remove specific size minimum:            Small lot houses may be considered on lots <u>smaller than 260m<sup>2</sup> (3,000 sq. ft.) where siting, location and design can meet the intent of the Small Lot Rezoning policy and associated Development Permit guidelines.</u></p>	<p>Analysis shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small lot house with a suite can achieve sufficient size to contain a larger (1,000 sq. ft. +) main unit in a 1.5 storey house with a basement</li> <li>However, there are few lots which could subdivide a 220m<sup>2</sup> lot without demolition or relocation of the main house.</li> <li>Thus, while there are examples of 220m<sup>2</sup> small lots built under the RS-1 zone, staff recommend removing specificity and allow for consideration of smaller lots where all goals of the small lot policy can be met.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Townhouses – omitted policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan shows a scenario for townhouses in one row on a corner lot; however, however, the policy regarding desired site characteristics (lot size) was accidentally deleted in revision between the Draft (Aug. 2017) and the Proposed Plan</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor change recommended:</b>            Add policy 6.12.2.a) as included in the Draft Plan (Aug. 2017):  <u>On corner lots, or lots with two frontages, on lots of at least 18m (60 ft) in width.</u></p>	<p>The added policy is consistent with Fig. 18, and consultation on the plan.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Heritage properties</b>            Concern regarding impacts of infill housing on heritage properties</p>	<p><b>Minor revisions to Section 6.8:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor corrections for clarification that retention and designation of properties of heritage merit (whether on the Register or eligible) is the preferred approach for redevelopment, and should be incentivized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action plan indicates updating House Conversion rules as a priority, to strengthen incentives.</li> <li>Individual applications for redevelopment (other than house conversion) to be considered through rezoning</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>Houseplexes - Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that parking variances should not be mentioned in neighbourhood as it implies that a variance would be favoured for this typology; each variance must be considered on its merits.</li> <li>Community has expressed concern for on-street parking, but also a desire for green space and added housing, and to avoid excessive pavement in back yards.</li> <li>Some community members wish to see reduced on-site parking and reliance on the automobile; others are concerned about impacts to on-street parking.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Revisions to plan recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise policy 6.15.3.c) regarding parking variance, replacing reference to considering a “justified” parking variance with the following language: <u>“A parking reduction may be considered where the location and transportation demand management approaches are expected to result in lower rates of parking use.”</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An applicant must meet zoning requirements or may request a parking variance through the standard process for requesting such a variance, and must provide justification. No need to mention in plan.</li> <li>Urban design testing shows that a site of the dimensions suggested in the plan, with 4 parking spaces, can provide rear yard landscape and tree planting space; and that possibilities exist to provide more units in specific locations.</li> </ul>	N/A
<p><b>Small Urban Villages</b></p>			
<p><b>OCP Amendment #7. Designate Catherine at Edward Small Urban Village</b></p> <p>General support for proposal (combined survey and open houses support of 78%). Concerns include desire to see commercial/mixed use on the whole block (not just two sites); that this is “heart” of the community; sensitive transitions to surrounding development; suggestion for a 2 ½ storey limit; concern about traffic; and suggestion for food production on rooftops.</p>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal is consistent with existing uses and provides for a 3-storey walkable streetfront with transitions to surrounding neighbourhood.</li> <li>Transitions best addressed through design guidelines, including the existing <i>Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial</i>, and the proposed addition of <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> with content specific to this site.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Change recommended:</b></p> <p>Add geographically-specific guideline content regarding sensitive transition to <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i></p>
<p><b>OCP Amendment #11. Expansion of Craigflower Village:</b></p> <p>General support (combined survey and open house support of 72%) for this proposal, consistent with earlier engagement. Concerns include suggestion to maintain Traditional Residential designation, with the opportunity for shops in converted houses, and concern to maintain any heritage merit houses in this area.</p>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed change received community support throughout engagement, and supports goals of adding some housing and possible opportunities for a few more shops, compatible with surrounding scale.</li> <li>During earlier engagement, 3 storeys was preferred to either 4 storeys or maintain the status quo.</li> <li>The proposed expansion of Craigflower Village to the south balances the proposal to retain most Traditional Residential to north, and results from earlier consultation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to proposal</b></p>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<b>Urban Residential Areas</b>			
<p><b>OCP Amendment #6. Proposed change from Traditional to Urban Residential to support 4 storey development, half-block at Russell and Skinner, east of Craigflower Village.</b></p> <p>While the City’s survey showed support for this amendment (combined survey and open house support of 67%), input on this proposal was mixed: some felt this was an appropriate site for housing, given the location near transit, villages and park amenities, and being at the foot of a sloping site would transition more easily to adjacent development. Others felt the proposed height was out of place with the character and form of the small urban village and surrounding low-density neighbourhood.</p>	<p><b>Revisions to plan recommended:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove proposed Urban Residential Place Designation.</li> <li>2. Show this area as Traditional Residential Sub-Area 1, supporting townhouses or apartments up to 10.7m (approx. 3 storeys) and 1.5 fsr, consistent with adjacent urban village densities and height; and rename sub-area 1 accordingly.</li> <li>3. Remove provision for higher density where affordable housing is included.</li> <li>4. Remove policy and map reference (Map 12) to view corridor from Skinner Street at Catherine Street. The view corridor remains in the new view corridors Map 11, for information should taller development be proposed in the future.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community expressed goals of accommodating housing diversity, affordable housing near village, transit and amenities. At the same time, a 3-storey height received more acceptance for this area.</li> <li>• The proposed height and density is consistent with the envisioned Craigflower Village. The location relates to the village, creating a sense of enclosure and to the one-sided village.</li> <li>• The location near transit, amenities, services and the downtown is appropriate for housing.</li> <li>• The existing grade (3m change across the site) supports sensitive transitions to adjacent lower-scale development and respects an identified view corridor from Skinner at Catherine Street.</li> <li>• The proposed density is unlikely to support affordable housing contributions.</li> <li>• Development Permit Area 16 would apply and contains guidelines for compatibility with context. At 3 storeys, development would not impact relevant view corridors nor have potential impacts meriting site-specific guidelines.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Changes Recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain Traditional Residential Designation</li> <li>• Support development up to 3 storeys, and 1.5 fsr, consistent with the anticipated form and density for Craigflower Village, through OCP Amendment #3 (reference form and density in Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan)</li> </ul>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>OCP Amendment #9. South of Esquimalt Road Area: Proposed change from Traditional to Urban Residential on Mary Street</b></p> <p>Change received 49% support (combined survey and open house support), with mixed input from the community.</p> <p>A range of concerns were expressed, including height (4 storeys is too high/appropriate; suggestion for 2 ½ storeys); that the proposal was out of scale with the surrounding neighbourhood; alternatively, that this is an appropriate location for housing near transportation, Roundhouse, amenities and downtown; that the mix of housing already existing in the area would accommodate multi-unit development; or that more height would better support housing and public amenities. Comments also reflected a difference of opinion of priorities, with some prioritizing concerns of current residents of the area, and others prioritizing a desire for added housing in this location.</p>	<p><b>Revisions to plan recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove proposal for urban residential designation on south Mary Street, and policy regarding added density where on-site affordable housing is included.</li> <li>Maintain Traditional Residential designation and include in Sub-Area 2, consistent with other areas south of Esquimalt Road, up to 3 storeys and 1.2fsr.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The revised height and density are meant to support housing diversity by supporting townhouse and courtyard housing forms with underground parking, consistent in scale with surrounding 2-3 storey development.</li> <li>Location near Frequent Transit, future shops and services, and within walking distance of downtown supports housing.</li> <li>Development Permit Guidelines (DPA 16) address specific concerns such as setbacks, privacy, massing, and compatibility of design; City standards address boulevards and street trees.</li> <li>Core Songhees, Westside Large Urban Village, and Esquimalt Road Corridor already provide opportunities to add multi-unit housing higher than 3 storeys.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Change Recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove proposed Urban Residential designation</li> <li>Include in Traditional Residential areas considered for 3-storey development at 1.2 fsr, through OCP Amendment #4 (by reference to Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan)</li> </ul>

What we heard (numbered items correspond to proposed OCP amendments as presented)	Proposed Change to Plan Policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>OCP Amendment #10. Change from Traditional Residential to Urban Residential along part of Esquimalt Road, to support 5 storey development; and related plan policies.</b></p> <p>General support for this proposal (combined survey and open house support of 68%). Concerns expressed about transitions to Traditional Residential areas generally and across Dundas Street; maintaining view corridors on sidestreets other than Catherine Street. Submission from Township of Esquimalt requests policy and guidelines to create a “gateway” at Esquimalt and Dominion Road.</p>	<p><b>Maintain proposed policies with minor revisions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add New Policy <u>6.27. The height of street walls (that portion of a building closest to the street) should relate to the width of the adjacent street and support sensitive transitions to residential areas located across the street, through setbacks, building massing, front yard landscaping, and design features.</u></li> <li>• Add Policy <u>6.2.11. Development adjacent to the intersection of Esquimalt Road and Dominion Road should help create a gateway recognizing the transition between Esquimalt and Victoria (see 14.1.5.).</u></li> <li>• Revise Policy 6.1.2, 8.5.8 and Maps 12 and 15 to recognize view corridor from Mary Street at Henry St,</li> <li>• Maintain (renumbered) Policy 6.2.6. addressing transitions to adjacent lower-scale development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing DPA 16 and proposed <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> development permit guidelines address sensitive transitions and state the height of the streetwall should be proportional to the width of adjacent streets.</li> <li>• Design guidelines are most appropriate tool to address massing, streetwall height and transition to adjacent development (rather than overall height restrictions). Current design guidelines would result in an approx. 4 storey streetwall along Dundas Street.</li> <li>• A given height may not be achieved on small sites if it cannot meet guidelines, as clarified in the addition of Map 10 (Anticipated maximum building heights at a glance).</li> <li>• Large sites on Dundas Street are already built to 3 – 4 storeys and while unlikely to redevelop, the 5 storey height allows for the addition of housing with the potential to achieve OCP densities (and possibly 10% added density for affordable housing) with rental retention or replacement. This still represents a reduced height from the OCP maximum (6 storeys).</li> <li>• A view corridors to the south from Mary Street also exists, with opportunities for future development to frame views of the Olympic Mountains.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Change recommended:</b></p> <p>Revise proposed design guidelines to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• geographically specific transition guideline, including for landscape and sensitive treatment of Dundas Street frontage, and guidelines regarding gateway feature.</li> <li>• reference to view corridor from Mary Street at Henry Street.</li> </ul>

Large Urban Village					
<p><b>OCP Amendment #8. Support heights above 6 storeys Vic West Village:</b></p>	<p>Strong support for the proposal (combined survey and open house support of 68%). Concerns include that the height be limited to 4 storeys, that heights above 6 storeys not be supported, that there be no further development permitted here in the future, that redevelopment happen sooner to help establish a village/replace parking lots; that density has already been transferred from Westside Shopping Centre site in the past and this be considered in amenity contributions; that there is enough density in the Songhees area; that this area not be called he “heart” of the community; that there be more density supported on those sites that support more height in the plan; that the DaVinci centre site support more height where community amenities are considered. General concern expressed during process to conserve opportunities for office employment. Advisory Design Panel suggested that areas where buildings higher than 6 storeys are desired, be aligned with densities higher than 2.5 fsr.</p>	<p><b>Revisions to plan recommended:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise (renumbered) Map 9 (Neighbourhood Land Use Map), policies 7.1.2., 7.1.5, and 7.1.6. to remove consideration of heights taller than 6 storeys.</li> <li>• Revise policy 7.1.1.: “Encourage a mix of uses such as residential, local commercial, retail, restaurant, <u>employment</u>, and community services, with residential uses <u>located</u> above commercial uses.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General community support for change in this area during the plan horizon; desire for it to feel more like a village than a shopping centre</li> <li>• Location is buffered from lower density areas spatially and/or due to elevation change to Alston Street</li> <li>• Heights taller than 6 storeys are not necessary to achieve density of 2.5 fsr and design objectives of plan. If a future proposal comes forward which includes taller buildings, it may be considered on its merits, with an OCP amendment.</li> <li>• Address earlier concerns regarding employment potential and reflect OCP vision for Large Urban Villages</li> <li>• There was no density transfer, but rather a rezoning of the shopping centre property and the Park site which distributed commercial and residential density at an overall density lower total density than previously zoned.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Remove OCP amendment #8</b></p>

Employment Lands			
<p><b>OCP Amendment #12: Change designation from Urban Residential to Employment-Residential (Alston-Skinner-Tyee block) and from General Employment to Employment-Residential (several parcels near Esquimalt Road)</b></p> <p><b>OCP Amendment #13: Change designation of most of the light industrial area between Esquimalt Road and Wilson Street, and between Langford Street and Skinner Street, from General Employment to Industrial-Employment to maintain light industrial uses at grade</b></p> <p><b>OCP Amendment #14: Change the designation of several areas adjacent to Esquimalt Road, and Langford Street, from General Employment to Industrial Employment-Residential.</b></p> <p>Strong support for these proposals. Concerns include: height be reduced; treat similar lands the same; provide more flexibility of employment use. Some feel more height along Esquimalt Road would better support redevelopment to mixed-use to enhance vibrancy and sense of safety of the area.</p>	<p><b>Revisions for employment areas (see Chapter 8 for details):</b> Revise sections 7.1.5.-7.1.6., (renumbered) sections 8.3 – 8.6, and future land use maps to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designate smaller sites adjacent to Langford Street, Skinner Street and Esquimalt Road between Springfield and Bay Street as “General Employment with Limited Residential” (revise land use maps accordingly)</li> <li>• For those areas along Esquimalt Road or adjacent to the Westside Large Urban Village, where 5-6 storey buildings are envisioned, align density with OCP density for Employment-Residential (approx. 2.5 fsr). For other areas, where lower heights are anticipated, maintain a maximum density of approximately 2.0 fsr.</li> <li>• Indicate in policy that these areas’ primary function is employment, and that residential uses are meant to be limited to no more than half the total floor space.</li> <li>• Indicate that light industrial or artisan spaces should be considered</li> <li>• Clarify that retail use is not supported except as ancillary to a primary use.</li> <li>• Indicate that residential uses would generally be on upper floors and/or facing Alston Street to transition to residential areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed changes are meant to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emphasize employment function of these areas</li> <li>○ Provide greater flexibility in employment uses in smaller sites proposed for employment-mixed use, while maintaining consideration of artisan or light industrial production integrated into the mixed use areas</li> <li>○ Continue to maintain the larger, contiguous light industrial areas while still providing opportunity for upper-floor offices.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The proposed changes are meant to balance concern about retaining employment lands with desire to add housing and mixed-use vibrancy to these areas along Langford Street and Esquimalt Road</li> <li>• These areas are currently envisioned in OCP, zoned and used for employment</li> <li>• Change to building height is not recommended for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposed neighbourhood plan already indicates 4-storey (or lower) maximum heights adjacent to lower-density areas.</li> <li>○ Development Permit Area guidelines are best tool to provide for sensitive transitions.</li> <li>○ The current OCP supports up to 4 storey commercial in these areas (which may be equivalent in height to a 5-storey mixed use building).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Maintain OCP Amendment #13 for most employment areas between Esquimalt Road, Dalton Street, Wilson Street, and William Street</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Changes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Designate other areas described in the proposed amendments, as “Employment-Residential” urban place designation</li> <li>2. In the proposed <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> Add content specific to transitions across streets to proposed design guidelines. (Guideline 10.e.)</li> </ol>

Core Songhees			
<p><b>Bayview Lands</b> Request to make minor changes to more accurately describe Bayview hillside lands, and more accurately represent open spaces and building footprints in these lands.</p>	<p><b>Minor revisions to plan:</b> Revise Chapter 9 to more accurately describe extent of Bayview lands. Map revisions to Map 1, 9, 15, 16 to more accurately reflect open space and building footprints approved. Revise Map 2 to include reference to Songhees Hillside Guidelines.</p>		
Development Permit Guidelines			
<p><b>OCP Amendment #16, 17, 18. Expand Development Permit Area 5: Large Urban Villages; 6A: Small Urban Villages; and 7A: Corridors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that light industrial buildings will be unattractive</li> <li>Recommendation for additional policies regarding transition to residential areas</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Guidelines for Multi-Unit Residential, Commercial and Industrial</i>, and the proposed addition of <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> address building design.</li> <li>Proposed specific content in <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> addresses transitions and screening for light industrial uses.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed Changes:</b> Minor revision to <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> adding detail for strategies to transition at edges of Esquimalt Road Corridor and Urban Villages.</p>
<p><b>OCP Amendment #19: Create a new Development Permit Area 15F: Intensive Residential – Townhouse and Attached Dwelling</b> Strong support (72% combined survey and open house) Few comments received, either supporting additional design control, or not able to support due to not agreeing with proposed development anticipated</p>	<p><b>No change to plan recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General neighbourhood input indicates support for additional ground-oriented housing diversity with design guidelines. The proposed guidelines have been revised to strengthen areas related to compatibility, contextual design, and transitions to better ensure neighbourhood fit.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed Changes:</b> Proposed Development Permit Area 15F has been renamed as “Intensive Residential: Attached Residential Development.” Content has been revised to address contextual design, compatibility, mechanical equipment and service areas, and transitions to parks and open spaces.</p>

<b>8., 15: Amenities</b>			
<p><b>OCP Amendments #8, 15: Amenities and Affordable Housing:</b> Community Association submission recommends the plan should commit to consult with the community regarding amenities to be provided per Amendment 8 (Vic West Village) and 15 (density bonus for affordable housing)</p>	<p><b>Revisions to plan recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify in Policy 7.1.4. that community amenities provided at Westside Large Urban Village would be informed by public engagement.</li> <li>Revise policies 6.1.5., 7.1.4. regarding 10% bonus density to substitute a more general policy which references consideration of additional density where additional affordable housing benefit is provided, consistent with city-wide policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intention of the plan is to identify the general types of amenities which are desired, as identified by a thorough engagement process, recognizing that conditions and community needs may evolve.</li> <li>Amenities offsetting impacts of density on a specific development proposal would be offered and considered through a rezoning process, which would be a public process.</li> <li>Based on Council feedback regarding consideration of bonus density, a clear policy recommending 10% additional density is not recommended for inclusion in the neighbourhood plan. The neighbourhood plan continues to mirror the OCP in describing maximum densities “up to approximately” a certain floor space ratio, providing opportunities to consider limited additional density on a site-by-site basis.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Remove Amendment #8</b> <b>Remove Amendment #15</b></p>
<b>General Land Use and Urban Design</b>			
<p>Include future <b>population estimates</b> in plan</p>	<p>A page has been added to Chapter 2 of the plan, providing future population estimates.</p>		<p>N/A</p>
<p>Provide <b>visualization</b> (3-D) of what Vic West will look like. (Note: Per communication with CALUC, could simply be a compound map of all anticipated building heights)</p>	<p><b>Change recommended:</b> Add new Map 10 showing anticipated building heights at a glance, to Chapter 5.</p>		<p>N/A</p>
<p>“Special Planning Area” for Esquimalt-Tyee triangle does not provide any additional guidance beyond the Core Songhees urban place designation in the OCP, and existing Development Permit Guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Change recommended:</b> Remove this section</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This section was added by staff to reflect the current OCP, for a site within Core Songhees that is currently low intensity and not within an MDA.</li> <li>The policies in the proposed plan were redundant and unnecessary. The site is not a large site with special characteristics meriting a Special Planning Area. Rather, any future rezoning would be negotiating using all existing policies.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>

Transportation and Mobility			
What we heard	Proposed change to plan policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p><b>Bay Street Bridge</b> Mention Bay Street Bridge Issues and Resolution (Community Assoc. urges City to include)</p>	<p><b>Revise Policy 3.4.1. to add:</b> <u>Complete rehabilitation and resurfacing of Bay Street Bridge.</u> Improve cycling and pedestrian facilities for Point Ellice Bridge as part of <del>future</del> <u>long-term</u> bridge improvements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan addresses Bay Street bridge in Action Plan (short term: complete rehabilitation; long term: pedestrian and cyclists improvements to Bay Street Bridge Crossing)</li> <li>Upgrading Bay Street bridge pedestrian and cycling facilities is a priority for the community. Decisions regarding Bay Street Bridge made as part of City-wide budget allocation.</li> </ul>	N/A
<p><b>Alston and Langford Streets</b> Improve safety on Alston and Langford Street. Suggestion to establish expectation that owners of properties along Langford Street delineate and maintain the borders of their properties to a safe standard and at a minimum install an asphalt curb to delineate walking area separate from parking area. (Community Assoc. urges City to include)</p>	<p><b>Revise policy 3.3.10. and action item in plan.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate opportunities for short-term sidewalk improvements on Langford Street between Alston Street and Tyee Road, and <u>potential improvements to Alston Street</u>, through update to pavement management plan (See Policy 3.3.10.).”</li> <li>Move Action Plan item regarding Langford Street (and Alston St) and pavement management planning up to bulleted list, to make it easier to find.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Langford Street is identified for pavement management plan improvements in 2018.</li> <li>Alston Street has been added to the list to be considered for pavement management plan.</li> <li>Policy 3.3.10. states:</li> <li>Alston Street and Langford Streets: Over long-term, complete sidewalk network through redevelopment. Consider short-term improvements through pavement management planning. See also 3.4.3</li> </ul>	N/A
<p><b>Speed Limits</b> Reduce speed limits on major roads (Craigflower, Tyee, Bay, Wilson &amp; Esquimalt) (Community Assoc. urges City to include)</p>	<p><b>Add Policy 3.6.9. Assess Craigflower, Tyee, Bay, Wilson and Esquimalt for consistency of speed limits along corridor, and across municipal boundaries.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Update Map 4 accordingly.</u></li> <li>Add to bulleted list in short-term actions (2019/ pending 2018 budget)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review speed limits for consistency</li> <li>Maintain Policy 3.4.2 (re: enhanced pedestrian-friendliness of Bay Street and possible new or enhanced crossings); and associated short-term Action Plan item.</li> <li>Maintain Policy 3.3.20 (monitor and review speed limit along Esquimalt Road after completion of the new Johnson Street Bridge) and associated Action Plan item.</li> <li>Maintain policy 3.6.5. and associated Action Plan item to evaluate Wilson Street from Dominion Road/Viewfield Street to Rothwell Street. Add this item to Map 4.</li> </ul>	N/A
<p><b>Traffic Calming and Crossing Improvement</b> Include plans for traffic calming, esp. on Craigflower, Hereward and</p>	<p><b>Revision to Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise policy 3.4.4. to add evaluation of the crossing at Raynor Street, and add to Action Plan for short-term evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the Craigflower at Raynor crossing was recently improved, evaluation recommended in response to comments.</li> </ul>	N/A

<p>Catherine (Community Assoc. urges City to include)</p> <p>Improve pedestrian crossing at Craigflower and Raynor – several comments that it feels unsafe due to traffic speed, visibility and nearby signal</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catherine Street has recently had a number of transportation improvements. Hereward Street and Skinner Street are already identified in neighbourhood plan and action plan for short-term assessment for potential improvements. Craigflower Street addressed through plan policies.</li> <li>• Maintain Policy 3.3.6. (re: evaluation of Pine Street and Hereward Street for improvements to pedestrian safety) and associated Action Plan item.</li> <li>• Maintain Policies 3.4.3. and 3.4.4. regarding improvements to create a slower more comfortable cycling experience along Craigflower Road; and short-term action item to evaluate Skinner Street between Front Street and Langford Street for pedestrian and cyclist comfort and safety.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>William Street Bicycle Route</b></p> <p>Recommendation that bicycles not be directed along William Street because this is a relatively narrow street with truck traffic accessing businesses on the west side, and that other options exist including the E&amp;N Rail Trail, Springfield Street (which is 3 m wider than William Street), and proposed connections adjacent to the Vic West Elementary field.</p>	<p><b>No change recommended.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• William Street carries primarily local traffic at low volumes and speeds, and is the most direct route from the south to access the people-only William Street Greenway and Vic West School.</li> <li>• William Street has been identified as a greenway since 2003, and is a key pedestrian connection to Vic West School.</li> <li>• No protected lanes are envisioned on William Street, rather bicycles would continue to share the road with other traffic. The plan also proposes a connection from the William Street Greenway to the E&amp;N Trail as proposed by the public comments, for those choosing an off-street route.</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion to revise the east-west path alignment across the Vic West field, to show the route more conceptually</li> <li>• Suggestion to revise childcare policies to include the opportunity for more childcare (out of school care) at Vic West School</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minor Change recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map 3 revised to show more conceptual path alignment</li> <li>• Policy 13.2.1. revised to include Victoria West Elementary School</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both policies could be supported through partnerships involving the Greater Victoria School District</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Urban Agriculture</b></p>			

What we heard	Proposed change to plan policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
Engage the Vic West Food Security Collective in strengthening Chapter 12. (Community Assoc. proposes City include)	<p><b>Minor change recommended</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The introduction to Chapter 12, Neighbourhood Food Systems, has been reworded to provide a greater level of context regarding the importance of urban agriculture to the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Policy 12.2.2. has been reworded to indicate support for applications for community gardens in parks identified in the neighbourhood plan, or in other locations of interest to the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community has a strong interest in enhancing elements of the neighbourhood food system.</li> <li>Further changes to urban food policies are best considered and adopted on a city-wide basis.</li> </ul>	N/A
Community Association submission recommends requiring all developments to include food growing amenities.	<p><b>Minor change recommended</b></p> <p>Add Policy 6.2.10 and 7.1.10.: Consider features which support urban food production for residents, including edible landscaping, allotment or rooftop garden areas.</p> <p>Add the following to the Action Plan as a short-term item: Create voluntary guidelines for urban food production in mixed-use and multi-unit developments to short-term action plan (2018)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recent Growing in the City process considered but did not require food growing amenities in new development.</li> <li>City is developing voluntary guidelines for urban food production in mixed-use and multi-unit developments, per OCP 17.12</li> <li>Proposed <i>Revitalization Guidelines for Corridors, Villages and Town Centres</i> encourage open space amenities which encourage sociability, including food growing amenities.</li> <li>Plan policies for redevelopment on larger cooperative housing sites encourages food growing amenities.</li> <li>Further requirements for urban food production space in new development should be considered city-wide and not in one neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	N/A
Question as to why policy 12.3.3. mentions allotment gardens specifically on Bayview lands, whose MDA does not provide for allotment gardens?	<p><b>Change recommended:</b></p> <p>Remove policy relating to Bayview Lands.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Origin of this policy appears related to suggestion that if MDAs are renegotiated, urban agriculture amenities were desired by community members. Staff recommends that any specific renegotiations of MDAs, if they should occur, should include public consultation at that time.</li> </ul>	N/A

What we heard	Proposed change to plan policy	Rationale	Impact on Proposed OCP Amendments
<p>Include policies for all parks, including a vision and plans for each park. (Community Assoc. urges City to include)</p>	<p><b>Change recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies have been provided for most parks, reflecting:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Input during the Vic West Neighbourhood Plan process</li> <li>○ Directions from existing Park Improvement Plans or Master Development Agreements</li> <li>○ Consideration of further planning needed for Arm and Burleith parks and the adjacent shoreline</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Add Park Condition Assessment to short-term actions in Action Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input through the neighbourhood plan process will be considered as future park improvement plans are undertaken.</li> <li>• The City will be developing a Parks Condition Assessment to help prioritize areas for investment in the coming years.</li> <li>• Some parks have not been included because there was no specific input through the plan process, nor is there a specific improvement plan for these parks. These include Songhees Hillside, Vista, Tenas, and Saghalie Parks.</li> <li>• A vision statement for each park is not included, as this should be developed through consultation during planning for each park. The Parks and Open Spaces Master Plan is a higher level document that does not individually address each of Victoria's 137 parks. Neighbourhood plan engagement sought ideas for improvements, but not a vision for each park.</li> </ul>	N/A
<p>Request for park improvements in Rainbow Park/Mary Street Park. Suggestions include picnic area, enhanced landscape, improved trail connections, and a community garden.</p>	<p><b>Change recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include as suggestions from the community, in parks section (above).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above</li> </ul>	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include water access points in the plan. (Community Assoc. urges City to include)</li> <li>• Concern that water and beach access do not have greater attention in plan, as they are very important to community.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Change recommended:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show existing and potential public water access points and private marinas on Map 6.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential water access points have been identified through the neighbourhood plan process (dependent on ecological assessment.)</li> <li>• An ecological assessment of potential for access points in Arm, Burleith and Banfield Parks is included as a short-term item in the Action Plan.</li> </ul>	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show the new Gorge Marine Park in the plan, with park's intent, vision and policies. (Community Assoc. urges City to include)</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change recommended</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Gorge Marine Park" is a zoning designation and not a park dedication.</li> <li>• Staff will be bringing forward a proposal to create a management plan. Creation of a management plan and its scope have not yet been approved by Council.</li> </ul>	N/A