



# Uptown-Douglas Plan (Draft)

---

## Comments Summary

All Sections	Section/ Policy	Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	All – Plan Name	Suggest considering the concept of neighbourhood identity in the Plan area, including exploring a revised Plan name.	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan.  Name of Plan changed to “Uptown-Douglas Plan”.	<u>Rationale:</u> Staff recognized issues with naming of the Plan (difficulty in public/stakeholder reference to Plan name, length of name, new plan area boundary, etc.) and supported the idea of having the Advisory Committee discuss options for change. Revised Plan name provides added simplicity to its reference.
	All – Trail reference	Suggest revising reference language to the Galloping Goose and Lochside trails, indicating they are Regional Trails.	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan.  Add ‘Regional’ to all references to Galloping Goose and Lochside Trails (i.e. Galloping Goose Regional Trail, Lochside Regional Trail, Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails).	<u>Rationale:</u> Consistency of language and alignment with other regional plans.
	All -Trail corridor	Suggest revising language specific to references to animation and access along the Galloping Goose Regional Trail. Concern over conflicts with existing plans and role of corridor.	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan.  Various revisions, including modifying language to be less prescriptive; clearly outlining trail ownership, management and approval process, and establishing front-yard setbacks and streetwall height for properties adjacent to the Trail.	<u>Rationale:</u> Maintaining the intent of the Plan while softening the language and providing assurances to other authorities of goals, processes, approvals, etc.
	All – Swan Lake reference	Suggest referring to Swan Lake as Swan Lake Nature Sanctuary	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> In general, the scope of policy extends beyond the lake itself, encompassing the wetlands and surrounding buffer area.
Section 1	Section/ Policy	Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	No major public comments			
Section 2	Section/ Policy	Comment /Concern	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	Section 2.4: Planning Framework	Suggests adding reference to additional plans in ‘Other Regional Plans’ – where policies may overlap and complement – that are not specified in the Draft Plan	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan.  Revised plan section to include, within “Other Regional and Municipal Plans”, reference “... including the Capital Regional District Regional Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan and Regional Trails Management Plan, and the District of Saanich Urban Forestry Strategy also inform...”	<u>Rationale:</u> Revisions expand reference to other regional plans to further ensure alignment with the broader regional goals and outcomes.
	Section 2.4: Planning Framework	Suggest providing clarity to ownership of the Galloping Goose corridor (owned by the Province and leased by the CRD) and note that it cannot be built upon by others without	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan  New Call-Out Box, Section 2.4: (Planning Framework) that outlines involvement of other approval agencies, such as the CRD and MOTI. As an example, new development that seeks access along the Galloping Goose Regional Trail	<u>Rationale:</u> Enhanced language to ensure clear communication of process and approvals when working with the Trail corridor. The language included here satisfies many of the agencies concerns throughout the Plan in regard to frontage and access.

		prior written approval from both organizations.	would require notification and approval of these authorities.	
Section 3	Section/ Policy	Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	No major public comments			
Section 4	Section/ Policy	Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	Section 4, <b>Objective E:</b> Environment and Sustainability	Suggest revising language, as per Terms of Reference	Revision applied to the Draft Plan  Revise Objective to read "...including Cecilia Creek <u>and its</u> Watershed."	<b>Rationale:</b> Wording aligns with approved Terms of Reference for the Uptown-Douglas Corridor Plan
	<b>Policy 4.4.1</b> (former Policy 4.3.1): Climate Change Adaptation: Built Environment and Resilience	Suggest including reference to partnership in the potential study related to Cecilia Creek and its Watershed.	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan, in consultation with the CRD  Revised policy: Approach the Capital Regional District regarding a potential study to comprehensively assess the Saanich portion of the Cecilia Creek Watershed, assess feasibility of daylighting Cecilia Creek and identify priority actions for improvements.	<b>Rationale:</b> Revised text further clarifies partnership and objectives. Informed through discussions with CRD staff.
	<b>Section 4.4</b> and <b>Policy 4.4.5:</b> Watershed and Stormwater Management	Suggest including reference to the Trails ownership, leasehold and management hierarchy of the Trails	Revisions applied to the Draft Plan  New Addition to Section 8.3 (Trails): The corridor that contains the Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails within the Plan area are owned by the Province of BC, administered by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI) and leased by the Capital Regional District's (CRD) Regional Parks Division, where development, operation, and maintenance are overseen.  Revised Policy 4.4.5 to include "Work with the CRD to...", included reference to ownership/lease/ management of the Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails and created a call out box that clearly outlines processes related other approval authorities that may occur during the development process.	<b>Rationale:</b> Revisions provided clarity for the public in terms of ownership and authorization for development, and reassurance for stakeholders in terms of process and collaboration (and align with goal of RTMP (CRD) #7 (p.7)
Section 5	Section/ Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	<b>Policy 5.1.1:</b> Future Land Use	Suggest increasing clarity with respect to how land use and height designations would be applied to development applications	Changes applied to Draft Plan  <i>Evaluate applications for new development that seek changes</i> to use, height and density in the UDC based on the land use and height designations identified on Map 5.1 and in Figure 5.1, as well as the policies contained in all sections of this Plan.	<b>Rationale:</b> Revisions to policy clearly state that applications will be evaluated based on criteria in supporting Map and Figures, as opposed to stating that a change would be considered.
	<b>Policy 5.1.2:</b> Future Land Use	Suggest increasing clarity through revisions to land use policies, providing greater	Changes applied to Draft Plan	<b>Rationale:</b> Aligns with key plan direction to lead growth with residential and

Section 5		clarity on the Plan's land use designations and heights.	Support site specific changes to land use and/or height designations as per Map 5.1 and Figure 5.1 where developments advance overall plan objectives and include significant community contributions (see Policy 5.6 and 10.2).	support strategic objectives of housing affordability.
	<b>Policy 5.1.3:</b> Future Land Use	Suggest moving away from a land lift analysis approach to achieving community contributions. Concerns that this approach creates uncertainty and may discourage development.	Changes applied to Draft Plan  Support developments that exceed the Base Building Height identified on Map 5.1 (but are within Maximum Building Height limit identified in Figure 5.1) provided that they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate advancement of objectives in all sections of the Plan, as appropriate to the site;</li> <li>• Provide community contributions as per rates identified in community contribution policy or agreed upon through a site-specific negotiation (see Policy 5.6.6); and</li> <li>• Align with the Plan's urban design framework (Section 9)</li> </ul>	<b>Rationale:</b> Revisions reflect change from a land lift analysis to per unit rate (and individual negotiation in the interim)
	<b>Policy 5.1.4:</b> Future Land Use	Suggest increasing overall maximum height in Plan area above 18 storeys. Desire to create a more varied skyline, increase viability on certain sites and provide the possibility of more open space with taller buildings.	Changes applied to Draft Plan, informed through comments and survey responses, and support by project Advisory Committee.  Added new policy 5.1.4, addressing height beyond maximums: "In addition to Policies 5.1.2 and 5.1.3, consider applications within the Core land use designation seeking to construct buildings taller than 18 storeys, provided proposed developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are a maximum of 24 storeys in height;</li> <li>• are located on or directly adjacent to the multi-modal Transit Hub site, on the half of the Uptown Shopping Centre site closest to Ravine Way / Carey Road, or on the half of Saanich Plaza site closest to Ravine Way. Other Core sites may be considered in exceptional circumstances;</li> <li>• demonstrate how increased building height can contribute to on-site open space and public realm improvements;</li> <li>• demonstrate application of good urban design specific to taller buildings, including massing, skyline character and shadowing impacts; and</li> <li>• prepare a land lift analysis specific to additional height above 18 storeys to inform negotiated community contributions (see Policy 5.6.6).</li> </ul>	<b>Rationale:</b> Allowing additional height within the Core designation, specifically along the Douglas spine and within close proximity to the future transit hub will benefit the key objectives of the Plan. From an urban design perspective, this will add variation to the skyline.  Support for increased height was been heard during the design workshop (key locations), public input in Phase 5 (during engagement events and public survey), various stakeholder meetings and from the development industry. This change will require an amendment to the Official Community Plan, which identifies a maximum height of 18 storeys.
	<b>Section 5.1:</b> Future Land Use	Suggest including taller buildings at corners and in other important locations to create a more interesting skyline.	Changes applied to Draft Plan, through public consultation/ comment and survey responses, later reviewed and supported by project Advisory Committee.  Comment addressed in new policy 5.1.4 (see above)	<b>Rationale:</b> With additional community contributions (for density above max height of 18 storeys) it makes sense to support the added height (and density) of up to 24 storeys for limited sites in suitable /strategic locations throughout the core designation. From an urban design

Section 5				perspective, the variation in height will contribute to a varied skyline.
	<b>Map 5.1:</b> Land Use and Building Height Designation	Request considering land use designation at 524 Culduthel Road/ 31 Regina Ave to from Mixed Employment to Core	No changes made to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Staff analysed this site and possible changes to land use and density, considering surrounding land use, access, topography and location. The key rationale for a change is the proximity to future transit hub and a slight dip in topography at this site between the highway on the east and the residential neighbourhood to the west/northwest. A major change to land use here seems premature without having a master plan for the School Board site and given the limited vehicular access and the surrounding land use context.
	<b>Map 5.1:</b> Land Use and Building Height Designation	Suggest allowing storeys, as per Map 5.1 and Figure 5.1, to be over and above existing building height (e.g. 2 storey building) to develop an existing 8 storeys on top.	No change to Draft Plan	<u>Rationale:</u> The height and land use designations proposed in Map and Figure 5.1 are considerable, given the built landscape in the UDC area today. An applicant could apply to add additional storeys to an existing structure so long as the new building height is within the maximum height permitted for a given land use designation.
	<b>Map 5.1:</b> Land Use and Building Height Designation	Suggest changing the base heights in the Mt. View Sub-Area Neighbourhood, as follows: -mid-rise residential (6) adjoining Vernon Ave, Cadillac Ave, and Crease Ave all reduced to neighbourhood apartment (4). -Core (12) numbers all reduced to urban mixed-use (8) -Identify landmark multi-modal transit hub built with a special zoning / designation.	No change to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Heights in the Sub-Area have remained the same. Height and Profile Elevation Analysis conducted, looking at transition areas and slopes. A range of low-medium, medium and high are included to support the nexus of the Plan, the future multi-modal transit hub.
	<b>Map 5.1 and Map 5.2:</b> Land Use and Building Height Designation and Douglas-Oak Hub	Suggest changing the land use designation of the Gateway Village site from Urban Mixed-Use to Core.	Change applied to Draft Plan.  Change to land use and height designation for the Gateway Village site, from Urban Mixed Use (8-12) to Core (12-18).	<u>Rationale:</u> This site could be considered a gateway location, is in keeping with the general orientation of the Core land use (north south) along the 'spine' and offers a transition to the Urban Mixed-Use to the west and south with the two end lots that border Carey Road.
	<b>Map 5.1:</b> Land Use and Building Height Designation and <b>Map 5.7:</b> Nigel Valley – Municipal Campus	Suggest changing land use and height designations for Darwin Avenue and Leslie Drive portion of Nigel-Valley Municipal Campus Neighbourhood. Concerns expressed of transition to adjacent neighbourhood and impacts to neighbourhood character.	Change applied to Draft Plan, informed through resident feedback, facilitated resident workshop, and discussions with the Project Advisory Committee  Maps 5.1 and 5.7 revised Nigel Valley – Municipal Campus (north east blocks): Adjusting height of Neighbourhood Residential (from 3 storey to 2.5 storey) along Leslie Drive; changing the land use designation from Neighbourhood Apartment (4-5 storey) to	<u>Rationale:</u> Leslie Drive and Darwin Avenue are transition areas at the periphery of the Plan boundary. The proximity to the Core spine and amenity rich areas within 5-15-minute walking distances justify including this area within the Uptown-Douglas Plan. Reduced heights, from 3 to 2.5 storeys, on Leslie Drive maintain the feel and character of the area while enabling sensitive infill. For similar reasons, Darwin

Section 5			<p>Neighbourhood Residential (3 storey) along Darwin Avenue, and changing end cap of lots (along Leslie Drive, Saanich Road and Darwin Avenue) to Neighbourhood Apartment (4-5 storey).</p> <p>See also Section 5.12 (Nigel Valley-Municipal Campus Neighbourhood Sub-Area) for additional policy and specific map revisions (Map 5.7).</p>	<p>Avenue has changed to Neighbourhood Residential with a height of 3 storeys. A slope in topography from Leslie south west to Darwin aids to mitigate overlook and shadowing for neighbouring properties. Density formerly along Darwin Avenue (Neighbourhood Apartment, 4-5 storeys) has been shifted to the end block adjacent to Saanich Road. The general land use aligns with the existing multi-unit residential building south of here. The changes permit modest changes to land use that could provide ground-oriented housing consistent with neighbourhood scale and character.</p>
	<p><b>Map 5.1 to Map 5.8</b>, All Land Use and Building Height Designation and sub-area maps</p>	<p>Base and Max Heights should both be included on land use maps.</p>	<p>Change applied to Draft Plan</p> <p>Both base and max heights are included on the Land Use Map. Base height is shown with max height shown after in parenthesis.</p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> To improve readability and add clarity to the base height and the maximum height. Figure 5.1 has also been adjusted to better visually explain heights.</p>
	<p><b>Section 5.1:</b> Future Land Use and Map 5.1: Land Use and Building Height Designations</p>	<p>Suggest increasing maximum heights from 4-5 to 6 storeys in the Neighbourhood Apartment designation for the following reasons: could delay or limit the plan's uptake; building code in BC have long defined six storey wood frame as 'mid-rise'; and this form of development feels more appropriate for the areas around Saanich's new Core. The 5 storey max heights are even more challenging because as soon as you exceed 4 storeys the building code requires that you build to the same structural requirements as a 6 storey.</p>	<p>No change applied to Draft Plan.</p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> The transition area on the periphery of the plan area is important, both in stepping down from the denser core but also as a transition to the surrounding single detached neighbourhoods. If the edges were increased to a low mid-rise form, it would be a stark difference of streetscape and not in keeping with good urban design practices.</p> <p>A significant amount of the plan area (&gt;50%), designated as Core, Urban Mixed-use or Mid-rise residential permits buildings 6 storeys or taller.</p>
	<p><b>Figure 5.1:</b> Land Use and Building Height Designations</p> <p><b>Section 9:</b> Urban Design</p>	<p>Suggest removing references to treating the Galloping Goose Regional Trail as street frontage and softening language relating to 'active uses' (reference cited Core, Mixed-Employment and Mixed-Institutional land use designations)</p>	<p>Changes applied to the Draft Plan</p> <p>Removed reference to street frontage and enhanced policy around setbacks, massing, access and use. (See: Figure 1 – Core, Mixed-Employment &amp; Mixed Institution land use designations)</p> <p>Concurrent amendments made in Urban Design Section:</p> <p>Section 9 - Building Placement, 9.2.2 vi.</p> <p>Section 9 - Map 9.2</p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> Intent of draft Plan aligns with the language in Regional Trail Management Plan (CRD), RTMP, and where necessary, revisions have been applied to the Draft Plan to ensure the greenway character of the trail is maintained and that limited access (with approvals), appropriate setbacks, building massing, and landscaping /screening, are all addressed for new developments along the corridor.</p>
	<p><b>Figure 5.1:</b> Land Use and Building Height Designations</p>	<p>Suggest reducing front yard setbacks for low rise, and potentially mid-rise (up to six storeys).</p>	<p>Changes applied to the Draft Plan</p> <p>Adjusted front yard setbacks to majority land use designations (see Figure 5.1). Created detailed provisions for setbacks, included in Section 9 (see Building Placement - Section 9.2.2.vi). <i>Refer to the noted section for</i></p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> Refined setbacks to complement the future urban setting of the Plan area and included additional provisions to assist with review of development/rezoning applications.</p>

Section 5			<p><i>additional stipulations for each land use designation setback.</i></p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Residential</u> (revised from 6 metres) <b>4-6 metres</b> A 4 metre minimum setback may be considered for developments fronting along Darwin Avenue and Calumet Avenue where each unit includes private outdoor space fronting the street that exceeds the minimum (see Policy 5.2.5) (e.g. patio, terrace).</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Apartment</u>: (revised from 2-4 metres) <b>4 metres</b>, and where a reduced setback may be considered (from 4-6)</p> <p><u>Mid-Rise Residential</u>: (revised from 4 metres) <b>4 metres</b>, and where a reduced setback may be considered</p> <p><u>Urban Mixed-Use</u>: (revised from 5-7 metres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>7 – 9 metres</b> of clear pedestrian space from edge of curb to building face of the ground floor for developments fronting along Oak Street;</li><li>• <b>5 metre</b> minimum setback from edge of curb to building face on the ground floor may be considered for developments fronting along Alder Street Carey Road, Cadillac Avenue, Cloverdale Avenue and Short Street; and</li><li>• A <b>2 metre</b> setback from property line to building face on the ground floor will be considered for developments with frontage along Audley Crossing</li></ul> <p><u>Core</u>: (revised, no previous reference): A <b>5 metre</b> minimum setback from property line to building face on the ground floor for developments fronting the Galloping Goose Regional Trail.</p> <p><u>Mixed Employment</u>: (revise, no previous reference): A <b>5 metre</b> minimum setback from property line to building face on the ground floor for developments fronting the Galloping Goose Regional Trail.</p> <p><u>Tennyson Industrial</u>: (revised from 3 metres) n/a</p>	
	Section 5.2: Housing	Suggest strengthening incentives related to rental housing.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan  New policy in section 5.2: Explore community contribution exemptions for rental housing as part of the establishment of a fixed amenity contribution rate.	<u>Rationale</u> : Viability of rental housing is often more challenging than strata development. Consider incentivizing rental housing through policy that includes the exploration of community amenity contribution exemptions specific

Section 5				to rental housing. This approach has been adopted in other jurisdictions, including the city of Victoria.
	<b>Policy 5.2.2:</b> Housing	Suggest strengthening policy and increasing required percentage of new two- and three-bedroom units.	<p>Changes applied to Draft Plan</p> <p>Draft plan encouraged 30% large unit sizes in the Rudd neighbourhood sub-area. Revisions to text now apply to entire UD Plan area with a required minimum percentage of 30% with the goal of attracting and retaining families.</p> <p>New Policy 5.2.2: Require 30% of all new residential uses to include two and three-bedrooms units as a means of providing family appropriate housing (see Policies 10.2.9)</p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> Policy framework is trying to create complete communities in all sub-areas of the UD Plan area, which is supported by a range of housing unit sizes. Development community expressed concern about market realities. 30% was a target that balanced feedback received.</p>
	<b>Policy 5.2.3 and Policy 5.2.4:</b> Housing	Suggest including large units and building features for families within the area.	<p>Changes applied to Draft Plan</p> <p>New policies to support Policy 5.2.2 and family-supportive/appropriate developments</p> <p>5.2.3 Promote child-friendly communities though encouraging larger unit sizes, building/development amenities, and neighbourhood programming that focuses on the needs of children and youth; and</p> <p>5.2.4 Require new residential developments to include engaging child-friendly design elements within common spaces.</p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> Varied unit sizes and typologies will enable a diversity of people that will choose to come, and stay, in the Uptown-Douglas Plan area. Additional supporting policy needed to achieve success of new family-appropriate housing, as required in revised Policy 5.2.2 (above).</p>
	<b>Policy 5.2.5:</b> Housing	Suggest reviewing DCC policy regarding possibility of waivers. In some places the plan states that non-market and secure rental projects may be exempt from DCCs. Is this still the direction?	<p>Change applied to Draft Plan</p> <p>Policy revised: Support developments that are non-market or include an affordable housing component (see Policy 10.2.2) through considering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional density and building heights;</li> <li>• Parking variances;</li> <li>• Financial support through the Saanich Affordable Housing Fund;</li> <li>• Partial waivers (up to 50%) to Development Cost Charges;</li> <li>• Property tax exemptions; and</li> <li>• Funding through grant programs</li> </ul>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> Updated language for DCCs is in keeping with Council adoption of the DCC Bylaw (including language around waiver to fees).</p>
	<b>Policy 5.2.8:</b> Housing	Suggest removing prescriptive requirement for private outdoor space being difficult to meet performance targets when considering Step Code. Consider applying just a minimum depth to achieve similar intent	No change applied to Draft Plan	<p><u>Rationale:</u> This section provides specific minimums of private outdoor space, with sizes dictating useable outdoor space. Draft Plan also enables space to be provide through a combination of private outdoor space and applied to common amenity spaces (indoor and/or outdoor).</p>
	<b>Section 5.6:</b> Community Contributions	Suggest revisions to community contributions, including reducing land lift percentage and pursuing a structured	<p>Changes applied to Draft Plan</p> <p>Revised/New Policies (5.6.5-5.6.7):</p>	<p><u>Rationale:</u> Policy revisions reflect current situation, (negotiated CAC for each application) , and new language seeking to move towards a clear a structured amenity policy (i.e. fixed rate approach)</p>



Section 5		amenity policy that is transparent and predictable	<p>5.6.5: As part of the rezoning process for new residential and mixed-use developments seek to obtain community contributions based upon a fixed rate (per unit or sq.m.) established through a future process, as identified in Policy 5.6.6.</p> <p>5.6.6 Undertake an analysis to enable the development of a structured amenity policy and contribution rate for rezoning applications that would establish a transparent and predictable system for obtaining community amenity contributions in the UD Plan area.</p> <p>5.6.7 For developments that exceed the maximum height in the Core designation (see policy 5.1.4), as identified on Map 5.1, require the provision of a pro forma analysis to determine the value of property land lift, and seek to acquire 75% of the land lift for community amenity contributions.</p>	for CACs. With draft policy supporting increased heights, application of the land lift analysis is suitable for limited site redevelopment (as opposed to an area wide approach).
	<b>Section 5.8:</b> Tennyson Industrial Quarter Sub-Area	Suggest revising text to distinguish between private and public improvements, as related to the Trail corridor.	<p>Change applied to Draft Plan.</p> <p>Added required minimum setbacks and guidelines on public-private interface treatment. See revised Figure 5.1 and Guidelines 9.2.2 vi re: building setbacks for Mixed Employment.</p>	<u>Rationale:</u> With inclusion of required minimum setbacks (Figure 5.1 and Section 9.2.2 vi.), policy and guidelines now clearly indicate distinction between public and private lands.
	<b>Section 5.8 and Map 5.3,</b> Tennyson Industrial, and <b>Objective F</b>	Noted concern over residential use fronting the Trail and with new 8 storey structures.	<p>Change applied to Draft Plan.</p> <p>A streetwall height (see Map 9.2) of 2 storeys has been applied to developments adjacent to the Trail.</p>	<u>Rationale:</u> The new streetwall height, paired with the building stepback requirement (3 m minimum for streetwall height) and the building setback (see Figure 5.1, Mixed Employment) will ensure that a tunneling effect does not occur, and that a human scale and greenway character of the Trail will be upheld.
	<b>Policy 5.9.1:</b> Rudd Neighbourhood Sub-Area	Suggest increasing minimum percentage of 2- and 3-bedroom units that are family appropriate in the Rudd and Rutledge Neighbourhoods.	<p>Changes applied to Draft Plan.</p> <p>The policy that was formerly specific to the Rudd neighbourhood sub-area, requiring 30% of all new development to be 2- and 3-bedroom units is now a requirement of all land use designations.</p>	<u>Rationale:</u> New residential developments starts are seeing a high percentage of micro/studio and one-bedroom suites. To ensure that there are adequate housing choices in the UD area, the Plan now requires all new residential development to supply 30% 2- and 3-bedroom units.
	<b>Policy 5.10.7:</b> Rutledge Neighbourhood Sub-Area.	Information offered on the process regarding the opportunity of utilizing highway island on Blanshard Street for public benefit	No changes applied to the Draft Plan	<u>Rationale:</u> Information on process and scenarios to consider have been saved in an implementation folder and a development process reference folder (including process options such as permits - LOO/VID or lease over fee simple lands). Topic to be addressed also in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with MOTI
	<b>Section 5.11:</b> Mt. View Neighbourhood	Suggest including language that 12-18 storey in this sub-area only considered with the	No changes applied to the Draft Plan	<u>Rationale:</u> The policy and language throughout the entire plan is very much focused on the development of a multi-

Section 5	Sub-Area, and <b>Map 5.1:</b> Land use and building height designations, and <b>Section 5.6:</b> Community Contributions	introduction of a multi-modal transit hub but should an alternate/lesser form of transit exchange be introduced that the height be limited to 6-8 or 8-12 storeys.		modal transit hub, as opposed to an exchange. See Policy 5.11.1 as example.
	<b>Policy 5.12.10:</b> Nigel Valley - Municipal Campus Neighbourhood Sub-Area	Suggest revising language relating to access along the Lochside Trail	Changes applied to the Draft Plan  “... <del>Nigel Valley plaza space across the Trail as part of the Municipal Campus upgrades at the</del> Municipal campus opposite the Nigel Valley Plaza through upgrades or redevelopment (See)...”	<u>Rationale:</u> Revised language clarifies connection rather than development crossing the trail.
	<b>Section 5.12</b> and <b>Map 5.7:</b> Nigel Valley - Municipal Campus Neighbourhood Sub-Area	Strongly suggest reviewing the land use designations and draft policies for Darwin Avenue and Leslie Drive portion of Nigel-Valley Municipal Campus Neighbourhood with consideration of densities, land use, built form, setbacks, heights, views, buffers, design guidelines, shadowing, tree protection, parking/traffic, and safety Concern expressed regarding impacts to neighbourhood character.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan  See revisions to Map 5.1, Figure 5.1 and Section 5.12 and Map 5.7.  <u>Land Use Changes:</u> Nigel Valley – Municipal Campus (north east blocks): Adjusting height of Neighbourhood Residential (from 3 storey to 2.5 storey) along Leslie Drive; changing the land use designation from Neighbourhood Apartment (4-5 storey) to Neighbourhood Residential (3 storey) along Darwin Avenue, and changing and end cap of lots (along Leslie Drive, Saanich Road and Darwin Avenue) to Neighbourhood Apartment (4-5 storey). <u>Access/parking:</u> development that includes lots on Leslie Drive and Darwin Avenue must provide access from Darwin Avenue. All parking much be underground (see Section 6.6 for more details) <u>Design Guidelines:</u> setbacks have been modified (9.2.2vi: 6m minimum along Leslie Dr. and 4m minimum on Darwin Ave.)	<u>Rationale:</u> Leslie Drive and Darwin Avenue are transition areas at the periphery of the Plan boundary. The proximity to the Core spine and amenity rich areas within 5-15-minute walking distances justify including this area within the Uptown-Douglas Plan. Reduced heights, from 3 to 2.5 storeys, on Leslie Drive maintain the feel and character of the area while enabling sensitive infill. For similar reasons, Darwin Avenue has changed to Neighbourhood Residential with a height of 3 storeys. A slope in topography from Leslie south west to Darwin aids to mitigate overlook and shadowing for neighbouring properties. Density formerly along Darwin Avenue (Neighbourhood Apartment, 4-5 storeys) has been shifted to the end block adjacent to Saanich Road. The general land use aligns with the existing multi-unit residential building south of here. The changes permit modest changes to land use that could provide ground-oriented housing consistent with neighbourhood scale and character.
	<b>Policy 5.13.1:</b> Tolmie Quarter Neighbourhood Sub-Area	Suggest revising language relating to activation of the Trail.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Amended Bullet 5 of Policy 5.13.2 as follows: “adds a pocket park, plaza or open space”	<u>Rationale:</u> Removed specified active uses that were previously listed in the policy, leaving the emphasis on the intent of public space and its proximity to the Trail.
Section 6	Section/Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	<b>Policy 6.1.4:</b> Mobility Network Connectivity	Information offered regarding the proposed ownership and operation and maintenance of the crossing. Provincial (MOTI) process offered.	No change applied to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Comments and process provided have been included in an implementation/approvals process folder (Phase 6 >).
	<b>Policy 6.1.4:</b> Mobility Network Connectivity	Suggest revising language regarding new traffic signal to provide additional flexibility	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Replaced “...” full traffic signal” with “...signalization”.	<u>Rationale:</u> Revised language was informed through discussions with the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure and Saanich Engineering

Section 6				staff and provides flexibility on the specific type of signal that is installed,
	<b>Policy 6.1.6</b> Pedestrian Networks	Suggest enhancing policy in relation to pedestrian safety. If pedestrians are really “to be put first”, consider reducing points of conflict between pedestrians and cars (underpasses, walkways, safe crossing of Douglas St. from Oak St.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Change has not been made to Policy 6.1.6.  Map 6.3, Mobility Network, has been updated to include additional complete streets, namely Carey Road, Cloverdale Avenue and Burnside Road East.	<u>Rationale:</u> Revisions to Map 6.3, through adding new Complete Streets, will ensure that there are safe and accessible pedestrian areas (sidewalks, separated bike lanes, etc.) throughout the UDC.
	<b>Policy 6.1.8:</b> Mobility Network Connectivity	Suggest revising policy through simplifying text - difficult to understand objective of changes of vehicle access restrictions.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Continue to work with the Capital Regional District to jointly monitor and evaluate intersections and road crossings with the Galloping Goose Regional Trail and assess suitability of restrictions to improve safety.	<u>Rationale:</u> Revised language, informed through discussions with the Capital Regional District, seeks to add clarity to its intent.
	<b>Section 6.2:</b> Walking	Suggest including mention to the Galloping Goose Regional Trail as a walking route in the Plan area.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  New text included in introduction to sub-section: “Creating a connected pedestrian grid, optimizing the Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails...”	<u>Rationale:</u> Serves to highlight that the Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional trails are greenway recreation trails, for cyclists and pedestrians.
	<b>Policy 6.6:</b> Parking	Ensure buildings can be repurposed, including structured parking levels	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  New Policy has been included as per comment regarding adaptive re-use of parking structures.  Policy 6.6.12: Support parking above the second storey of new developments provided the structure is designed: -with quality screening through architectural detail on the facade of the building -to enable adaptive reuse/flexibility of use of the floors in the future (i.e. future commercial units)	<u>Rationale:</u> Adaptive re-use of above-grade parking structures should be considered in new development, and policy has been drafted for the Plan.
	<b>Policy 6.4.2:</b> Public Transit	Suggest revising language in policy, clarifying ‘rapid transit’.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Revised Policy 6.4.2 (bullet 8): Accommodate the future conversion to an enhanced rapid transit technology (i.e. bus rapid transit and light rail) through innovative and proactive design solutions	<u>Rationale:</u> Revised language offers a range of rapid transit options that may be considered with the future conversion of transit technology.
	<b>Policy 6.4.8:</b> Public Transit	Suggest revising language in policy relating to transit service.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Revised Policy 6.4.8 replaces exclusive busways with interim bus priority lanes.	<u>Rationale:</u> Revised language aligns with the long-term transit plans for this area.
	<b>Map 6.5:</b> Transit Network	Suggest adjusting transit network map, specifically regarding Route 70, Swartz Bay.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Map 6.5 has been revised to include a dashed red line from Douglas Street north along Patricia Bay Highway. This now indicates this line constitutes a rapid service but at levels lower than that of the priority Route along Douglas Street.	<u>Rationale:</u> Revised transit routes align with the long-term transit plans for this area. Change supported by BC Transit staff.

Section 6	<b>Policy 6.6.7:</b> Parking	Suggest including the immediate implementation of a pilot project, to regulate and enforce street parking limits, in the study area. Further, suggest adjusting the priority action in Section 12.1 from medium priority to high priority.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Section 12.1, Priority Actions, has been revised to reflect parking study as a high priority.	<u>Rationale:</u> The management of parking is a high priority for the plan. Important to prioritize addressing on-street, as well as off-street parking practices (policy 6.6.4 (review and update the parking requirements in the Zoning Bylaw))
Section 7	Section/ Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	<b>Section 7.7:</b> Saanich Road	Suggest improving Saanich Road (from Douglas to Tattersall) to alleviate congestion during peak hours, including a sketch with transportation options for consideration	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  A new section, Saanich Road, has been included in the Draft Plan. Policy supports improvements to the road right-of-way in this section and is supported through a conceptual cross section. In addition, Boleskine Road/Harriet Road (south) have been added. Together, these improvements will enhance the east-west connection through this part of the plan area. See new Sections 7.7 (Saanich Road) and 7.8 (Boleskine Road/Harriet Road (south)).	<u>Rationale:</u> Saanich Road and Boleskine Road/Harriet Road were underestimated (included only as complete streets) within the first draft plan. These streets are key east west-connections and their redesign will elevate the function and aesthetic of the area.
	<b>Section 7.8:</b> Oak Street	Suggest revising policy and language relating to Oak Street to further its role as a neighbourhood Street, specifically making this street a 'slow street'.	No change applied to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Through redevelopment, Oak Street will remain a part of the vehicle circulation network, however, reduced loading and commercial activity will take place as a result of the new Audley Crossing, and enhancements to the public realm will be a focus of this street, including new parklets, park space and other public realm enhancements.
	<b>Section 7.9:</b> Audley Crossing	Suggest considering further impacts to properties as a result of the future lane alignment, such as site development constraints	No change applied to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Through the redevelopment process, work with developers to ensure optimal outcomes for Audley Crossing, including through easements, adjustments to the alignment and consideration of community contributions.
Section 8	Section/ Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	<b>Policy 8.1.4:</b> Park Acquisition and Financing	Suggest revising the proposed parks standard. Comment that the standard is general and cannot be realized and that developers are encouraged to build an urban model.	No change applied to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> The figure used, 1.2 hectares of neighbourhood parks per 1,000 people, is a District standard and a reasonable benchmark. Draft Plan seeks to apply this standard to guide future park and open space acquisitions through redevelopment in the plan area. Note that standards related to community and municipal parks are not included, as it is acknowledged that acquisitions of that scale would not be possible in UD area.
	<b>Policy 8.1.5:</b> Park Acquisition and Financing	Suggest revising language of Policies 8.1.5 and 8.1.6 to provide clarity on open space requirements	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Policies 8.1.5 and 8.1.6 combined and language refined as follows:	<u>Rationale:</u> Revisions provide a clear and concise intent as one policy.

Section 8			As part of any redevelopment application, require land for neighbourhood parks, plazas/urban parks (non-DCC parks), and/or publicly accessible open space based on the gross land area of the total lot, as follows: -Minimum 10% for properties 1 hectare or more, with a minimum 50% of that area to be formally dedicated as Park; -Minimum 5% for properties between 0.5 and 1 hectare, with no formal dedication of Park required.	
	<b>Section 8.2:</b> Parks, Open Spaces and Trail Network Design	Suggest including reference to partnership opportunity between Saanich, CRD, MOTI, and City of Victoria	Changes applied to the Draft Plan  New Policy added to section 8.2: Collaborate with the CRD, MOTI and the City of Victoria regarding the provision of park land in this area and connections to the Galloping Goose Regional Trail (refer to Map 8.1).	<u>Rationale:</u> Policy suggested by CRD and MOTI to work together to address future connection/park in the vicinity of Tolmie Lane, as identified on Map 8.1, 'priority area for parks.
	<b>Section 8.3:</b> Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails	Suggest new language be included in the sub-section introduction related to the Regional Trail's ownership, management and operations.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Paragraph added to the introduction: The corridors that contain the Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails within the Plan boundary are owned by the Province (and administered by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure) and leased to the Capital Regional District (Regional Parks) to develop, operate, and maintain.	<u>Rationale:</u> inclusion of ownership and management assists the reader to better understand the process when making applications that are adjacent to the trail corridor or have implications to the trial corridor.
	<b>Policy 8.3.3:</b> Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails	Suggest revised language referencing active commercial uses in the Trail corridor.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Policy 8.3.3 reference to the Galloping Goose revised to read "...at appropriate locations adjacent to the Galloping Goose"	<u>Rationale:</u> The minor language revisions gives notice to an applicant that only select locations may be considered along the Trail Corridor, and thus encouraging discussions on proposed developments with Planning staff early in the process.
	<b>Policy 8.3.6:</b> Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails	Note concern with policy supporting public art along the Trail corridor (ownership, maintenance, etc.),	No change applied to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Typically, public art would be provided on private property. However, with interest for art along the Trail Corridor, Saanich would circulate the application to relevant authorities for review/support. In review of RTMP (CRD), specifically #7(p.10), The CRD supports municipalities and the MOTI establishing and maintain murals and public art on municipal and MOTI lands/structures along the regional trail routes. The CRD may support other art opportunities along the trail corridor where it is felt that such an opportunity will significantly improve the character of the trail route, will deter graffiti, and will not cause undue maintenance requirements. Discussions with CRD reaffirm process, including review and approval of CRD/MOTI with any applications for public art installations within the Trial Corridor.

Section 8	<b>Policy 8.3.2 and 8.3.7:</b> Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails	Suggest revising language in policy to reflect cooperation with the appropriate agency	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Policy 8.3.2 and 8.3.7, revised policy to include “Work with the Capital Regional District to...” for each of the three policies.	<u>Rationale:</u> Revisions to policy provides clear direction and intent of cooperation between various agencies.
	<b>Policy 8.3.3:</b> Galloping Goose and Lochside Regional Trails	Concern noted over significant density near the Trail Corridor, which may outpace the Trails’ capacity to respond to increased expectation/demand.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan.  Language relating to access and frontage for properties adjacent to the Trail has been removed from the Plan. Additional building setbacks, building stepbacks, streetwall heights, and reference to limited/select site access included throughout Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Recognize concerns regarding capacity of the trail given the development potential in the area. Policy and guideline revisions and enhancements will mitigate negative impacts and access interferences along the Trail corridor
Section 9	Section/ Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	<b>Policy 9.1.8:</b> General Urban Design Policy	Suggest including viewsapes from the Nigel Valley-Municipal Campus vantage, west/north west towards Mt. Work	No change applied to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> There are five key views corridors identified in this section, each one identified from public lands and that may be impacted through redevelopment (as per Map 5.1) and increased building heights. The suggested view towards Mt. Work is not considered to be at risk, with no proposed height increase (from single detached residential to neighbourhood residential, both 2.5 stories) on the south side of Leslie Drive.
	<b>Section 9.2.6:</b> Building Massing and Design	Suggest including strong language regarding the mitigation of light pollution and mechanical equipment noise	No change applied to Draft Plan.	<u>Rationale:</u> Language to this effect is included in the section of the Plan, 9.2.6 vi and vii
	<b>Section 9.2.10 v.:</b> Building Massing and Design	Suggest revising approach, away from a 1:5 stepback. Concerns around impacts to development viability.	Changes applied to the Draft Plan  Revised Section When buildings are required to stepback above the defined streetwall, a minimum building stepback of 3 meters shall generally be applied (See Guidelines 9.2.6 viii., Map 9.2, and Figure 9.20).	<u>Rationale:</u> Further research indicates that the stepback at streetwall height is clear and effective. This, along with other design guidelines, will achieve a desirable form and massing of new, taller buildings.
Section 10	Section/ Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	No major public comment			
Section 11	Section/ Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	No major public comment			
Section 12	Section/ Policy	Theme/Comment	Revision and/or Addition	Rationale
	No major public comment			